

men, and the proceedings filled more than 70 pages in the RECORD.

This joint resolution will enable the American people to properly demonstrate to the world and especially to North Vietnam that we are a united nation in our support for our prisoners of war and missing in action.

In recent weeks, there has been a slight improvement in the flow of mail from North Vietnam to the families, and more parcels have been allowed into the prison camps. There is some unofficial indication that the North Vietnamese might be more willing to notify the families of these men as to their status. I submit that these slight improvements are direct results of growing public interest and concern about these men. This resolution will allow this public interest to continue, hopefully with increasingly positive results.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON, on account of official business in Oklahoma on January 22, 1971.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DOW, for 1 hour, January 28, 1971, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALL, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOGAN, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHWENDEL, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. FLOOD, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 60 minutes, January 27.

Mr. MIKVA, for 60 minutes, January 28.
Mr. FLOOD, for 60 minutes, January 28.
Mr. ADAMS, for 60 minutes, January 26.
Mr. ADAMS, for 60 minutes, January 28.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BOLAND in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. ZABLOCKI, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.
Mr. PETTIS.
Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.
Mr. HORTON in six instances.

Mr. BAKER.
Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.
Mr. LUJAN.
Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. McCLURE.
Mr. MIZELL in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in five instances.
Mr. ZWACH in two instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. GUBSER.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.
Mr. BROTMAN.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
Mr. SANDMAN.
Mr. WIDNALL.
Mr. KEITH.
Mr. PRICE of Texas in 10 instances.
Mr. COLLIER in four instances.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.
Mr. PELLY in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE of Texas) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. DENT in four instances.
Mr. BOLLING.
Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.
Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. DELANEY.
Mr. O'NEILL in six instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
Mr. PATTEN in three instances.

Mr. KARTH.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. FASCELL in three instances.
Mr. KASTENMEIER in three instances.
Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in four instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
Mr. DOWNING in two instances.
Mr. MOLLOHAN in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS in two instances.
Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.
Mr. GIAIMO in 10 instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. MIKVA in eight instances.
Mr. BEVILL.
Mr. KOCH in six instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER in three instances.
Mr. JOHNSON of California in three instances.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.
Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 22, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS, JANUARY 18, 1971

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary on the 92d Congress:

WASHINGTON REPORT, JANUARY 18, 1971

(By Congressman LEE H. HAMILTON)

Although the 91st Congress compiled a substantial legislative record, it was overshadowed, to a great extent, by the bickering and

tumult which brought the session to a close.

Each Congress, to a great extent, sets the mood and direction of the upcoming Congress. The legacy of the 91st, I believe, is a growing realization that reforms in the way Congress operates are needed. The 11th-hour dilemma of the 91st Congress demonstrated graphically its inability to handle quickly and effectively the growing and complex problems of the Nation.

It is becoming painfully apparent that better housekeeping is in order. Any institution that is unable to approve its budget until 6 or 7 months after the fiscal year already has begun needs radical surgery. Part of the problem is due to the increased size and complexity of government. But it is also due to the obsolete procedures, and a leadership weakened by the requirements of seniority and the privileges of incumbency.

The overriding aim in any reform of the Congress must be to improve the quality of legislation, not necessarily the quantity. The 91st Congress set the stage for the 92nd Congress to take positive steps to make the institution of Congress more responsive to the majority of its members, to insure better deliberation of the issues, and to favor the elected leadership of the Congress, not leadership automatically achieved on the basis of length of service.

The 91st Congress left a lengthy agenda of unfinished business for the upcoming Congress, which goes to work January 21. Among the first items to be considered will be increases in Social Security benefits and automatic adjustments tied to cost-of-living increases—a measure which passed both Houses but perished when it became snarled

in a massive bill dealing with welfare reform, trade and health insurance.

Major battles already are shaping up over proposed improvements in the Nation's health delivery and insurance systems. A revenue-sharing plan, to return a portion of Federal revenue to State and local governments on a no-strings-attached basis, was widely discussed by the 91st Congress, but no action taken. This legislation is certain to be among the major considerations of the 92nd Congress.

Congress will continue its efforts to reassert its role in foreign policy through a tough scrutiny of funds for the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system, military spending, and military assistance programs. The Congress will continue to press for limitations on American involvements and commitments to foreign countries.

A trade bill, which imposed quotas on imports of textiles and shoes, provided relief to American companies suffering from imports, and granted the President authority to reduce tariffs, passed the House in the 91st, but died in the Senate. That measure is likely to be back for consideration.

Also certain to be brought back for consideration is legislation establishing a consumer protection agency and to allow consumer class actions in our courts, both of which floundered in the last session of Congress. A bill to impose ceilings on election campaign spending was passed by the 91st Congress, but vetoed by the President. It is obvious that some kind of legislation in this area also will be considered in 1971.

The Administration's request for \$290 million for the development of a supersonic transport (SST) was granted a three-month reprieve with a reduced appropriation. The SST will be back with us, along with measures to meet the increasing problems of transportation in the Nation.

In the labor field, there is growing dissatisfaction about the inadequacies of the laws in labor disputes which endanger the National interests and the Congress almost certainly will be asked to act.

In the areas of crime and anti-pollution legislation, the emphasis will be on the implementation and funding of legislation already on the books.

THE BUSINESSMAN AND THE LAW IN THE URBAN AGE

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, I had the privilege of attending the 94th annual meeting of the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce. The speaker on this occasion was U.S. District Judge Frank W. Wilson. Judge Wilson told us where we have been over the past 30 years and some of the guidelines we should use in meeting challenges of the future. As he sees it, there can be no stability, no progress no business and most of all, no freedom unless, and foremost, the rule of law is maintained in the city, State, and Nation.

Judge Wilson's remarks were oriented toward the businessman but what he had to say applies to the activities and goals of all of us as we conclude this last third of the 20th century. I commend this excellent address to the attention of my colleagues. I am sure they will find it a source of inspiration and sound advice.

The text of Judge Wilson's address to the annual meeting of the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce follows:

THE BUSINESSMAN AND THE LAW IN THE URBAN AGE

As we enter upon this new year and upon the beginning of the last generation of the Twentieth Century, I want to talk with you for a short while this evening about some of the common concerns which we in the law and you as members of the business and commercial life of this community and of this Nation should share. I want to talk with you about some of the reasonable expectations that each of us should have of the other and so I have selected as my topic, "The Businessman and the Law in the Urban Age." As a basis for looking forward to the next generation—the generation which President Nixon has hopefully called "The Generation of Peace"—let me turn your minds backward for a moment.

It is difficult for us to realize that only a few years ago the following conditions prevailed in America. The death rate exceeded the birth rate. Pneumonia killed more people than cancer. The average wage in manufacturing was 63 cents an hour and the average weekly wage was \$23.86. The average earning of a doctor was \$4229.00 and of a lawyer was \$4391.00, and each paid an average income tax of only \$25.00 a year. Wage earners paid no income tax. In fact, only one American in 33 was subject to the payment of any income tax. No one paid any sales tax, for the sales tax hadn't been discovered. A new Ford sedan could be purchased for \$685.00 and the stock market suffered a severe setback when the President proposed a \$10,000,000,000 budget. The gross national product was less than \$100 billion dollars. There were no transistors, no radar, no jet planes, no atomic energy, no atom bombs, no rockets, no interstate highways, no frozen food, no penicillin, no data processing, no computers, and no television. The bleak, sparse, quaint, and far-away conditions that I have described existed in the United States of America when many of you commenced your business careers and when I commenced mine in the law. For the year I have described was just 30 years ago—1940.

In 1940 a census official predicted that the American population would grow to 136,000,000 and then by 1980 level off at about 126,000,000. When many of us here tonight were born the population of the United States was less than 100,000,000 people. Already that population has more than doubled. Not only that, but when many of us were born the population of the world was about one and one-half billion. Today more than 3,000 million people in the world must be fed each day. At the present time the population of the world is increasing by 50,000,000 each year. If present population trends continue, in another 30 years the population of the United States will be in excess of 300 million and it will be necessary to find food for 5,000 to 6,000 million people who will then populate the world. Today automobiles are multiplying in the United States three times faster than the population and five times faster than the roads necessary to accommodate them. Highways even now cover with concrete an area equal to all of New England, excluding the State of Maine. When most of population live in rural areas and more than 50% of the American population still lived in rural areas. Today less than 25% of our population live in rural areas and more than 75% live in urban areas. The flight from the farm to the city and the suburb has been one of the most marked national trends in the past 30 years.

What I am attempting to say as a basis for my further remarks on the role of the law and its relation to the business community is that population increase, the urbanization of

society, and technological change are three immense social forces drawing both this Nation and the world ahead at an accelerated pace into a turbulent and uncertain future.

It is not too surprising then that one feels the tremor of anxiety through the whole of society, feels it in the city riots, in the war, in the accelerating crime rate, in the widespread unrest, unease, disaffection, and tendency of youth to drop out, turn on, or "take a trip." These are times of rapid change. These are times of great risk. They are also times of great challenge and great opportunity.

THE LAW MUST PROVIDE STABILITY

In the first place, I would suggest that if businessmen are to remain in business and if mankind is to avoid disaster, the law must provide stability. Businessmen are entitled to expect and should demand no less than this, for there can be no progress amidst anarchy. There can be no freedom but ordered freedom. Men cannot shout, shove, burn, nor brawl their way either to dignity or to freedom. In short, there can be no stability; there can be no progress; there can be no business; and there can be no freedom unless first and foremost the rule of law is maintained in this City, this State, and this Nation.

For the rule of the law is the single greatest achievement of mankind's centuries long struggle for freedom. If there is to be a future worthy of its promise, there must be a recommitment here and now to the following propositions: first, that all citizens in a democracy are equal under the law, regardless of race, class, sex, or religion or any other circumstances; second, that all citizens in a democracy are equally bound by the laws duly adopted by the orderly processes of representative government, even those laws with which they may personally disagree; and, finally, that each citizen in a democracy is committed to use only orderly and lawful processes to change the laws and rules by which that society is run. These are the fundamentals of the rule of the law. They may be forgotten or trampled upon only at the risk of losing all that makes freedom possible and all that makes life meaningful and worthwhile.

Going one step further, it should be apparent to all that if the rule of the law is to be maintained and if we are to secure a stability that will permit progress, we must meet the challenge of crime and criminal behavior in America. For the fact is that we are losing that struggle today and have been losing it for a number of years. The fact is that the rate of commission of serious crimes in America for a number of years has increased almost 10 times faster than the growth of our population. The fact is that even if there is no further increase in that rate, three out of every 100 young people now between the ages of 10 and 17 will be adjudged a delinquent before they reach their majority. The fact is that from two to three out of every 100 persons here tonight will be the victim of a serious crime within the year 1971, assuming that the law of averages applies to this audience.

The solution to the explosion in crime and criminal behavior in America is of course most complex. And yet the American people in matters of public affairs all too often want simple answers to complex questions.

Even amidst the complexity of the problem, however, two or three things stand out. One such thing is that crime detection has not progressed at anything like the rate of crime commission. This is abundantly shown by the fact that no solution is ever made in more than 75% of all serious crimes. No arrest is ever made in three out of every four serious crimes. If the war on crime is to have any chance of succeeding, the American people are going to have to be willing to provide the manpower, the skill, and the money to do the job of crime detection.

Another obvious matter in this connection is that in our effort to achieve perfection in criminal procedure, we must not so prolong that procedure until the judicial process itself exceeds the life expectancy of the accused. There was a time when after trial and conviction and exhaustion of appellate remedies a judgment of conviction was considered final. Authorities charged with rehabilitation of the criminal could then set about attempting to accomplish their job. There is little public appreciation, however, of the enormous expansion in recent years of post-conviction proceedings. When I came upon the bench ten years ago, state court prisoners were filing less than 1,000 petitions a year in the federal courts seeking post-conviction relief. Last year more than 16,000 such lawsuits were filed, constituting almost one-sixth of the entire caseload in the federal courts. It is not inaccurate to say that death and acquittal now provide the only sure terminal facilities to criminal litigation.

You must demand that your courts bear in mind their obligations to provide a system of justice that considers both the rights of the accused not to be unjustly convicted and the rights of society not to be victimized by crime—a system that renders justice within a reasonable time of the offense and a system in which society isn't injured more by the expense of the trial than by the offense being tried.

Finally, it should be apparent that we are doing an inordinately poor job in the field of criminal rehabilitation. It is no exaggeration to say that in the matter of criminal rehabilitation we stand today where mental hospitals stood a century ago in the care and treatment of mental illness, when the word "bedlam" came into our vocabulary as descriptive of the mental asylum. Even in the best of our institutions, the program is inadequate. Moreover, a great majority of inmates are always in local jails and workhouses and none of these make any pretense at rehabilitation. Here in Hamilton County we do not even provide secure detention, much less decent housing or programs for rehabilitation.

THE LAW MUST PROVIDE FOR CHANGE

What should the businessman expect of the law in the latter third of the Twentieth Century? In the second place, I would suggest that not only are you entitled to expect the law to provide society with stability, but you must also expect the law to provide for social change. This seeming paradox in the law was never better stated than by Roscoe Pound, former Dean of the Harvard Law School, when he said: "The law must be stable, and yet it cannot stand still."

Upon reflection, the statement is not so much a paradox as at first it seems. Stability does not necessarily mean the absence of change. A child is not considered unstable because he passes from infancy to adulthood. In a world where change is inevitable, orderly change has as much of the quality of stability as does the absence of change. Stability includes orderly and anticipated change. If it did not, there could be no stability in the world, for the one certainty in life is change.

Accordingly, if the law is to provide you with stability, it must provide for change. Not only that, it must anticipate change. A rather dramatic illustration of this capacity of the law to anticipate and provide for change has been the development of the law of product liability within the past ten years. For generations now, yes, since the time of the Romans, business law has operated on the principle of "let the buyer beware." In the past ten years that principle has been reversed and now it is the manufacturer who must beware. Caviat emptor, or "let the buyer beware," may have been a proper placement of the risk of loss in an age of handicrafts and small business enterprise. Caviat fabricator, or "let the manufacturer

beware," is now considered a more suitable placement of the risk of loss in the impersonal age of large business enterprise and national markets.

In the future the law must both accommodate and anticipate changes in many areas of life if it is not itself to become an anachronism, contributing to the creation of more problems than it solves.

Two areas of social conflict readily come to mind which mankind has not yet been ingenious enough to subject to the rule of the law. One is the field of industrial relations. The other is the field of international relations. In the former considerable progress has been made within the past 30 years, but as yet we have been unable to fully substitute an orderly and civilized procedure in lieu of duress, force, and even violence as a means of settling disputes and assuring justice in the labor-management field. Moreover, some of our worst monopolistic practices are sometimes committed in the name of collective bargaining.

In the field of international relations we have made some progress in recent years, with negotiations, treaties, regional agreements, the United Nations, and even a World Court more often than not serving as substitutes for force and violence in the settlement of international disputes. Unfortunately, it would appear that our progress here may have been relatively in reverse, for with only modest progress in extending the rule of law to international relations, advancements in the techniques of settlement of international disputes by force and violence have progressed at a truly prodigious rate. But we must not despair. The rule of the law in international relations will not likely come all at once. It would be wonderful if it could. Instead, it is more likely to be built piecemeal, like the common law.

If the future is to be dynamic and if the law is to accommodate the inevitableness of change, your legislators and your courts must, with all of the skill, patience, and foresight of the scientist, devote themselves to the tasks of formulating a new body of law adequate to assure that mankind in the future will be the master of his fate and the author of his destiny. For this is what freedom means. This is the only security worth having. Otherwise, things will be in the saddle and systems, governments, and social forces, which man does not understand must less control, will surely dominate life in the latter part of the Twentieth Century.

SELF-DISCIPLINE

So far I have been talking about what the businessman is entitled to expect of the law. Before closing let me say a few words about what the law may expect of the businessman. In the first place, you can be expected to recognize the shortcomings of the law as well as its strengths. You can be expected to recognize the danger of excessive resort to the law as a means of governing our society. The law can stifle and destroy human freedom as well as nurture and protect human freedom and excessive reliance upon the law can as surely destroy individual freedom and democratic institutions as excessive watering of a plant can lead to the death of that plant. I fear that we are witnessing the beginning of just such excessive reliance on the law. Each year the number and complexity of laws and regulations are increasing at a truly amazing rate. That a more populous, more urban, more technologically advanced society requires more laws and more regulations cannot be doubted, but should all industry become as regulated, for example, as the railroad industry, where the process of decision making has become so complex that by the time a solution is applied the problem has changed, then economic democracy and freedom of business enterprise will largely have disappeared from the American scene. But who can doubt that the trends are in this direction? When the

law grows to such dimensions and such complexity that even the computer cannot keep up, the law will have lost its certainty and will be honored more in its breach than in its obedience. We are witnessing that very process in the field of taxation. If we do not soon learn that a dollar is a dollar and re-write and simplify our state and federal tax laws accordingly, tax evasion is going to become the rule instead of the exception.

Few things concern me more than the rush to pass another law or to impose another regulation to correct every ill or fancied ill in our society and then upon its passage to have a feeling of assurance that the problem is now solved. Each generation of Americans must relearn one of life's most important lessons if freedom is to survive, and that is that a man can only be truly free when he has learned self-discipline. When self-discipline disappears, no amount of law can assure justice and no amount of law can restore freedom. No policeman can ever replace a disciplined conscience.

In the second place, it has been my observation for 20 years as a lawyer and for ten years as a judge that businessmen fall into three categories. There are those who do what they think they can get away with and not be caught; there are those who do only what they are required by the law to do; and there are those who not only do what the law requires but also do what a disciplined conscience tells any good man to do. Fortunately for this City and for this Nation, most businessmen belong to the latter group, but it takes only a few in the first and second categories to create situations where another law is passed that further regulates the lives of all, and freedom is diminished to that extent. Last year six banks failed in the United States. There appeared some connection between their failure and the transfer of ownership interests in the bank, so a new law was imposed regulating stock transfers in all banks in the Nation.

It is a matter of historical fact that one of the reasons why we have big government today is because some businessmen never learn the first lesson of free enterprise, namely that freedom stays only where self-discipline prevails. Every sharp practice, every dishonest act, every false or misleading representation, every compromise with principle weakens the free enterprise system and weakens democracy itself. If ever Russia buries America and our free enterprise system, as she has threatened to do, it will be in a coffin built by Americans who drove the nails in one at a time by refusing to discipline themselves. The encouragement of a disciplined business conscience is the highest function any chamber of commerce could perform.

Finally, as one who knows the threat to freedom that excessive reliance upon government and the law can bring, I would urge the businessmen, individually and through their chambers of commerce, to continue to exercise greater sensitivity to their social responsibilities.

For the businessman whose life is bounded by the boat on the lake and the golf club on the mountain, complacency is still possible, but few such isolated businessmen still exist. Caught in an era of a protracted war, urban crises, a decaying environment, a youth rebellion, a generation whose hero is Ralph Nader, a rising crescendo of crime, violence, drugs and assorted obscenities, the time will not long tolerate business neutrality on the most urgent issues of the day.

Business has come a long way from the "public be damned" days of the 90's, or the "give them any color they want as long as it is black" of the Model T era. I can understand, too, how some might argue that it is the responsibility of business simply to mind the store and leave to the government and the law the problems of society, but in an era when consumerism is the rallying cry

of the day, in an age when black Americans are demanding the right to share in the American dream, in an age when the quantity of production has run headon into the quality of life. Earnings per share will never again be the measure of all things good.

If the businessmen of Chattanooga could solve the problems of pollution with the maximum of self-discipline and a minimum of law, free enterprise would be better served. If the businessmen of Chattanooga could make it possible for large numbers of our black citizens to move up into the great American middle class, all of us would be much the better for the move.

It is the role of business enterprise to act, to manage, to innovate and to bring about social change. Business is a means to an end—not an end in itself. Human life is the end. The humane, creative, successful, self-disciplined business organization can be one of the highest forms of human enterprise.

CONCLUSION

If the law can provide a stable society and yet not stand still, if businessmen can recognize the absolute necessity of self-discipline unless the law is to grow into stifling dimensions, then together we can make our contribution to the freedom, welfare, and happiness of mankind during the remaining 30 years of this century. Hopefully, this will be the generation of peace. Hopefully, also, it will be a generation of continued freedom in America.

One thing is certain, businessmen and the Chamber of Commerce have a major role to play in the preservation of that freedom.

Winston Churchill, in his *History of the English Speaking People*, after recounting the few known facts and referring to the many surviving legends of King Arthur, has this to say of that noble character in British antiquity:

"It is all true, or it ought to be; and more and better besides. And whenever men are fighting against barbarism, tyranny, and massacre for freedom, law and honor, let them remember that the fame of their deeds, even though they themselves be exterminated, may perhaps be celebrated so long as the world rolls around. Let us then declare that King Arthur and his noble knights, guarding the sacred flame of Christianity and the theme of world order, sustained by valor, physical strength and good horses and armour, slaughtered innumerable hosts of vile barbarians and set decent folk an example for all time."

While this Nation can never expect the businessmen of America alone to turn back a new tide of barbarism, if that is what we face, it is not too much for the nation to expect that you should "set decent folk an example for all time."

THE PROMISE OF NEW IDEAS AND FRESH APPROACHES—THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, amidst mounting controversy and lengthy debate the last Congress approved the 1970 Voting Rights Amendments, which gave 18-year-olds the right to vote in local, State, and Federal elections. Oddly enough, the chief source of the controversy was not the substance of the measure, but the opinion of many Members that it could not be enacted by

CVXVII—5—Part 1

an ordinary statute. That the bill was passed in spite of these important reservations is proof of the profound support in the Congress for extending the franchise to our young citizens.

I believe that support is justified. Our young are better educated and better informed than any previous generation. They have taken a deep interest in the policies of our Government. They have fought our war. We can no longer deny them the privilege of participating in the democratic process; we can no longer deny ourselves the promise of new ideas and fresh approaches.

A large number of my colleagues, however, disagreed with the means used to extend the franchise, feeling that such a matter required a constitutional amendment, not merely a Federal statute. I myself shared some of these feelings, and I voted for the 1970 amendments with serious reservations. At that time, however, I felt that the Supreme Court would resolve whatever constitutional questions eventually arose.

On December 21, 1970 the Court did just that—in a way which proved neither side of the controversy correct. It was the Court's opinion that the Congress remained within the limits of the Constitution when it extended voting privileges for Federal elections, but that it could not do so for State and local elections. Consequently, 18-year-olds will be able to vote for President and for Congress, but not for their Governors, mayors, or State legislators.

While I am no expert, I believe the Court's decision was a good one. Unfortunately, it leaves us with an almost unworkable set of voting laws—at least, as they relate to 18-year-olds. Most States will be forced to set up dual balloting and registration procedures at substantial cost to themselves. We cannot begin to estimate the confusion a system like this will cause among the voters.

Even more important is the fact that, if 18-year-olds are felt by the Congress and the Court to be responsible enough to vote for Federal offices, then certainly they are responsible enough to vote at the State and local levels. A dual system would be unjust as well as unworkable.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the House joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to give 18-year-olds the right to vote in all elections. Ratification by the States will necessarily be a long, drawn-out process. Accordingly I urge immediate passage of this resolution, so that the States may complete the amendment process quickly, hopefully in time for the 1972 elections.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a joint resolution

to create a Joint Committee on the Environment.

One of my keenest disappointments of the last session was the failure of this resolution to win final passage. As you know, the resolution passed both the House and the Senate by overwhelming margins, but the minor differences between the two versions were never resolved in conference committee.

Needless to say, I hope that these differences can be resolved and that a version of this bill will become law early this year.

Without repeating the arguments of last year, let me only say that I think a Joint Committee on the Environment is essential if the Congress is to coordinate its efforts against pollution.

There must be one committee which has the authority to oversee and investigate all areas of the Federal pollution effort. I think this committee, first proposed by the then distinguished majority leader (Mr. ALBERT), is the best idea yet advanced in that field.

Again, I hope this bill is swiftly reported to the floor and that final action can be taken this spring.

CARLUCCI CONFIRMATION BLOCKED BY POLITICS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, syndicated columnist Charles Bartlett has written a perceptive analysis of the Senate hearings held late last session on the nomination of Frank Carlucci as Director of Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Bartlett's column is instructive because it explains how a Member of the House or Senate, by using an improper method to defend a program, can easily endanger a program that merits support.

Bartlett observes that Mr. Carlucci emerged from the Senate hearings in December "with considerably more credit than his harassers."

Mr. Bartlett writes:

He professed eloquently his enthusiasm for having his agency perform as the cutting edge of social change. In the crunch he declined the compromise propositions . . . he showed himself to be a man of principle and spirit.

Mr. Carlucci is proving to be a statesman. That alone gives hope to supporters of the OEO legal services program that the improper pressures placed on him during the hearings will not do damage to the legal services program.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I include the text of the Charles Bartlett column that appeared in U.S. newspapers the week of January 12, 1971, at this point:

ROUGH TREATMENT BY THE SENATE

(By Charles Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—Of all the barbarians perpetrated in the awkward exit of the 91st Congress, none was more political and

counter-productive than the handling of Frank Carlucci's nomination to be Director of OEO.

It was one of those unhappy situations in which the political game became more important than the public interest. To help California Sen. Alan Cranston score points against Gov. Ronald Reagan, the Senate Democrats allowed him to block Carlucci's confirmation and thus to leave the man and his agency uncomfortably vulnerable at a critical moment.

The future of the poverty agency is up in the air as President Nixon sets his course for 1971. One alternative before him is the "big package," a sweeping reorganization of the executive branch which will tidy up the overlapping functions of the departments and agencies by a process of consolidation. If the President makes this move, secretly urged on him by the Ash Council, he will stir the vested interests, in and out of Congress, into an uproar.

A transportation of the poverty agency would be part of this reshuffle. OEO will not be eliminated because the White House has come to understand that the symbolism of an agency committed to the concerns of poverty is essential. As a tender of good faith to the poor, it is certain to be preserved in one form or another.

But in a shake-up of federal functions, the identity and nature of the OEO would change. Community action might be merged with model cities; VISTA might become part of a new alignment of volunteer programs; legal services could become a separate entity. These are all possibilities and it will be important to resolve them wisely in the joint interest of efficiency and the poor.

A confirmed director, particularly one with Carlucci's sensitivity to the problems, could obviously have played a stronger hand in these maneuverings. An agency with leadership already accepted by Congress would obviously stand more stoutly against the uncertainties.

Cranston did additional damage to the specific cause of the California poor by putting Carlucci in a position in which it will be awkward for him to reverse Reagan's veto of the legal services program until he has been confirmed by the Senate. This could mean there will be no final disposition of the issue until March.

Cranston could have sensibly gambled that the new director of OEO would uphold the old director, Donald Rumsfeld, against Reagan's veto. The California program was closely studied before Rumsfeld funded it in August. The Nixon-Reagan relationship has worn very thin and the Governor has moved so far to the right that it is prudent for the White House to take him on.

But by this crude device of making the rejection of Reagan's veto a pre-condition to Carlucci's confirmation, Cranston made the next step difficult. The Senator's blackmail has been so blatant that if Carlucci reverses Reagan before he is confirmed, he will seem to have capitulated to a proposition which is in fact illegal.

In the debate on New Year's eve in the Senate, Sen. Edward Kennedy tried to ease Cranston out of his bind by turning the attack more personally on Carlucci. Kennedy and Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) had pressed hard in the hearings to make Carlucci predict the President's decisions on next year's program. Noting that such predictions cannot be made with grace by a new appointee, Carlucci declined. He was in turn assailed by the two Senators on the floor as "unresponsive" and "unimpressive."

Actually he emerged from this contretemps with considerably more credit than his harassers. In the hearings he professed eloquently his enthusiasm for having his agency perform as "the cutting edge of social change." In the crunch he declined the compromise propositions which Cranston put

to him. In a series of taut moments he showed himself to be a man of principle and spirit.

One depressing aspect of the case is that the Senate would never have considered the Carlucci nomination before adjournment if the California case had not arisen. The Democrats have been extremely casual about the OEO's appropriations and nominations during the past two years. In fact it can be argued that the Nixon administration has been treating the poverty agency better than Congress has.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION ACT OF 1971

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have noticed an area which I feel our Government has needlessly neglected. The Government has a plan for health, for housing, for education, for security in old age, for urban areas, for transportation, for war and defense—and countless others. Yet, we have neglected a plan for peace. The question has been unanswered as to how we plan for peace.

We are winding down the war in Vietnam, but are we going to have a so-called peace dividend from the funds that were plowed into our effort in Southeast Asia? In fiscal year 1971, \$66.6 billion was appropriated for the Department of Defense; for fiscal year 1972, the administration's defense budget will be even greater—the Washington Post has reported that the President will request approximately \$75 billion for the purpose of defense.

Therefore, those who anticipate a reduced expenditure for defense to coincide with our reduced efforts in Vietnam will be disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to solve our domestic problems and respond adequately to human needs, we must be prepared to plan for peace as energetically as we have planned for war.

I do not advocate dismantling the Department of Defense—far from it—for, I am convinced that our defense capability must be the very best. Yet, I do advocate that we initiate plans and programs to cushion the human and economic impact of ending the war, withdrawing the troops, and cutting back on military production.

The need for a conversion plan is obvious when one looks at the unemployment rolls. From the beginning of 1969 to mid-1970, about 500,000 defense-related jobs disappeared. From June 1970 to June 1971, another half million are scheduled to vanish. And things are getting worse. Robert C. Moot, the Pentagon budget director, has predicted that defense-related employment will fall from 3.4 million workers in January 1969, to about 2.4 million workers by this summer.

Mr. Speaker, defense industries have been a great blessing to this country and they have contributed greatly to our success as a nation. We must keep this great resource of talent together by guiding

them toward fields such as pollution control, housing, mass transit, oceanography, and recreation—fields which presently are receiving a higher priority in Government spending.

In order to minimize disruption in the lives of people—whether physicists or electricians, whether engineers or welders—and in communities where the transition from war to peace can have painful consequences, I am today introducing a bill which would create a National Economic Conversion Commission. The Commission would be authorized to conduct research and educational programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian-oriented research activities.

Specifically, the bill authorizes \$450 million to be spent, over a 3-year period, for programs of education, research, and assistance to small business firms in order to convert a portion of their resources to civilian research and development. The bill also authorizes the Commission to develop retraining programs for scientists, engineers, and technicians. In addition, the Small Business Administration is authorized to assist small business firms in achieving conversion by providing technical grants, loan guarantees, and interest assistance payments.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the National Economic Conversion Commission can provide the guidance and the leadership in converting our Nation from war to peace. Because this transition is of such a top priority, I take pride in introducing this bill on the first day of the 92d Congress. I am hopeful that the 92d Congress will consider and approve this necessary legislation.

ON-JOB TRAINING EXPANDS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in this era of emphasis on college education, many people usually think of the veterans' training program as one primarily designed to attract veterans to pursue university and college courses. This, of course, is an erroneous belief.

In this time of the downward slide in the economy and consequent rise in unemployment, it is highly significant that, after a slow start, more veterans are becoming interested in developing their talents in the trade and industrial fields through apprentice and other on-the-job training.

During the past 18 months, a total of 160,000 veterans have taken on-job training. The in-training figure has jumped from 57,000 6 months ago to 85,000 at the end of November or a 33-percent increase.

The heaviest enrollment is in apprenticeship training in a variety of structural work occupations. About 47,000 are training for electrical workers, carpenters, plumbers, steam fitters, and related objectives. There are approximately 23,000 veterans training in the machines

trades occupations of which 10,000 are learning to be machinists and toolmakers.

It is especially noteworthy that in the field of service occupations a total of over 15,000 veterans have completed training or are now enrolled for policemen, firemen, and detectives.

This record supports the conclusion that although job opportunities may not be plentiful many business firms do realize that training a veteran while he works is a good investment to meet immediate and future needs.

I also invite attention to a bricklayer training program under Project Transition. The National Association of Home Builders, under a grant of funds by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Department of Defense, is conducting a bricklayer transition program at five military installations. The project will provide training for 1,000 servicemen.

The training classes are 6 weeks in duration at 40 hours per week. The project started July 1, 1970, and will continue for 18 months.

Each training site will train 200 men in 10 classes of 20 men per class. Placement of the trainees will be upon separation from active military service wherever possible in the city of their choice.

During the period of training the trainee will have received 240 hours of intensive training in the bricklayer trade. The course of study covers method, use of hand tools, mathematics, blueprint reading, and practical experience in the trade. The trainee will possess the basic skills of the craft. Entering the service with little or no civilian-related job skills, he will be both better equipped to make a sound readjustment to the economic life of his community, and able to help to fill the need for skilled labor.

A NEW YEAR'S RESOLUTION FOR THE MEDIA

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the media would resolve to accentuate the positive instead of the negative in American life, it would be a most meaningful contribution to our national goals for 1971. There has been far too much emphasis on the conduct and speech of a small violent minority bent on anarchy and revolution within this country. Most people are trying to be good citizens.

Those responsible policymakers of the press, radio, and television would take a great step forward for America if they would determine to emphasize those things in American life that are the strength of America—that bring us together, that hold us together, that make us thankful and grateful to be Americans as well as determined to make this country an even better place in which to live.

The next time the hate mongers or rabble rousers throw rocks at policemen or Molotov cocktails into businesses or

homes, if they would leave it off of page 1 and even page 8, it will help America.

In this connection I commend the following comments of the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, appearing in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report, to the thoughtful attention of the media:

MOST OF THE NEWS THAT IS FIT TO PRINT NEVER GETS PRINTED

More than 250,000 college students in this country operate, without pay, 1,000 programs for mentally retarded children, others conduct classes in hospitals and jails, still others tutor ghetto children to enable them to keep up with children from more fortunate homes.

More than 200 American corporations donate tools and money to 140 schools in Latin America training 150,000 students to earn a self-supporting, self-respecting future more friendly to the United States.

In California a lone college student stood off for hours a mob bent on desecrating the flag he proudly said "stands for what enables me to go to college."

In 160 American cities 18,800 businessmen act as Big Brothers to young boys who lack and desperately need that sort of counsel, friendliness, help.

In Michigan a small group of students donated and collected money to pay merchants for windows broken by student rioters.

Marines in Vietnam, out of their own pockets, have built and maintain three hospitals for natives; regularly provide toys for hundreds of children who never had any; encouraged and helped an American town, from which one Marine had come, to give a Christmas to the entire Vietnam town in defense of which he had been killed.

Large corporations have set up and maintain in Harlem a very special school for drop-outs to fit them for college. There have been no drop-outs from that school.

So be of good cheer . . . it's still America—and it's wonderful.

ELIMINATING MULTIPLE TAXATION BY STATES OR SUBDIVISIONS OF INDIVIDUAL INCOMES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, many Members will recall that the Interstate Taxation Act, as it was passed by the House of Representatives in both the 90th and 91st Congresses, included an amendment intended to prevent several States from requiring individuals to pay income taxes upon the same income. It would do this by first, prohibiting a State or political subdivision from levying an income tax upon an individual who was not domiciled in the State during the year, except with respect to income earned or derived within the State, and second, requiring that, in the case of an individual domiciled within the State who may be taxed on his entire income, the State must allow a credit for the taxes he was required to pay in the State in which the income was earned.

Because of the very considerable importance of the Interstate Taxation Act to businesses and individuals whose incomes may be subject to taxation in several States, I trust the House will again

give early and favorable consideration to this measure in order to encourage comparable action in the other body. While the amendment referred to above, dealing only with individual incomes, constitutes an excellent start toward eliminating double taxation by States and their subdivisions, it still contains a number of unresolved problems which the proposal I am introducing today attempts to meet.

First, the amendment as written in the past unnecessarily prevents the States from taxing the out-of-State income of a person who is a resident but who is not legally domiciled in the State. It is essential, in order to prevent a serious weakening of our State income tax systems, that this situation be corrected to permit the State of residence—even though not the State of domicile—to tax the out-of-State income. My proposal achieves this objective.

By eliminating this undesirable weakening of the State and local income tax systems, however, a related problem arises. This problem concerns the rather small but significant group of individuals whose employment requires that they reside away from, and yet who cannot give up, their States of domicile. This group consists of Members of Congress, their staff assistants from the home State, and presidential appointees serving at the pleasure of the President. At the present time, many Members of Congress, their staff assistants, and presidential appointees find themselves in the most difficult position of paying income taxes on their governmental salaries both in their home States, and in a State of residence in the Washington area. My proposal provides that, for the named group of officials and individuals who are not in a position to move their domiciles to the State in which they are resident because of their employment, the State of residence which is not also the State of domicile would not be permitted to tax the individual's out-of-State income. Thus, double taxation would be avoided in these special cases. The District of Columbia law already provides that this same group of individuals is not subject to the District of Columbia income tax even though resident in the city.

The third major problem, uncorrected by the former amendment, is that by according the State of employment the right to a full tax on a nonresident's earnings, it is often inequitable to the individual's State of residence. That State, if it has an income tax system, would have to allow him a full credit for the tax paid where he works and thus would suffer a reduction in its own revenues.

On the other hand, if the State of residence has no income tax system, then the individual—rather than his State of residence—is disadvantaged since his home State will allow him no reduction in his taxes. Such an individual will find himself paying a full tax—not in terms of income taxes alone, but also in terms of real estate taxes or other major revenue sources in the absence of an income tax—both where he works and where he resides or is domiciled. This is an inequity which I have long resisted because it strikes close to home and affects many

New Jersey residents, as well as residents of other States. Thus, by way of example, a New Jersey resident who pays an exorbitant real estate tax in lieu of an income tax must shoulder the additional burden of a 3-percent tax on gross earned income imposed by the city of Philadelphia where he works. This gross inequity on the level of State income taxes is illustrated in the case of a New Jersey resident who is subject to a 2- to 14-percent withholding tax on his taxable income derived from sources within New York State.

A logical and equitable way of correcting this situation would be to require the State of employment to recognize that the nonresident individual is benefitting only fractionally from the governmental services of that State. This is being implemented, as a matter of policy, by agreements between two income tax States to refrain from taxing the income earned in those States by residents of the other. It is also being achieved under local, as distinct from State, income tax systems by providing a reduced tax rate for nonresidents.

It makes sense that State and local income tax systems recognize the fact that the nonresident does not enjoy full services. My proposal, therefore, while perhaps not a foolproof solution to this problem, does move in that direction. As to States which have tax systems, my proposal would simply require that an appropriate adjustment be made for nonresidents of such State who only earn their income in that State. There is no fixed formula as it is contemplated that the States would negotiate agreements with respect to the tax treatment of nonresident income or accomplish this objective in whatever other manner they deem appropriate.

In the case of an income tax imposed by a subdivision of a State, this recognition would also be required. While the subdivision, in cooperation with the State, could make an appropriate adjustment in any manner it desires, my proposal would also allow for the operation of conclusive presumptions. Thus, a rate reduction—50 percent for employees working in Federal areas and 33½ percent for others—for nonresidents of the State would be conclusively presumed to be appropriate. Many local subdivisions already make similar provisions in their income tax systems. My proposal would merely require that this be done in the few instances where the system does not already make such allowance for a nonresident.

A BILL TO TERMINATE CERTAIN TAX PREFERENCES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the public interest in providing decent housing for all its citizens is easily recognized. However, it is difficult to discern the public interest in guaranteeing loans

and subsidizing interest rates in transactions where speculators may receive tax-free income.

Therefore, I have reintroduced my bill, previously introduced September 22, 1970, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate certain tax preferences which seem to me unfair.

Two abuses of the tax laws are in the field of low-income housing rehabilitation and the so-called rollover provision exempting the seller of certain low-income housing from income tax on the sale.

Under the housing rehabilitation subsidized loan program, a wealthy person could borrow at 3-percent interest but a poor person would have to pay 7 or 8 percent. That is the effect of the 5-year amortization of rehabilitation expenditures contained in the Tax Reform Act. HUD, itself, has recognized that inequities exist in some of these programs.

Under the roll-over provision, a builder might construct a housing project such as that proposed at Black Jack, Mo., and sell it with a gain of \$500,000. If he reinvests the proceeds of the sale in another "Black Jack-type" project within 1 year, his \$500,000 profit on the first sale is not taxed.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passage of legislation to end unfair tax loopholes and stop subsidizing speculators.

CALIFORNIA'S NEVADA COUNTY'S PUBLIC GUARDIAN RETIRES

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the recess between the 91st Congress and the 92d, I read in the Union, Grass Valley-Nevada City's newspaper, of the retirement of Nellie Kammerer after 11 years of formal service as public guardian of Nevada County.

Mrs. Kammerer has worked for over 22 years, 11 years without any compensation, helping families and people in need. She used a section of the county barn to store furniture, utensils, food, bedding, medication, and other essential emergency items so that people could be helped in a matter of hours. She did not worry about qualifications of a person for this help, she felt questions could be asked later.

After she became the official public guardian she was named honorary lifetime president of the California Association of Public Guardians and in 1958 the Nevada City Soroptimist Club awarded her an honorary membership in the form of a résumé of "This Is Your Life."

Mrs. Kammerer has been a dedicated public guardian to Nevada County for 22 years and therefore I insert at this point in the RECORD an article about her, entitled "Nellie Kammerer Retires Thursday as Guardian," from the Union, Grass Valley-Nevada City, Calif.

NELLIE KAMMERER RETIRES THURSDAY AS
GUARDIAN

(By Margaret Trivelpiece)

Nellie Kammerer, Nevada County's "dedicated" public guardian will retire Thursday after 11 years of formal service to the county.

Mrs. Kammerer was the first person to hold the post in Nevada county, and supervisors decided to put public guardianship under the Social Services Department when her retirement is effective.

The board ordered that a resolution of appreciation be directed to Mrs. Kammerer, and that "something be put in about her many years of devoted care to people in need."

However, there are some facts that the resolution will not convey because they were history before Nellie received any pay for her interest in people and their troubles.

There are those who collect stamps or fossilized bones as a hobby, but Mrs. Kammerer collected troubles and hardships and solved them many years before she was appointed to her post.

Lacking an official title, she was designated as western Nevada County's "welfare director without portfolio" before she received a paid appointment.

Over a span of 22 years before that time, Mrs. Kammerer obtained food, funds, clothing, furniture, bedding, gasoline, or medication for nearly 8,000 people.

Hundreds of firemen, police officers, social workers, civic leaders and clubwomen who came upon families in need had one stock comment:

"We'd better get in touch with Nellie right away."

Often it was 3 a.m., but Nellie arose cheerfully and went into action quickly and efficiently.

Mrs. Kammerer hastened to explain that her work never overlapped or conflicted with the functions of regular agencies—in fact she worked closely with them.

Her welfare formula prior to the day she became guardian (and afterwards) deviated slightly from the policies of some agencies. It was simple. Cold and hungry people, especially children should be fed and clothed immediately. Questions concerning qualifications could be asked later.

Before she became public guardian, she arranged with an earlier board of supervisors for use of a section of the county barn for storage of stoves, chairs, beds, bedding, tables, utensils, dishes, refrigerators and other emergency essentials.

"If a destitute family was burned out of its home, we could have obtained shelter and furnished a house in a matter of a few hours," Mrs. Kammerer recalls.

When there was need for cash, she had a small drawing fund collected by the Nevada City Benevolent Society.

Nellie's by-word is and was speed. Official agencies often are restricted by red tape requiring days or even months for processing cases. When she was "guardian without portfolio" she had food on the table and new shoes on the children while other agencies were examining the family's qualifications.

Mrs. Kammerer recalls that one of her proudest moments was after she discovered a woman blinded by cataracts did not qualify for one reason or another for surgical aid. By a series of manipulations and exerting pressure at the right places, she had the woman transferred to a Sacramento institution. The cataracts were removed, and the woman regained 20-20 vision.

In another case involving a Polish refugee with four children whose discouraged husband had committed suicide, the woman was established in a modest home which eventually she owned.

One important source of strength for Mrs. Kammerer's earlier work came from anonymous donations. The gifts carried simple

messages like "carry on," Mrs. Kammerer recalled.

The unidentified but liberal donors knew Mrs. Kammerer's "unofficial welfare agency" had no salaries, mileage, office rent, or heat and light costs. They knew that "the Nellie administered welfare dollar went 100% for welfare."

After she became the public guardian, Mrs. Kammerer was named honorary lifetime president of the California Association of Public Guardians.

The statewide honor was awarded to her during a convention of the California Association of Public Guardians, Coroners and Administrators in Santa Cruz some years ago. Mrs. Kammerer was the first president of the state association and for many years was the only woman guardian.

The Nevada City Soroptimist Club in 1958 awarded her an honorary membership based on her "countless acts of kindness and help to others."

This award was made in the form of a resume of "This is Your Life," and was narrated by Elsie Nile.

Mrs. Nile told of a "woman born in England who moved to Canada at the age of 12 and to the United States at the age of 18."

As Mrs. Nile continued she noted the "good works" of a woman who had helped more than 8,000 people during her 22 years as "guardian without portfolio."

Sheriff Wayne Brown, Attorney William Cassettari (then with the district attorney's office), and representatives of the Nevada City Chamber of Commerce Auxiliary, and the Nevada City Women's Civic Club and the press were present the day the Soroptimists honored Mrs. Kammerer, according to a report from The Union of Jan. 16, 1958.

SAFEGUARDING THE PENSIONS OF OUR CITIZENS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of private pensions has been under considerable study by the labor subcommittee I am honored to chair. We have already conducted nearly 6 months of public hearings on various proposals to modify our present inadequate pension protection law, and the subcommittee staff has undertaken a research effort of massive proportions.

Hopefully, the net effect will be the enactment of meaningful legislation, safeguarding the pensions of our citizens.

The problem we will attempt to resolve is aptly described in the following two articles I am including in the RECORD. The first, "Are You Sure of Your Retirement Pension," was printed in the December, 1970, issue of the American Legion magazine. The second appeared in the Wall Street Journal of November 4, 1970. The articles follow:

ARE YOU SURE OF YOUR RETIREMENT PENSION?

(By Henry Lee)

When you retire, do you expect to get a pension from your employer or union which, when added to Social Security and any private means of your own, will assure that you can more than make ends meet?

A lot of people who may think they are going to get a private pension based on their life's work are not going to get it.

Today, about 30 million people are working under 50,000 different private pension plans, if past experience is a guide, no more than 6 million of them, and perhaps as few as 3 million, will ever draw a penny. So if you say that about 25 million of 30 million who work under private pension plans will get nothing from them, you are on fairly safe grounds.

This prediction is based on projections of government experts and other students of private pension plans. Among them, the U.S. Department of Labor and some Congressional committees—as well as a special committee appointed by President Kennedy that reported in 1965—have dug deeply into the subject and know what they're talking about.

Of course, the scope of the problem of workers who end up not getting pensions under their company or union plans is hardly as great as the 25 million figure might make it seem. That includes the parade of stenographers and secretaries who go to work for corporations, only to marry within a year or two and never work again—many of whom never had any intention of sticking around for retirement benefits.

Beyond that, it includes people who work all their lives, but change jobs so frequently that they never establish any pension rights.

For some of these, their failure to qualify for a pension is a serious problem—sometimes of their own making, and sometimes not. In general, corporations consider that their pension plans are a reward to those who give their loyalty and their best years to the company. They don't think they are running a social welfare program to compete with Social Security for employees who come and go.

Many unions, too, set a high value on long membership, and have little to offer in the way of union pensions to those with short service, or who change unions.

In any event, it's a wise worker who looks into his own company or union pension plan in detail before he counts on getting something from it some day.

If you look at all the private pension plans that run smoothly and pay off just as they are supposed to, there's a wide diversity in how much you get; how long you have to work to qualify; how much right you have to your pension (i.e.: whether the management can arbitrarily abolish the plan or alter its terms to your detriment); how much you can get, if anything, if you retire or are fired before the most usual stipulated retirement age of 65; how young you have to be when first hired in order to come under the plan—and so on.

With 50,000 different plans it isn't surprising that they vary enormously in these and other details.

If the accepted overall figures on those already retired are correct, there are about 3 million retired people in the country today who are drawing about \$3.5 billion a year in private pensions. This averages out to slightly under \$100 a month. That isn't much today, but is nice to have on top of Social Security. Of course, the average is made up of some very handsome payoffs that are considerably more than \$100 a month, balanced against others that are only token retirement pensions.

Very broadly, then, private retirement pensions offer a mixture of excellent and meagre retirement incomes, paid under a variety of conditions. Whether one's own plan is average, better than most, or skimpy, almost any employee who inquires can find out what retirement provisions are presently in force where he works—and perhaps plan accordingly.

But, for a variety of reasons, present information isn't necessarily reliable. There is a trend to improve many private pensions. This allows the rosy possibility that if you still have quite a few years to go you may retire on more than you can now expect, even taking rising living costs into account.

On the other hand, private pensions are loaded with elements of real or potential insecurity.

Here is a catalog of risks that come true in some cases.

The company fails, and with it goes its pension plan. The longer an employee has worked there, the worse the blow.

An employee is discharged after years of service, but before retirement age. He may get nothing, or his own contribution back (if any), or a pittance based on early retirement.

The company arbitrarily reduces or abolishes its pension plan, and it turns out that it always had the power to do so. The employees may have had no stake in it and are entitled to nothing, or have contributed to it themselves and can only get back their own contribution.

The company is bought out by or merges with another. The new management abolishes the old pension plan, or dismisses employees *en masse* who have put in many years but still have time to go to be eligible for a partial or full pension.

The pension fund, be it a company fund or a union fund, disappears under crooked management.

The pension fund disappears or is seriously reduced under honest but incompetent management, through bad investments, excessive costs, bad planning, etc.

A worker under a union pension plan changes his livelihood, for personal or unavoidable reasons, after many years in his first trade. He has to start on his pension rights all over when he joins a new union, and there may not be enough time in a long life for him to qualify for retirement in his new union.

An employee who loses his job after years of service under any of the above circumstances may find that he's too old to be admitted to the company pension plan of a new employer.

Case histories and statistics have been compiled on these various forms of "you don't get it after all" by the Labor Department, by Congressional committee hearings, by special committee studies and by private studies. They have led to various laws being enacted in the past, especially laws to close in on pension fund fraud.

Further, they have led in recent years to more far-reaching pending bills, notably two different but similar bills originally introduced in the Senate by Senators Jacob Javits (N.Y.) and Ralph Yarborough (Tex.).

Some features of these bills are highly controversial.

One is "portability"—a proposal to require by law that one could transfer his private pension credits from job to job. Though this is an attractive idea to every worker, it seems on examination to be somewhat like turning private pensions into a federally regulated second Social Security program on top of the existing one.

It raises all sorts of questions that aren't easily answered. Perhaps the greatest danger is that such a law would drive many of these voluntary plans out of existence by killing the management and union motives behind them to reward long service and loyalty.

The legislators' motive behind the "portability" proposal seems commendable, whether it is workable or not.

Today, if one works from age 25 to age 35 for one firm with a pension plan, then moves on, he has accrued no pension rights for his ten years' service in 90% of existing plans.

Far worse is the situation of a 55-year-old worker with 25 years' service for one firm. In 45% of existing plans he loses any claims to a pension for that service if he now changes employers. And what happens if he gets another job?

Most plans require at least 15 years service, and the vast majority 20 years or more, while they require retirement at age 65. Thus, this particular 55-year-old has little hope of qualifying for a pension on the next job he moves to before he is compulsorily retired. Somewhere, between the case of the young man who switches jobs after ten years and can requalify under his new employer, and the case of the older man who switches after 25 years and can no longer qualify, there is an area of hardship that isn't easily justified.

Case histories that were read into 1968 hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor include the following examples of people whose pensions were hung up in various ways simply under the rules of their plans. In the first one, loss of accrued pension rights occurred because the employee was promoted!

1. "My company has two pension plans. One, for hourly employees, pays \$3.50 for each year of service upon retiring at age 65. The plan is paid wholly by the company. The other is for salaried employees, who pay 3% of earnings and the company contributes an equal amount, which yields a better pension. I worked for 19 years as an hourly employee, then was transferred to a salaried job. At the time of my transfer, I was not aware and was not notified that I would lose my 19 years of pension rights. I am still with the same company and in the same plant. When I spoke to management about the unfairness of this, I was told that it 'was just an unfortunate situation' . . ."

2. "I entered the employ of — Co. of Chicago in December, 1940 . . . I served in the positions of analytical chemist, research chemist, field sales and service man, and district manager. After 26 years, at age 58 I was dismissed from the company and any pension that I had earned was erased from my credit. This amounted to \$180 per month at age 65, assuming that I kept up my current level of income . . . The removal of the pension has left me at now almost 60 with my savings quite depleted, and nothing but Social Security in the future. I have found out how unemployable a man is when he reaches this age, even if he is a trained man in his field. . ."

3. "I joined the union in 1918 and was a member until 1950 when I left Chicago and came to live in California for health reasons. Unable to obtain a position in my regular field, the men's garment industry, I had to get one in ladies' cloaks. I relinquished my membership in the men's garment union and joined the ladies' cloaks union, where I have been a member for the past 16 years. I am now 71 years old and cannot get a pension for another four years, when I will have been with the present union 20 years. I feel that under the circumstances, I should not have to wait, but should be able to get some benefit from at least one of them so I can retire. . ."

The following cases resulted from closings or mergers:

1. "I worked for 20 years for a factory and was a member of the union. The factory closed down. Then I worked for another factory for two years and joined their union. This factory also closed down. I am now working for the — Co. and am a member of the — union. I am 61 years old and have been a member of this union for 11 years. I would like to retire at 65, but according to the rules of the union, a person has to have 20 years membership in order to be eligible for a pension. This means that I would have to work until I was 70 years old to qualify for a pension. I have worked all these years, paying union dues faithfully, and

I don't consider it fair that I have to retire at 65 with no union pension. There are many others in this same situation. . ."

2. "I worked for — Co. from 1926 until they shut the factory down here at Charleston, W. Va., on September 30, 1962. At the time I had 36 years with them, including 3 years in the armed services . . . I was 53 years old and, having a sick wife, could not leave her and go to any other factory. After a brief period of time I was terminated. I am now 58 years old. I got nothing from them whatsoever except 6 months severance pay, too young to get a pension and too old to get a job. Now, if I should live to retirement age, according to their retirement plan, I can never receive anything from the company. . ."

Hardly any firms voluntarily set up a pension plan without retaining it in their power to change it. Not only do many of them improve and update their plans, but by the same prerogative some of them later abolish their plans.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics about 500 pension plans are abolished each year by management, which is about 1% of all plans. On the average, it is the smaller firms whose pension plans vanish. While one plan in a 100 is terminated each year, one worker in about 1,200 is affected.

Sometimes there is no payoff to anyone when a plan ends. Sometimes the existing fund, or part of it, is paid off at a reduced rate. Where employees have contributed directly to the fund, they always have a legal right to recapture their own investment.

In one of the cases of an abolished pension plan heard by the Senate in 1968, the workers who had lost their benefits complained that they had a right to it because it had been offered instead of other benefits, and was not simply a voluntary extra. Said a witness:

"In December 1963, X Co. sold or transferred their dairy interests to the Y Co. of Evansville, Ind. As a result, our group was left at the mercy of Y Co. without any of the earned pension rights attained while in the employ of X Co. On termination of our employment, our group went to work with Y Co., and with the exception of a few are still employed there, without our previous earned pension rights. It is our feeling that we are entitled to continued coverage or at least a monetary settlement by our former employer, since that pension plan was initiated in lieu of increases in our hourly rates of pay and other benefits. The longevity of this group runs from 12 to 27 years of tenure. Our ages are 35 to 52 years. Most of us are too old to start again. . ."

A second proposal in pending legislation, that is not as revolutionary as compulsory "portability," is to guarantee private pension payments through some sort of government insurance program. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation already guarantees bank deposits against bank failure, and pending bills propose to create similar insurance against pension losses due to company or union failure, fraud, mismanagement, etc.

The Studebaker and Packard stories are classic examples of pension loss due to company failure.

When Studebaker suddenly closed its South Bend, Ind., plant in 1964, it left behind a retirement fund with assets insufficient to make good on promised benefits. From statements made by Senator Javits and Vance Hartke (Ind.), it appears that one 59-year-old employee with 43 years of service had to settle for 15% of his pension. Twenty other employees with more than 40 years service were in a similar fix. Employees between the ages of 40 and 59, many with over 30 years of service, received 10% of their earned benefits. Those under the age of 40, despite 20 years of service and an acknowledged right to something under the plan, received nothing.

In a sense, this was history repeating itself. In 1954, Studebaker and financially-ailing Packard merged. At the time, Packard employed about 10,000 people. Packard's pension plan, as renegotiated with the United Automobile Workers, provided for voluntary retirement at 65, compulsory retirement at 68, early retirement with reduced benefits for those aged 60 with ten years or more of credited service, and a deferred pension credit for separated employees aged 40 or more with ten years of service. As business failed to improve, Studebaker-Packard cut back operations and employment in its Detroit plant until by 1956 only 625 employees were left. By 1957, operations all but ceased.

With no money coming into the pension plan's fund, the corporation announced it could no longer pay full benefits to the 1,930 already-retired employees, much less meet its commitments to any of the others, and terminated the plan. After a suit by the UAW, Studebaker-Packard agreed to continue the pensions at \$50 a month instead of the previous \$59, and to make a lump sum settlement equivalent to about a year and a half's benefits to 435 employees who were over 60 and eligible for early retirement. About 3,300 other employees below the age of 60, who were qualified to get something, got nothing because there was nothing left to give.

Mismanagement and fraud hit only a few of the private pension funds, but where they hit, they hurt.

Thomas R. Donahue, then Assistant Secretary of Labor, told a Senate subcommittee in 1968: "Most plans in this country are managed wisely by persons who follow the strictest code of fair dealing. However, the characteristics of many plans and their extremely rapid growth have thrown temptation into the path of the unscrupulous."

Donahue told the Senate that in some cases company and union officials had milked pension funds for private profit. In others, company officers had risked the tax-exempt pension funds in investments for company profit, jeopardizing the interests of the workers in such funds. He went on to say, "There have been capital losses in trust funds due to lack of prudence in their investments and transactions, and as a result of self-dealing."

Cited at hearings was a case of corporate officials investing pension funds in their company's own stock. This boosted the price, the officials sold out their own holdings, then the price dropped leaving the pension fund in the bag to the tune of \$4.5 million dollars in loss of value.

Another firm was cited which borrowed 90% of a pension fund's assets to invest in its own operations, and then went bankrupt.

A fund was cited that was jointly operated by the contributing employees and the local union, whose president dominated the fund management. He padded the trust expenses with such things as putting his girl friend on its payroll, and enough more so that administrative costs rose from \$12.70 per worker in 1961 to \$431.50 in 1962! That was more than each employee's contribution in one year.

Five officers of a company who were also its pension trustees had \$460,000 of a \$686,000 pension fund tied up at one time in loans to themselves, and to the company to finance new risk ventures.

Five officers of another firm who were trustees of 16 pension and profit-sharing plans created a separate corporation, with themselves as officers, to manage the funds. It charged \$130,000 in one year in fees, while the five trustees took an additional \$300,000 in trustees' fees. Donahue testified that a bank trust department would have charged about \$50,000 for the same services.

One of the most notorious cases of pension fund manipulation was the international network of union fund structures in which

George Barasch and the Allied Trades Council of New York, plus New York Teamsters Local 815, were the main cast—though Barasch and his associates created all sorts of other legal and financial entities in the course of their operations.

The story of these fantastic dealings covering nearly 30 years fills 39 pages of a 1966 report of the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations. It involved the diversion of more than \$4 million. In the end, the Senate investigators did not report anything illegal in a web of manipulation that is almost indescribable. In the course of the exposure, authorities persuaded the principals to return most of the money, leaving the public to guess what more was never revealed.

Similar exposure had by then already resulted in new laws in 1958 and 1959 governing the disclosure of how pension funds are managed. The hearings involving Barasch, and the Kennedy committee report of 1965 helped prompt keen interest in looking at all aspects of pensions and pension funds.

Yet it is hard to see how federal regulation can go a long way beyond policing dishonest dealings in any efforts to regulate the whole field of private pensions.

There are two enormous hurdles that such regulations face, both arising from the fact that private pensions are private and to varying degrees voluntary.

(1) It may be simply impossible to write any workable broad regulations to govern 50,000 plans. They are so varied in detail that no two may be identical. They are also so varied in circumstance that no one set of rules to govern them could possibly work out for all of them.

(2) Across-the-board regulation in detail would seem to be self-defeating. It is the declared aim of the proposed broad laws to see that more entitled workers actually get their pensions and that more workers become entitled. Such requirements can only be effective if they cost employers and unions more.

On this basis alone, such laws could well serve to drive many of the plans out of existence—or to reduce the benefits of long-time employees in order to meet legal requirements to pay benefits to people who worked for a shorter time.

There would be few other options available to any firm or union which felt that it could not afford increased total payments that might otherwise be required by law. It could drop out, or spread what it has more thinly, neither of which seems to be the aim of the legislative proposals. It seems a dead certainty that if 500 pension plans are abolished each year at present, any compulsory increase in costs will see more of them disappear purely on an "inability-to-pay" basis.

Meanwhile, many private pension plans are motivated solely or chiefly to attract good workers and keep them and their loyalty for the balance of their working lives. The "portability" proposal, especially, could destroy the desire of many a management to maintain a pension plan at all.

So long as any employer has an option not to have a pension plan, it's hard to see how such broad proposals could be made to work without doing harm with good.

To accomplish such sweeping aims it would seem necessary to require every employer to have a pension plan on some simple basis that could be applied to all. In short, legislate away their private nature. And when that was done, if it were done, and you took a look at what remained, you would see that it was nothing but an increase in, or duplicating of, the existing Social Security system accomplished by destroying systems that now exist in addition to it.

It's enough to make one dizzy to look at the complexity of existing private pension plans and try to figure how any sort of

blanket legislation could achieve what the more sweeping proposals are trying to achieve.

One type of pension, which embraces more than a half-million people under 700 different plans, is pay-as-you-go. In its purest form, a pay-as-you-go plan has no pension fund. As a worker reaches retirement age the company goes into its current assets and buys him an annuity from an insurance company.

Among plans which lay a nest egg aside before the day comes to pay it out, there are several types and numerous variations of each. Two basic kinds are insured plans and trustee plans.

In insured plans, premiums are regularly paid to an insurance company, which then pays out in annuities to workers when they retire.

Trustee plans accumulate a going pension fund under control of trustees, who may be company officials, union officials, a combination of the two, or outside trustees. Some trustee plans must be used to buy pensions. Others may be dissolved and returned to the management.

There is growing resentment today against the pension plans that are revocable by management, especially since some conglomerate "raids" have taken over a company then revoked the pensions simply to capture the fund as an asset.

A pension fund that seems adequate today may become inadequate tomorrow for reasons that nobody can foresee.

The best of all possible plans would be "fully funded" for the future. "Full funding" means that there is enough now on hand or being surely accumulated to pay off all expected demands when they come due.

Most of the better plans today are only fully funded on a current basis. That is, enough is set aside each year to cover future pension rights earned by employees during that year.

But when a plan is improved, either voluntarily or as a result of a union contract, the fund may for years remain short of enough to cover the new liabilities that the improvements obligated it to pay off for past services. And when a plan is first started it may take a long time, and require hope as one of the ingredients, to set aside enough to cover employees' services for the years before the plan started.

By the same token, the method of building the fund may fall apart, as in the case of the United Mine Workers. Back in 1946, the UMW got an agreement that so much would go into the union welfare and pension fund for each ton of coal produced. It started at 5 cents a ton then, to be built up to 40 cents a ton by 1952 and thereafter. It looked like a perfectly good plan at the time.

But coal production fell off drastically at the same time that more and more miners became eligible for pensions. By 1966, benefit payouts were taking about 80 percent of the fund's income, while there wasn't enough in it to cover the next year's payments. As a result, benefits had to be cut drastically.

To the most militant reform advocates, all private pensions are earned rights to which the worker is entitled. This is undeniable for all pensions that were actually negotiated as fringe benefits. It is morally true if an employee were told of a pension as an inducement to sign him up, and kept on in the belief he'd get his pension. As these two circumstances cover almost all plans, it isn't hard to see the motive behind legislative efforts to make sure that actual payment doesn't fall through a sieve.

Congress is in a strong position to regulate pensions that are the result of a contract, and it is in just as strong a position to regulate "voluntary" plans to which management has gotten a tax exemption for its contribution to its pension fund. Many voluntary plans exist for all employees only be-

cause the firm's contribution is not tax-exempt if it only covers the officers.

We will probably get tighter laws to secure the integrity and funding of pension funds and their management. Congress and the Administration seem together on that.

Meanwhile, of all the proposals for more detailed regulation of pension rights, the best hope for employees lies in growing pressure for earlier and surer "vesting."

"Vesting" is a key word for the employee who hopes to get a pension. If you are "vested" you have some pension coming at 65. Suppose you are "vested" after ten years. Even if you are then only 45, and move to another firm, when you are 65 you will have at least a small pension coming from your former employer. Employees who move about frequently, could, if vested early, accumulate a group of small pensions from several former employers that could add up to a full pension.

Time and again, the cruelest examples of pension failure have sprung from harsh vesting features of both management and unions—as in several cases we've cited.

In both the original Javits and Yarborough bills, vesting after ten years was stipulated, while there are those today who are seeking vesting from the first day of employment.

It seems unlikely that "portability" will become law. But improved "vesting" is actually a form of "portability." Instead of making a mess by trying to create a common fund out of 50,000 different plans, as some "portability" schemes propose, improved vesting would serve the same purpose without commingling assets from all the different plans. Each fund could pay according to its own scheme to vested former employees, exactly as it pays to those who retire from it directly.

It is entirely possible for Congress to require some reasonable standard of vesting in all negotiated contracts that provide employee pensions, and to withdraw tax exemption from voluntary funds that don't.

But if one may make a guess, the technical problems that arise in spelling out such laws so that they will work, plus the resistance of both management and unions, will prevent the enactment of any far-reaching vesting or portability laws. Instead, by the pressure of open hearings and by the threat of drastic laws backed up by the enactment of some milder ones, we will see more protection of pension rights brought on by heat than by law.

OUT IN THE COLD: INCREASING LAYOFFS ROB MANY OF THEIR PENSIONS AS WELL AS THEIR JOBS

ELIGIBILITY RULES OFTEN BAR WORKERS; UNIONS PRESSING FOR MORE LIBERAL PROGRAMS—A WHITE COLLAR IS NO SHIELD

(By Jim Hyatt)

AVON LAKE, Ohio.—At first glance 33-year-old Edward Herrera didn't fare too badly last April when he was laid off here by Fruehauf Corp. He eventually found a job paying \$50 a week more at a nearby Ford Motor Co. plant.

Despite the higher pay, however, Mr. Herrera is still bitter about losing his old job. "I put in 11 years for nothing," he says. Because he was laid off well before age 40, when he would have become eligible for an eventual pension, Mr. Herrera took nothing with him when he left Fruehauf but his final paycheck.

As layoffs reach the highest levels in six years, and as corporations tighten their belts by closing plants, many workers like Mr. Herrera are learning that they're losing more than just their current jobs. Years of potential eligibility toward pensions are also evaporating. As far as earning a pension is concerned, many workers are, in fact, having to start their working careers over.

Private pension plans hold well over \$100

billion in assets. About 17,000 such plants covering about 21 million workers are on file with the Labor Department, and several million workers are thought to be in plans not reported to the department. Pension plan coverage has become increasingly generous over the years—yet Congressional committees and others looking into pensions are discovering that because of high industry turnover even in good times, stringent eligibility requirements and today's widespread layoffs many workers "covered" by such plans will never be eligible to collect a penny.

HIGH CASUALTY RATE

Just how many workers lose out is a hotly debated question and no exact figures are available. "My very rough estimate is that it is quite possible that over one-third of all workers in pension plans will never get anything from them," says Michael S. Gordon, special minority counsel for pensions for a Senate subcommittee. "In some industries the ratio will be much higher."

Union officials estimate that Fruehauf laid off more than 1,000 workers in the final year of manufacturing at the plant here and say that at least 350 of them were let go short of pension eligibility requirements—age 40 and 10 years on the job.

Companies often try to save pension rights by liberal recall provisions or by offering workers jobs at other plants. But those choices often create a variety of problems. A Dallas man in his 30s was laid off recently by Texas Instruments Inc., where pension eligibility begins at 50. But he says it has been difficult finding another job because prospective employers fear he'll go back to TI if a recall occurs.

Other workers say alternate jobs are seldom offered on the best of terms. John Voss, a 38-year-old engineering aide, is two years short of pension eligibility at a General Dynamics Corp. division in Rochester, N.Y., and stands to lose perhaps \$100 a month in potential pension when he is laid off late this year under a previously announced schedule. He says he might be able to get on with a nearby General Dynamics plant, "but I'd have to take a lot less pay." He also complains that "there's no telling when the other plant will lay off, too."

SMALL COMFORT

Industry-wide "portable" pension plans often keep pension rights intact for workers who move to similar jobs, but in the current economy such plans are little comfort to many so covered. Evelyn W., a 40-year-old Cleveland woman lost a job last January as a packer at a sausage plant. Because of the business slowdown, "a lot of the other plants wouldn't even take an application," she says. She is 10 years short of being old enough to establish a pension right and figures she has lost a pension worth \$70 a month at retirement. Currently, she's taking accounting and secretarial courses at a junior college.

Layoffs hit especially hard at older workers who are dismissed short of retirement age. Jesse Stockton, 53, laid off after 23 years at Fruehauf, figures he'll never be eligible for another pension. At 65, he'll draw about \$50 a month but working to 65 could have added another \$36 a month to his check, union officials say.

Plant closings often take an even harsher toll on pensions already earned. An unexpected and sudden closing can leave a pension fund that doesn't even cover the built-up obligations already due workers. A classic instance: The 1963 closing of Studebaker Corp.'s South Bend, Ind., operations, in which several thousand workers with earned pension rights received only a small portion of the money they had expected.

Today's wave of plant closings is creating thousands of similar cases. Metals Forming Co., a unit of Gulf & Western Industries, is in the process of closing a plant in Ecorse, Mich., that employs about 175 workers. United

Auto Workers officials say that because of the unexpected shutdown, only the most senior employees will get a pension.

WASHED OUT

In a letter to Congress last July, Leonard Woodcock, UAW president, asserted that "among the victims of that closing are a man and a woman, both 52 years old, each with 37 years of service. Their entire 37 years with the company were washed out as far as pension benefits are concerned."

A Gulf & Western spokesman says only that the company "intends to honor all provisions of its contract" and adds that "employees will receive the benefits to which they are entitled." That's true enough, the union says. The problem is that what they're "entitled to" is precious little.

The United Steelworkers of America says it recently talked one company into forking over an extra \$35 million to bring a subsidiary's pension fund into balance after the subsidiary folded. Such instances are not isolated. Melvin Glasser, director of the UAW's social security department, says in one recent week alone the union had "four requests to terminate pension plans from employers going out of business." Some benefits will almost certainly be lost, he adds.

Some workers find, unhappily, that their employer's pension plans are so restricted that virtually no benefits are available. Olga Jensen worked about 18 years for a San Francisco marine transportation company that suddenly was liquidated a couple of years ago. She was 47 at the time and expected that she would receive some settlement from a pension fund for her years of service.

To her surprise, Miss Jensen found that the fund only paid a pension to employees working to the age of 65 and that when the plan terminated, her expected Social Security benefits were deducted before any pension was calculated. As a result, she got nothing. "It was more than shabby," she says. She worked for a time at another company but decided the risks of losing another pension were too great. Taking a pay cut, she moved to the U.S. Customs Office, where the pension provisions were more liberal.

Lower-level workers aren't the only employees encountering pension problems. "The loss of pension credits is spreading into new sectors," says Merton C. Bernstein, an Ohio State University law professor. "Manufacturers are laying off white-collar managerial people."

A 49-year-old middle-management official at Texas Instruments is less than a year away from meeting the age 50 pension eligibility requirement, but he figures his chances are "less than 50-50" of making it in the face of major layoffs by the Dallas company. "It's like being in an artillery barrage when they have you zeroed in," he says.

WIPED OUT

One 58-year-old bank executive in the Midwest was recently fired just 18 months short of having 10 years on the job, a requirement for a pension. Bitter about the treatment, he calls such requirements "archaic and obsolete." He adds: "A place like this constantly reminds you that maybe you don't get much pay but a big percentage of your overall compensation is in various benefits, including the pension plan. When they forfeit the pension they fatten their own purse."

A 44-year-old Cleveland banker, fired after seven and a half years, frets that "I'm half way through my working career and I'm starting over again on another potential pension. If you change jobs every 10 years or so, you're not a job skipper in any sense of the word. Yet two or three moves and you can effectively end up without anything at all."

Such problems are especially widespread

among professional and technical people out of work due to defense spending cutbacks. "We're getting some pretty pathetic letters," says one California job retraining specialist. "Because of the ups and downs of our business, they suddenly find themselves near retirement, laid off, with no pensions." One study found the average engineer spends less than six years at any single job, far short of most pension eligibility requirements.

TAKING REMEDIAL ACTION

In boom times, of course, high-salaried engineers didn't worry about pensions. "I've been buying a little real estate and thought I wouldn't worry about pensions very much," says John R. Goodwin, 49, an aeronautical engineer who has had 11 employers in his career but has never qualified for a private pension. He lost his last job, which paid \$17,500 a year, just three months short of qualifying for a plan.

With hundreds of his colleagues out of work, however, he finds his real estate holdings, including his own \$45,000 home in a Los Angeles suburb, impossible to sell. He has taken some temporary \$3-an-hour drafting jobs and hopes to do some consulting work, but he figures he has lost any chance of ever earning a pension. "As far as I'm personally concerned," he says, "I think the game is up."

Alarmed at such developments, unions are taking increasingly tough stances in negotiations, seeking to improve pensions even at the sacrifice of current wages. "Unions are saying it is senseless to stick money in the pay envelope just to let Uncle Sam get it," says Robert F. Rainey, supervisor of pensions and trusts for H. K. Porter Co., Pittsburgh, an industrial equipment concern. He figures his company's pension costs have almost doubled in two years.

The United Rubber Workers Union this year boosted pension benefits to \$7.75 a month per year of service, almost 50% higher than the previous level. In October Owens-Illinois Inc., Toledo, signed a new three-year contract with the Glass Bottle Blowers Association that will boost pension benefits in 1973 to \$7 a month from \$4 a month currently for each year of service. The union represents most of the company's 20,000 employees in 18 glass container plants.

But fatter pensions alone don't protect workers from layoffs, so unions are also seeking more liberal eligibility requirements. A major issue in the current strike against General Motors is a UAW demand for a full pension of \$500 a month after 30 years. GM has offered such terms for workers at age 58. "Thirty and out" could double pension costs," says one corporate official.

Pension disillusionment has led to considerable pressure in Congress for tighter Federal controls and looser eligibility requirements. One measure sponsored by Sen. Jacob Javits of New York would set up a reinsurance fund to pay benefits that employers couldn't cover in the event they are forced to go out of business. It would also create an independent pension commission, similar to the Securities and Exchange Commission, to handle pension regulatory matters.

Moreover, a number of unions and employees are seeking fully "portable" pensions. Such a system, already used by some unions with industry-wide contracts, permits workers to simply change jobs and carry their accrued pension benefits with them. White-collar workers caught in the economic downturn are particularly interested in such a plan. The American Chemical Society is exploring portability for its members, and an official of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics says: "I know of four companies that six months ago would have shot you if you stood on their property and uttered the words 'portable pensions.' These companies are now investigating it. The climate is changing."

WOMEN'S EQUALITY ACT OF 1971

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with my colleagues Mrs. CHISHOLM, of New York; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; Mr. HALPERN, of New York; Mrs. HANSEN of Washington; Mr. HARRINGTON, of Massachusetts; Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia; Mr. JACOBS, of Indiana; Mr. KOCH, of New York; Mr. McCLOSKEY, of California; Mr. MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii; Mrs. MINK, of Hawaii; Mr. NICHOLS, of Alabama; Mr. O'HARA, of Michigan; Mr. PEPPER, of Florida; Mr. PODELL, of New York; Mr. ROSENTHAL, of New York; Mr. ROYBAL, of California; Mr. RYAN, of New York; Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; Mr. SYMINGTON, of Missouri; and Mr. DINGELL, of Michigan, the Women's Equality Act of 1971, a bill to carry out the legislative recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities.

The bill would eliminate sex discrimination in all federally assisted programs, in State and Federal employment, in employment in educational institutions, and in the payment of wages for professional, executive, and administrative jobs. The bill actually goes beyond the recommendations by the President's Task Force by also banning sex discrimination in housing practices, just as racial discrimination is prohibited under the Federal Fair Housing Act.

The Women's Equality Act authorizes matching grants through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to finance State advisory commissions to study the status of women. It requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make recommendations to equalize the treatment of women under the Social Security Act, the Internal Revenue Code, and the Family Assistance Act, and extends the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to include sex discrimination. It provides the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with cease and desist powers, authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits in cases of sex discrimination in public facilities and public education and confers jurisdiction upon the district courts to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations.

This legislation asks for no special privileges. Adult women make up over one-third of the working population of the United States and they want to enjoy the full benefits of citizenship. The Women's Equality Act amends existing civil rights law to extend the coverage to women. Actually, it goes beyond the President's Task Force recommendations by extending the Federal Fair Housing Act to prohibit sex discrimination.

Let me give you examples of the most blatant forms of sex discrimination. Although women make up 37 percent of the total work force in this country, they suffer inequalities in employment opportunities, and wage payments. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has brought some progress in industrial hiring prac-

tices, but it exempts educational institutions and State and local governments from its coverage. As a result women who make up 90 percent of public school elementary school teachers can be discriminated against in public school systems. In 1966, for example, 75 percent of elementary school principals were men out of a teaching force made up of about 10 percent men. The bill I propose today will amend title VII, removing the exemption clause to oblige State and local governments to hire and promote women on their merit. Furthermore, in its present form, title VII places the main burden of enforcement on the aggrieved individual. This enforcement provision is inadequate and will be amended in line with the Task Force recommendations to give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission authority to enforce the law in all cases of discriminatory hiring practices.

Women suffer gross injustices in wage payments as well as employment practices. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 guarantees equal pay to all, including women. But the 1963 act contains an exemption for professional, executive, and administrative employees. Although title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act protects women in professional, administrative, and executive positions, it does not permit a complainant to withhold his identity as he can under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Many women who achieve high positions after years of struggle fear jeopardizing them and silently suffer the discrimination of a double pay standard. The Women's Equality Act amends the Fair Labor Standards Act so that women in those high status positions have a right to pay for equal work.

Sex discrimination in education is one of the most serious injustices borne by women. Many State and local laws deny them equal educational opportunity which results in unequal abilities and unequal employment opportunities. Statistics show that the percentage of women employed in a particular occupation goes down as the job qualifications go up. Women, for instance, make up only 3 percent of the lawyers in this country. Until the State of Virginia took legal action, the University of Virginia College of Arts and Sciences refused to admit women. In a similar case on a local level, Stuyvesant High School, a specialized public high school in the sciences, was forced to admit girls because of legal action taken against the New York City Board of Education. In addition to this form of discrimination in high schools and colleges, there is another form of unequal educational opportunity on the professional level. Only 6 percent of our law students and 8 percent of our medical students are women although, according to the Office of Education, statistics show that women tend to do better on admission tests. My amendment to titles IV and IX of the 1964 Civil Rights Act authorizes the Attorney General to bring suits in behalf of persons denied equal protection of laws by public school officials and requires the Commissioner of Education to conduct a survey on the extent of discrimination because of sex, not only in practices with respect to students, but also in employment of faculty

and administration. In doing so, the bill merely secures the rights of women which probably already exist under the 14th amendment.

Discrimination against women in public facilities—restaurants, for instance—is less severe but in principle just as damaging. By amending title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Women's Equality Act authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits in cases of such discrimination and confers jurisdiction upon the district courts to provide for injunctive relief against sex discrimination in public accommodations.

Perhaps the greatest deterrent to securing improvement in the legal status of women is the lack of public knowledge. The Civil Rights Commission authorized by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, collects, studies and distributes information on civil rights laws and policies. At present, the Commission's mandate does not include responsibility for women. The bill I am introducing amends the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to extend the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to include denial of rights based on sex discrimination. Thus, State laws punishing women with longer prison sentences for the same offense, practices which exclude women from State universities, and other laws and policies which deny equal protection of the laws to women will be studied and recommendations made to change them.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on with an unending catalog of the injustices women presently suffer in this country. It is surprising and inexcusable that the quality of life Americans have sought for nearly 200 years is in many ways denied female Americans by law. At a time when our commitment to the democratic ideal is being questioned both at home and abroad, it is imperative that the Nation utilize the potential of all its citizens. Studies show that we are lagging behind some newly emerging countries in the role ascribed to women. This is an ironic oversight on our part. With nearly 40 percent of our labor force women we must amend the existing laws. Of that female working force, 64 percent are married. Because of the rising cost of living, family illness, or widowhood, many women today must work to support families. I urge the attention of my colleagues to this important bill which will actualize enforcement of already existing rights, which will eliminate second-class citizenship in this country, and which will open up an untapped source of productivity. I hope that the Judiciary Committee will take immediate action on this bill to make sex, like race, an anachronism under the law as a basis for measuring people's rights or worth.

SPEECH OF GEN. WILLIAM C. WEST-MORELAND ON OUR DEFENSE POSTURE

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Chief of Staff of the U.S.

Army, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, delivered a magnificent address on our defense posture when he appeared in my district last week. I am happy to include it in the RECORD because I feel that it is important enough to be read and studied by all of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

To be with you this evening and take part in your annual meeting is a personal pleasure. To join you in a tribute to our country's Armed Forces and the Defense Installations in this area is reassuring . . . especially at a time when the military is under attack at home as well as on the battlefield.

But to be here in the Williamsburg-James City County area . . .

Where the first permanent English speaking community suffered and survived,

Where the philosophy and ideals for our independence and the nation that followed were conceived and expressed by the enlightened patriots of Virginia,

Where the battle was fought and won that ended our long struggle for independence . . . to be here among the monuments of our heritage from the past is truly an inspiration for all, who cherish the freedom we enjoy today.

Yet we live in an age when some in our society assert that the past offers little light for the future, when time honored tradition and custom are in some sectors rejected, and when reason is frequently drowned in a clamor of emotion and hysteria.

In spite of those who refuse to be guided by the lessons of the past, I continue to agree with a great patriot from this state who later became its first governor. Patrick Henry said almost 200 years ago that—I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know no way of judging of the future but by the past.

The American Army today traces its roots to our colonial forebears who shouldered arms in our war for independence. Yet force of arms was used almost two hundred years before. Within a few weeks after landing at Jamestown, the 120 colonists repelled an attack by 200 Indians that threatened the colony. Later, in 1622, the colony . . . having been lulled into a false sense of security by the marriage of John Rolfe to Pocahontas . . . neglected its defenses. As a result, a secret Indian onslaught killed almost one-third of its inhabitants.

Weathering privation and hardship . . . and a rebellion in 1676, the colonists endured. But the difficult life prompted William Fitzhugh to write in 1687 that Virginia was no place for a gentleman to raise a family. He stated that "Good education of children is almost impossible, and better be never born than ill bred." And I might add, this concern for proper upbringing has continued among Virginia gentlemen to the present.

Not only did the colony survive, but it later flourished as a center of enlightenment. With the founding of the College of William and Mary in 1693 and movement of the Capital from Jamestown to here, the birth of the American ideal had started. The Alumni of William and Mary and our forebears who gave life to old Williamsburg are a panorama of American history. Their names are well-known to all. Jefferson; Monroe; Wythe; Peyton; Edward and John Randolph; John Marshall; Patrick Henry and George Washington. It was this last individual who, 168 years after the founding of Jamestown, was appointed Commander in Chief the day after the Second Continental Congress resolved on June 14, 1775.

. . . that six companies of expert riflemen be immediately raised in Pennsylvania, two in Maryland, and two in Virginia. . .

On taking command, Washington found a fearless group of patriots but hardly a match for the well-trained professionals they would later confront. He noted in a letter his assessment: "A mixed multitude of people here. . . They are under very little discipline, order, or government."

Not until over a year later . . . on July 4, 1776 . . . did this dedicated group of citizens under arms receive their mission that was to change the course of history. And it was six long years after Lexington and Concord that the last battle was fought and won near here at Yorktown.

In 1783 came the formal acknowledgment of independence and our Revolutionary War was over. The Continental Army—an Army organized by the people to serve the people—had accomplished its mission.

The American military leaders in our Revolutionary War were in large part without appreciable military experience, but they commanded and fought with skill equal to that of professionals. When independence was won, these same men shed their uniforms for civilian pursuits. From their ranks came many of the leaders of our young Nation whose gifted enlightenment helped mold our governmental institutions.

Our Army today is deeply rooted in this country's early formative years . . . and the tradition of subordination of the military to civilian leadership is a foremost fundamental. Suspicious of large standing armies that owed their allegiance to European kings and knowledgeable of examples of military leaders seizing political power, the members of the Continental Congress closely regulated the size and composition of the Continental Army . . . chose its generals . . . and governed its supply and administration.

Those who framed our Constitution built into this document civil control of the military. To underscore this fundamental precept, all soldiers—officers and enlisted men alike—continue to take essentially the same oath that Washington took on April 30, 1789 . . . an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic. This oath is unique . . . its charge is not for the defense of any man, nor any partisan cause. Explicit in this oath is a solemn affirmation to defend the foundation and expression of the highest ideals of freedom for man. Implicit in the oath is obedience to the Commander in Chief—the President of the United States.

Your Army has never compromised this sacred oath. As an organization, its undivided loyalty to our government is without equal.

This undivided loyalty is a part of the philosophy of the American soldier . . . a philosophy born in his oath of allegiance, lived in his performance of duty, proved by his spirit of personal sacrifice, guarded by his acceptance of discipline, and inspired by the knowledge that he has the support of the American people.

This guiding ethic of the United States Army has served our Nation well for nearly two centuries. Just as we find strength in the past, we also must face the challenges of the present and anticipate the problems of the future. Where the Army is and where it is headed raise issues that challenge all of us as we look ahead.

The Army is now experiencing one of the most critical and turbulent periods in its history. We are adjusting to the new realities of the Nixon Doctrine . . . which means a reduced U.S. presence overseas and smaller military forces. We are redeploying forces from Vietnam and substantially reducing our strength to come within reduced budgets. We are also changing our internal structure as we examine the composition of our forces . . . test recent developments from our continuing research . . . and apply lessons learned in Vietnam—with needed adaptation, of course, to our forces elsewhere in the world.

Unfortunately, the Army continues to be the principal target of a disturbing anti-military campaign. This has undoubtedly resulted from our central role in the Vietnam War and reliance on the draft to help fill our ranks.

Those who attack the Armed Forces are motivated by differing reasons. We value and welcome constructive criticism . . . realizing that any large organization does make mistakes . . . particularly one that has suffered the stresses and strains that the Army has.

We also recognize and appreciate the need for the give-and-take of debate in an open society. But it is one thing to criticize our governmental policies . . . and quite another to wave the flag of an enemy that has killed over 40,000 Americans.

The rhetoric of the "so-called" antiwar movement is especially harsh to servicemen who are the staunchest antiwar advocates.

Anyone who has known the cruelty of war firsthand would never be its advocate. Those who have experienced prolonged family separation, who have suffered the agony of the battlefield, and who have lost comrades know better than any that war is the most abhorrent of human endeavors.

The American people must not let short-run frustrations and misrepresentations of a vocal minority blind them to the long-range imperatives of national security.

The importance of strong national security forces was appreciated early in our history as a nation. The Father of our Country . . . the foremost American of the eighteenth century—George Washington—cautioned that:

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

As part of our efforts to improve the fighting capability of the Army, we have established at Fort Hood, Texas an organization to devise and test a new battlefield control and intelligence system. We call this test organization Project Masster. Its purpose is to take the latest advances in technology that have been proved in Vietnam, integrate them into a unified system responsive to the commander, and adapt them for use in other areas of the world.

We have achieved excellent results with sensors, night vision devices, improved communications and firepower, and automatic data processing. Our radars, infrared searchlights, and starlight scopes allow our soldiers to see at night and during other periods of poor visibility without themselves being seen. We have had remarkable success with sensors . . . small acoustic or seismic devices that virtually defy enemy detection yet signal the presence of human movement in their more . . . and firepower and communication. Computers are now being used in ways never before seen as responsive. Our objective is to incorporate these devices that have enhanced our fighting capability in Vietnam into our Army of the 1970's.

We are also embarking upon another program which will involve far-reaching changes. We are committing every effort in moving toward a zero draft, volunteer force.

Our task will not be easy. In the Active Army alone, we must more than double enlistments and re-enlistments. And while we seek quantity, we also seek quality.

Our assigned goal is to reach a volunteer force by the summer of 1973. In moving toward that objective, continuation of Selective Service beyond its expiration date of June 30, 1971 is essential to guarantee our Nation's defenses. But, most important, even if a zero draft is achieved, we believe that Selective Service legislation should remain in force as national insurance.

As you know, I have already announced several new policies as part of our efforts to improve Service attractiveness. Also, I have instructed the Army's senior commanders and my own staff to take a hard look at other areas . . . where policy changes might remove unnecessary irritants and

practices detrimental to morale and achievement of a more professional, volunteer force.

Our formula for success consists of three elements:

Enhanced professionalism . . .

A better Service life . . .

And improved public esteem for the Army.

We seek an Army in which service is personally satisfying, individually rewarding, and professionally stimulating. We are reviewing all our practices. We are willing to part with past practices where these no longer serve a productive and useful end. Nothing is considered sacrosanct except where military order and discipline are jeopardized. In this we will not yield. We will continue to hold to those principles that have insured success on the battlefield and a loyal, responsive Army for our Nation. Anything else would be unthinkable and a danger to the very Nation the Army is sworn to defend. Certainly our citizens must realize this simple truth.

We in the Army realize that responsibility for the first element in our formula—enhancing the professional climate of the Army—rests squarely on our leadership.

I continue to believe that most young men in our society are looking for responsibility, respectability, challenge, fulfillment, job satisfaction and adventure. And, I believe they are searching for purpose and direction as well. The Army can and will satisfy these aspirations. We can make Service life more attractive . . . without lowering our standards.

Our responsibility is to "practice the time-tested principles of leadership that we have always preached."

The second element in our formula is to improve life in the Army. We are working hard to come up with ideas. Limited resources restrict us in certain areas. Using civilians for KP is high on our list . . . but this will cost about \$104 million a year. Installing barracks partitions is also top priority . . . and will cost about \$50 million.

Nevertheless, we can do many things that involve changes in policies or attitudes and cost little or nothing. For example, we are eliminating "make work" practices and unnecessary formations. And, we are altering our policies to insure that soldiers are treated as responsible individuals. But our efforts alone are not enough. We must have resources . . . and I mean adequate funding.

The third element in our formula is to increase public esteem for the Army . . . and appreciation for those who serve. To attract and retain the quality people in the numbers required, we must have the full support of the American people and their leaders in the Congress, business, industry, the church, the community, education and the news media.

We cannot expect to achieve our goal of a zero draft, volunteer force when the Army is maligned by some, directly attacked by others and half-heartedly supported by many.

Unfortunately . . . our critics are helped along by aberrations in the system. These exceptions to the rule . . . unrepresentative as they are . . . eclipse the greater good that has been achieved. Yet, this is hardly a new phenomenon, for throughout history the sensational has always overshadowed the routine.

The Army by itself cannot rally public support. Neither can it argue in the public forum the wisdom of national policy. Yet the vitality of the Army is dependent on support, understanding and encouragement from the American people.

I know of no better way to achieve this . . . to insure that our fellow citizens know the facts . . . than through community leaders such as you in this audience this evening.

Your Army's performance need not be defended. It speaks for itself. The Army has done what it was ordered to do . . . and done it well . . . in Vietnam and elsewhere. The record is a proud one . . . and hardly deserving of the disparagement that comes from certain quarters.

If the military continues to receive widespread abuse . . . if it is not provided adequate resources . . . and if it is not presented as a necessary, highly respectable profession, we can hardly expect to attract volunteers in the numbers required.

The public cannot have it both ways. Public support must be visible, audible and tangible.

I solicit your support and best efforts as we strive to insure the Nation a strong, ready and responsive, quality Army. How well we do depends not only upon the professionalism of those on active duty and the actions we take to better Service life . . . but also on the assistance and encouragement of our civilian friends as well.

The dedication of the soldier to serve his Nation and the confidence of the public in its Armed Forces constitute a national strength that must never be diminished. As the Army prepares for the future, we continue to agree with America's great statesman and one of our foremost humanists, Thomas Jefferson, who said that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1917, is a memorial day in the minds and hearts of freedom-loving Ukrainians.

For a very brief period of time in modern history the Nation of the Ukraine achieved its independence from the foreign powers on that historic day. The opportunity for national independence arrived and was carried through with the overthrow of czarist Russia and the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. This resulted in a new nation being created which ended 300 years of Russian domination.

In less than 3 years the newly created Communist Russia invaded Ukraine and conquered its people once again. Many of the Ukrainian leaders were assassinated; national religions were persecuted and destroyed. There were 600,000 people who perished in famines organized by the Kremlin to force the acceptance of collective farming; language and culture were Russified and the economic viability of the once proud nation was destroyed.

Many decades have passed since this terrible tragedy occurred, but the people of the Ukraine have resisted spiritual domination and a flame of hope still burns in their hearts that one day they will again be free.

It is an honor for me to join with the Ukrainian Americans in commemorating this coming anniversary. I fervently hope that freedom will be forthcoming soon to the brave and courageous Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain.

UPGRADING OUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a singular privilege to introduce today seven resolutions bearing a total of 16 names of sponsoring Members, which—when adopted—will bring this body into the forefront of the crusade to upgrade our physical environment.

For many years I have contended that Congress should be innovative, and that it should not merely react in the fight to preserve the integrity of our earth, its waters, and its atmosphere.

And I believe that so long as we treat the complex and interrelated environmental degradation problems piecemeal, through committees whose primary responsibilities lie elsewhere, we are destined to only react. We are destined to be behind the problems instead of ahead of them. In the past, we could get away with reaction. Nature has been forgiving, in terms of healing the wounds inflicted upon her ecological balances by man and his technology.

In the past the axiom that time heals all wounds has been, in the main, quite true. However, we are now in an era when time—or, if you prefer, nature—simply cannot heal all of the wounds.

We are discovering, through tragic degradations in our environment, that nature does not have an infinite ability to support human societies and their excesses.

Time definitely is not on mankind's side, and accordingly the very highest of priorities must be assigned to environmental quality by the Federal Government; and particularly the Congress.

No; reaction by this body simply is not enough. But how do we become innovative? How do we assume the leadership in the environmental quality crusade?

I submit that the most forceful vehicle would be the creation of a single, action-oriented standing Committee on the Environment.

My resolution would amend the rules of the House of Representatives to establish just such a committee. It would have jurisdiction over such matters as air quality, water quality, solid waste disposal, noise pollution, and herbicide and pesticide abuse.

In advocating such a reorganization of our committee structure, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that this body does not often so act. As a matter of fact, only about once in a decade does a major regrouping of committee jurisdictions occur. The last such action was in 1967 when the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was created. The Committee on Science and Astronautics was established in 1958 and all of our other standing committees date from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and earlier.

The time for change has come. I believe the American people are presenting us with a mandate for change. I believe

the concept of a standing Committee on the Environment is an idea whose time has come.

This is not, I should point out, a new idea. I first proposed the formation of such a committee in a speech before the 91st Congress on April 28, 1969, and in the year and a half which followed I was joined by more than one-third of the Members of Congress—168 to be specific—in sponsoring enabling resolutions.

The need for additional congressional attention to the problems of the environment was underlined by passage of a House resolution which would have established a Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Environment and Technology. I cosponsored that resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I felt it would serve as a positive step forward in the environmental quality crusade.

Frankly, I considered it to be only a half step, however, because the Joint Committee would have possessed few actual powers. It would not have been a primary committee assignment for its members. Instead, it would have been an additional chore to be added to the already busy schedules of senior Members. And, it would not have possessed the power to draft and report bills to the floors of the House and Senate. Its function would have been primarily that of another advisory body to the standing committees.

As it turned out, the Joint Committee was not to be. An unresolved difference between the House and Senate resolutions caused the proposal to die in conference.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to take a quantum leap forward. We can create a standing Committee on the Environment and—hopefully—the other body will create a parallel committee. Then, and only then, will Congress be prepared to shift into high gear in asserting the creative leadership which the Nation and the world so desperately need.

We will be in a position to fulfill an obligation which I believe transcends all others: leaving the earth, its atmosphere and waters in better condition than we found them. No generation in the history of civilized man has been able to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I am intensely proud of the broad base of support which is reflected in the list of my cosponsors today. Both political parties in the House are represented in substantial numbers, and all aspects of the philosophical spectrum are evident.

The cosponsors come from 43 States of the Union. And each of the 21 current standing committees is represented, with four probable chairmen and 11 probable ranking minority Members included.

The full list of sponsors follows:

LIST OF SPONSORS

ALABAMA

Mr. Beville, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Dickinson, and Mr. Flowers.

ALASKA

Mr. Begich.

CALIFORNIA

Mr. Don Clausen, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Gubser, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Mathias;

Mr. Moss, Mr. Rees, Mr. Talcott, Mr. Teague, Mr. Van Deerlin, Mr. Veysey, Mr. Wiggins, and Mr. Wilson.

COLORADO

Mr. Brotzman and Mr. McKeivitt.

CONNECTICUT

Mr. McKinney.

DELAWARE

Mr. duPont.

FLORIDA

Mr. Bennett, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Sikes, and Mr. Young.

GEORGIA

Mr. Blackburn.

HAWAII

Mr. Matsunaga.

IDAHO

Mr. Hansen.

ILLINOIS

Mr. Anderson, Mr. Arends, Mr. Crane, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. McClory, Mr. Michel, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Price, Mr. Rallsback, Mrs. Reid, Mr. Springer and Mr. Yates.

INDIANA

Mr. Bray, Mr. Dennis, Mr. Hillis, Mr. Madden.

IOWA

Mr. Mayne and Mr. Schwengel.

KANSAS

Mr. Sebellus, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Skubitz, and Mr. Winn.

KENTUCKY

Mr. Carter.

MAINE

Mr. Kyros.

MARYLAND

Mr. Hogan.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Boland, Mr. Burke, Mr. Conte, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Drinan, Mr. Harrington, Mrs. Heckler, Mr. Keith, Mr. Morse, and Mr. O'Neill.

MICHIGAN

Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Esch, Mr. Harvey, and Mr. Riegle.

MINNESOTA

Mr. Karth, Mr. Nelsen, Mr. Quile, and Mr. Zwach.

MISSOURI

Mr. Ichord, Mr. Randall, and Mr. Symington.

MONTANA

Mr. Shoup.

NEBRASKA

Mr. McCollister and Mr. Thone.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Wyman.

NEW JERSEY

Mr. Daniels, Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Howard, Mr. Minish, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Roe, Mr. Sandman, and Mr. Widnall.

NEW YORK

Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Biaggi, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Fish, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Horton, Mr. Kemp, Mr. King, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Pike, Mr. Pirnie, Mr. Reid, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Smith, Mr. Stratton, Mr. Terry, and Mr. Grover.

NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Broyhill.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. Andrews.

OHIO

Mr. Brown, Mr. Devine, Mr. Hays, Mr. Miller, Mr. J. Wm. Stanton, Mr. Stokes, and Mr. Vanik.

OKLAHOMA

Mr. Camp.

OREGON

Mr. Dellenback and Mr. Wyatt.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Biester, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Dent, Mr. Ellberg, Mr. Fulton, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Goodling, Mr. Green, Mr. McDade, Mr. Rooney, Mr. Schneebell, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Yatron.

RHODE ISLAND

Mr. St Germain and Mr. Tiernan.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Mann.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. Abourezk.

TENNESSEE

Mr. Duncan and Mr. Kuykendall.

TEXAS

Mr. Wright.

UTAH

Mr. Lloyd.

VERMONT

Mr. Stafford.

VIRGINIA

Mr. Daniel, Mr. Poff, Mr. Robison, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Whitehurst.

WASHINGTON

Mrs. Hansen and Mr. Pelly.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Hechler.

WISCONSIN

Mr. Aspin, Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Steiger, and Mr. Thomson.

THE 91ST CONGRESS ESTABLISHED A RECORD FOR INNOVATION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since the final adjournment of the 91st Congress earlier this month, it has been popular for many pundits and other commentators to criticize the work of the 91st Congress. This is a position that I did not accept as was indicated in the remarks I made in these Chambers on the final day of the 91st Congress. At that time I expressed the conviction that the 91st Congress did indeed have a productive record. On the same day one of the fine newspapers which serves the 20 counties comprising the Second Congressional District of California, Redding Record-Searchlight, carried a story by Tom Foley, the Washington correspondent of the Los Angeles Times, with the headline "The 91st Congress established a record for innovation."

Mr. Foley is an independent congressional observer who is highly respected for his congressional reporting. I think that Mr. Foley in his article puts some of the critics in their proper perspective. Therefore, I insert at this point in the Record, the article entitled "The 91st Congress Established a Record for Innovation" published from the Redding Record-Searchlight:

THE 91ST CONGRESS ESTABLISHED A RECORD FOR INNOVATION

(By Thomas J. Foley)

It's a popular time for bad-mouthing the 91st Congress—with its interminable debates, its contentious arguments and what seem like its best causes.

Republican leaders point a finger at the Democrats, and the Democrats say the Republicans are to blame. But all of this is

political posturing. For beneath the rhetoric lies a record indicating that the 91st has been one of the more innovative in history, establishing a record of reform, challenge and badly needed modernization.

While some of its accomplishments are plainly visible now, others will become manifest in the 92nd and succeeding congresses when the legislative reforms enacted this fall take effect.

Furthermore, these reforms—the first in 24 years—had a sort of self-generative quality to them, particularly in the highly structured and slow-moving House. Members found that it didn't hurt. The fresh air felt good.

Now more changes are being planned, and the House appears to be bringing itself into the last third of the 20th century with a minimum of kicking and screaming.

Although significant, procedural reform has only an indirect effect on the citizenry, and there is plenty in that record that directly relates to the nation's needs.

Nothing is so direct as the environment. And congressional treatment of the subject illustrates clearly one of the underlying reasons for the success of the 91st Congress—the political rivalry between its Democratic majority and the Republican President and administration. Each tried to out-do the other on at least some popular issues.

President Nixon proposed an interagency committee to develop a government environmental policy. But Congress, at the urging of Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., created a three-man Council on Environmental Quality similar to the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The legislation required that any federal program with any effect on the environment had to be cleared with the council.

Then Congress followed up with amendments to the 1965 Clean Air Act which establish tough new federal standards for air quality and which requires development of a virtually pollution-free automobile by 1975.

The President also proposed a 10-year \$10 billion federal-state program for waste treatment facilities.

The first year allotment called for spending about \$400 million on these facilities. Congress ignored the long-term program but boosted federal outlays for the current year to \$1 billion.

Another example was tax reform. House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., had been talking about it for 15 years and the common assumption was that it was too vast and complicated a subject to clear the legislative process in the two-year span of one Congress.

But early in 1969, there were hints that President Nixon was going to propose a tax reform program, and Mills promptly began working on his own. Largely through his efforts, the bill, a relatively comprehensive one, became law within nine months.

To win acceptance of changes that hurt certain special interests, such as the oil industry, Mills "sweetened" the bill by cutting both individual and corporate taxes.

After years of ignoring the sensitive but critical issue of trying to control the population explosion, Congress finally acted, partially in response to administration initiative.

The lawmakers authorized a commission to study and recommend steps for control and later enacted a three-year \$285 million program to provide help in family planning to local communities.

Postal reform was another subject that had been proposed several times by Democratic administrations but got nowhere until the competitive political juices began flowing under a Republican regime. Aided partly by a postal strike, Congress finally turned over the postal system to a public corporation which hopefully will be able to modernize and de-politicize mail delivery.

The novel public corporation concept was employed in trying to solve two other national problems—maintaining a viable railroad passenger system and protecting stockholders from brokers who go broke.

A SPEECH THAT ENDURES: THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago yesterday, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was inaugurated our Nation's 35th President.

On that cold day, the hearts of Americans were warmed by one of the most eloquent and inspiring inaugural addresses in our history. The speech lasted only 20 minutes, but its contents and prose were praised throughout the world by many liberal and conservative publications and by many Republicans, as well as Democrats.

Time magazine wrote that the new President's address "stirred the heart," and compared passages of the speech with one of the best in history, Franklin D. Roosevelt's first inaugural.

Many other publications lauded the speech. The Washington Post pointed out that "Mr. Kennedy set a high standard of content and oratorical performance." The Pittsburgh Press declared that "We have, certainly, a new President of eloquence."

A leading west coast newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, claimed that "The testament of the inaugural address is about as good a start as a President could make."

From the New Orleans States-Item: "An expert job, eloquent, brief, and inspiring—just the right expression for the occasion."

The Christian Science Monitor reported to its readers, "Mr. Kennedy's address had a marked ring of history."

The highly respected columnist, Walter Lippmann, wrote that it was "efficient and ardent" and noted that the address was received with "so much hope and anticipation everywhere."

And Arthur Krock, chief of the New York Times Washington Bureau, wrote: "The excellence of the prose seemed to me to match Woodrow Wilson's."

The New Leader magazine called the speech "splendid" and several foreign newspapers shared the enthusiasm and praise:

Augusto Guerriero, in Corriere Della Sera, of Milan, believed that, "for a long time no such virile language had been heard on the far shore of the Atlantic."

And the Allgemeine Zeitung, of Frankfurt, proclaimed: "It promises strength and leadership."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Americans especially remember the section that exhorted us to make our Nation truly great:

My fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Because of President Kennedy's leadership, the true greatness of America and "the freedom of man" came closer to realization.

Those who admired and loved President Kennedy will always grieve, and there is little solace. Yet, there is this to say: America lost a President with the promise of greatness, but the world found an inspiration.

Even before he was elected President, he spoke of the urgent need of providing "moral, as well as political leadership" and during his Presidency, that is the kind of leadership he gave to America—and to the world. This was only one of the reasons he appealed to the young, for he had many other distinguished qualities. He was brilliant, he was brave, he was a strong and respected leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was unforgettable.

Mr. Speaker, when people in this country and the world think of hope, they often remember the words of President Kennedy's inaugural address.

In observance of the 10th anniversary of his magnificent inaugural address, I insert that sterling document in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help remind us of the great hope he expressed for mankind on that cold, but beautiful day. It was a day that millions of Americans will never forget and one that history will remember, for a new hope was born on that day and it will always live and inspire.

JOHN F. KENNEDY INAUGURAL ADDRESS,
JANUARY 20, 1961

Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, reverend clergy, fellow citizens, we observe today not a victory of party, but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end, as well as a beginning—signifying renewal, as well as change. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three quarters ago.

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

To those old allies whose cultural and

spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new States whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our words that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far greater iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.

To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds, in a new alliance for progress, to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of laboring those problems which divide us.

Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to “undo the heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free.”

And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a

new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are; but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in, and year out, “rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation”—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, during the 91st Congress, we enacted a tax reform law which did provide some needed reforms. But, as we all remember, there were many provisions which were questionable and a concerted effort should be made in this Congress to make further corrections.

Included in the tax law was the removal of the investment tax credit for small businesses and farmers. At a time when we face continued inflation, high interest, and tight credit, our small businessmen and farmers need this tax credit restored for the coming year.

The administration has also just proposed economic help to big business and it is only fair that help be passed on to our small businesses. I am today introducing legislation which would reinstate the 7 percent investment tax credit, with a \$20,000 limitation, and I hope my col-

leagues will join with me in working to restore this necessary incentive.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING CURBS CONSIDERED

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the electorate is very concerned about campaign spending. They are thinking that only the rich, or those with rich backers, can aspire to public office. They are demanding that something be done.

Typical of this line of thought is an editorial written by Gordon E. Duenow in the Little Falls Daily Transcript on January 14.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission and to inform my colleagues, I insert Mr. Duenow's editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CAMPAIGN SPENDING CURBS CONSIDERED

“Spending in the last national political campaign reached such proportions that I believe everyone will agree that the time has come to do something about it,” wrote Cong. John Zwach in a recent newsletter to constituents.

He reported that he had introduced two measures in the last session which were side-tracked. One of the bills would have abolished District of Columbia campaign committees and the other would have set a limit on the amount of money a candidate could spend in an election.

“Our election system should not be such that only the rich can aspire to public office,” he stated.

A law was passed during the last session of Congress limiting campaign spending for federal office but it was vetoed by President Nixon.

Without question, we need some regulations governing campaign expenditures. Today we do find that in many instances only the rich can aspire to public office. This has been going on for a long time and will certainly get worse if something isn't done.

Evidently it doesn't help to protest too much. Just this week a news report indicated that a Vermonter who wants to close loopholes in election campaign expenditure reporting laws got into trouble. The House committee charged with investigating campaign expenditure violations sent his name to the Justice Department, which could prosecute him for violating the laws he thinks should be toughened.

Dennis J. Morrisseau, an unsuccessful third party candidate for Vermont's single House seat last fall, said he spent less than \$4,700 but announced he had refused to fill out “meaningless” forms with the House clerk as a protest against loose reporting laws.

Two years ago 107 cases were turned over to the Justice Department, which took no action. The department has announced, however, it will take a close look at possible violations this year.

Morrisseau contended that present laws are so loose that only a fraction of actual expenditures are required to be reported.

Possibly this is one reason why the Justice Department in the past has seen fit to ignore previous cases. It might be impossible to secure a conviction. On top of that, it also might be possible that action by the Justice Department could prompt someone to take a closer look at campaign spending which could be embarrassing for many a public office holder.

THE EFFORT TO FREE OUR FELLOW AMERICANS FROM FORCED CAPTIVITY BY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the 8th year in which American servicemen have been held prisoner by North Vietnam, I think it necessary that we analyze the motives behind our enemy's continued intransigence. In this way, perhaps, we may find a clearer understanding of our own roles in the effort to free our fellow Americans from forced captivity.

It should be clear by now that the prime purpose behind the North's strategy is to frustrate our plans to Vietnamize the war. They realize that the Nixon administration will never withdraw from Vietnam as long as American servicemen are held captive. But they realize as well that this withdrawal has been promised by the President to the American people. It is their hope that public opinion here, impatient with our inability to get out, will force a change in our official stance at the Paris negotiations: one which would allow the President to fulfill his promise, but also one which would seriously weaken the government of the South and nullify all our past efforts to guarantee the Vietnamese a free choice of leadership. At the very least, they hope that, in exchange for the prisoners, we will set a specific date for the complete withdrawal of American forces.

But to announce such a timetable runs directly counter to our past position. We would, in effect, be encouraging North Vietnam to ignore the Paris talks and to wait simply until our withdrawal has taken place before launching a major attack upon the South Vietnamese nation.

Clearly, we can make no such concession—even in exchange for the prisoners. Yet, until those prisoners are released, we cannot leave Southeast Asia.

Of course, the North Vietnamese do not want to delay our withdrawal any more than they have to: the sooner we are out the better. This fact, in itself, would seem to make their strategy a contradiction, for by holding the prisoners they force us to stay even longer than we want to stay. They seem to be acting against their own best interests.

In their own minds, however, this is apparently not the case. So sure are they of the will of the American people to withdraw from Vietnam, so sure are they of our impatience with an unwinnable war, that they believe the United States will withdraw whether or not the prisoners are released. In other words, they are taking a calculated chance: if we make the desired concessions, then their situation is all the better; if we do not, they are gambling that we will leave anyway, so great is the pressure on the President to order our departure.

This calculated risk is at the heart of their strategy. As long as they believe

the gamble will work, our prisoners will be used as barter at the Paris talks. We must convince them that it cannot work, that we will never forget our servicemen held captive in Vietnam. Only in this way can the misguided strategy of the north be discredited.

Therefore, we must continually strengthen and reaffirm our commitment to these brave soldiers and their families. The north must realize that the concern of the American people for these men will never subside, that we will not allow them to be manipulated like inanimate pieces in an insane chess game, and that, as long as these men are prisoners, the American public will not accept a total withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, with this resolution we dedicate ourselves again to the struggle of our prisoners of war. Let all the world know that we will not sacrifice their lives to our own impatience and that the American people will not abandon them to their cynical and malicious oppressors.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACT OF 1971

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, our society and our political system are at a critical stage of intensive scrutiny by critics and supporters alike. We cannot afford the luxury of maintaining laws and policies which are contrary to the basic premises of an open democracy. For that reason, I have today introduced legislation to lift the ban on political activity which the Hatch Act currently imposes on all Federal civil service employees. At a time when we are trying to convince the American citizenry that the electoral process is responsive to the will of the people and that change is possible within the political system, how can we in the same breath exclude millions of citizens from active political participation because they devote their working lives to helping the Government function?

The existing law was first passed in 1939, when there were less than a million Federal civil servants. It was intended to control improper political activities, but it did so by a classic example of legislative overkill. Rather than prohibiting only corrupt political activity or misuse of official influence, it imposed a blanket prohibition on all electoral participation.

The bill I have introduced will restore full political rights to civil servants while retaining the necessary protection against misuse of official influence and providing protection for civil servants against political pressure from their superiors. The central provision of the bill, which does not repeal but rather amends the present law, removes the sweeping prohibition against political activity by Federal employees. In addition, it gives the Civil Service Commission authority to take action against officials, including those appointed by the President—not presently subject to Civil Service Com-

mission jurisdiction—who are guilty of unlawful coercion. Finally, the Commission will be given a functional interrelationship with the Justice Department by referring violations for criminal prosecution. Actions are now initiated by Justice, which has only rarely pursued prosecution in the past. Greater feedback between the Attorney General and the Congress is also provided.

Let us retain and enforce those prohibitions which effectively guard against corruption of our political system, but let us also return the franchise to the people who run the daily affairs of our Government.

TAXPAYERS NAILED AGAIN

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one encounters so many small outrages in the Federal City that the senses are numbed to some of the minor atrocities which occur.

But this morning's Washington Post recounts one such incident which cannot go unnoticed.

At the behest of the White House, the Smithsonian Institution—the repository of all that is supposed to represent the best in this Nation's cultural and scientific heritage—hung 50 photographs of the President and his family.

According to the article, the White House was "so anxious to get this bit of instant history on the walls that instead of hanging the pictures in the standard manner, nails were driven directly into the \$50-a-yard Italian silk covering the wall where the pictures were hung."

The total cost was \$7,000.

And so, the Ship of State sails on.

PICTURES OF THE PRESIDENT, NAILS IN THE SILK

(By Sally Quinn)

Mrs. Richard Nixon spent 30 minutes Tuesday night at the Museum of History and Technology looking at 50 photographs of her husband and family.

Although Mrs. Nixon seemed pleased with the exhibition, there were those at the Smithsonian Institution who were not so enthusiastic, mainly because the exhibit cost the Institution \$7,000 in Italian silk.

A long-time Nixon friend, Justice Department official and member of the Nixon Foundation, Dick Moore, had gotten the idea to have "the first photographic exhibit to be shown of an incumbent President."

So they took the pictures that members of the President's four personal White House Staff photographers had shot of President Nixon over the last two years, chose 50 of them, and prepared the exhibition.

They contacted the Smithsonian about two weeks ago and arranged to show the photographs there to the public from Jan. 20 (the anniversary of Nixon's inauguration two years ago) through Feb. 21, with a press preview Jan. 19.

Unfortunately for the Museum of History and Technology, the White House was so anxious to get the exhibit hung in time for the anniversary that they couldn't wait to have it hung properly. So, according to one Smithsonian Institution official, they didn't.

Rather than use the normal procedure of placing a border at the ceiling above the \$50 a

yard Italian silk and hanging the pictures from wires, the museum officials were forced to hammer nails through the plush silk. "That was the most expensive wall in the entire museum," said one official. "This project had ended up costing \$7,000. That's four times what a normal project of this type would cost."

"The First Two Years: A Photographic impression of the Presidency" was put together because, as the brochure states, "The President of the United States leads not only our great country, but provides leadership to the free world. His decisions provoke worldwide interest both in the office of the presidency and in the man who holds it."

Chief White House Photographer, Ollie Atkins, who gave Mrs. Nixon the tour of the exhibition explained that it would be available to "responsible people" after it closes at the Smithsonian.

"It will go where it's invited," said Atkins, "as long as people are capable of supervising it and not stealing or mutilating the photographs."

Mrs. Nixon had seen all but two of the 50 pictures. However she doubted that the President would come and look at them himself.

"He doesn't like to see pictures of himself or watch himself on television," she said.

"He never watches himself on TV. He speaks from the heart and he's afraid that he will get self-conscious if he sees himself."

Mrs. Nixon's favorite photograph was of the President sitting on the steps with David Lupi, the Hearing and Speech Poster Child. "That's adorable," she said. "They look like they're enjoying each other."

Another favorite was the White House at Christmas time. "What I like about it is Old Glory up there," she said pointing to the flag on top of the White House, "just flying and waving away."

After Mrs. Nixon left, Secretary of Agriculture and Mrs. Clifford Hardin who came in with her, departed too. But Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and Mrs. Dillon Ripley and White House Director of Communications and Mrs. Herb Klein stayed on with some 80 others to enjoy the drinks and the buffet that the White House had provided.

ESTABLISHING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in joining my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and other concerned Members in sponsoring legislation to establish a Select House Committee on Aging. The unceasing efforts of the gentleman to provide a touchstone for House consideration of the problems associated with aging are an inspiration to all of us who are striving to make the institutions of Government more responsive to the needs of the people it serves.

In the past few years, what I think is a disproportionate amount of public concern has been focused on the problems of youth. I say disproportionate because in the process, it seems that our national concern for the problems of aging have been forced to take a back seat to the problems of youth. This is a thinly veiled criticism of the press and the media, as well as a thinly veiled criticism of the

instrumentalities of Government charged with responsibilities relating to our senior citizens. This preoccupation must be terminated; a proper perspective and a proper mix of attention and action must be restored.

That segment of the U.S. population which falls in the 65-and-over age group is very significant both in terms of its number and its caliber. There are over 19 million persons in this age group; this is more than 9 percent of our total population and more than 16 percent of our adult population. Among its members are some of our most able lawmakers and some of our wisest judges; yet, paradoxically, we are willing to entrust the aged with decisionmaking responsibilities in areas vital to our national and personal well-being while we arbitrarily exclude them from job opportunities and the economic mainstream.

As a result of this almost schizophrenic view, many of those 65 and older discover that they are living in their "sunshine years" in name only. They discover that the thing they share most with their peers are serious and continuing problems in such areas as personal fulfillment, housing, medical care, education, transportation, and income. On this last point, it has been estimated that one-third of the elderly live in poverty or near poverty. Of those over 65 who live alone, 66 percent have annual incomes of less than \$2,000.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are the things I have just described desirable fruits of the American dream? We all would cry they should not be, but the facts bear out the tragic fact that they comprise the reality in which far too many older Americans spend their last years.

Among highly civilized peoples, one measure commonly used to evaluate the humaneness of a particular society is in what fashion and to what extent does that society take care of its elders. To primitive man, the aged members of the tribe or kin group were a burden that had to be discarded by virtue of economic necessity. This was commonly accepted as an individual's destiny. In more advanced societies, as the demands of subsistence were surmounted halting efforts were made to maintain and protect the aged. They began to assume a revered societal position by virtue of the wisdom and experience they had accumulated over their lifetime. These qualities proved vital to early man as he strived to construct what we today know as the beginnings of Western civilization.

I would dare say that if the story of this Nation were written and concluded today, future historians would not judge us too kindly with regard to our attitudes and our actions as they relate to the aged.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, we owe it to this Nation, and more fundamentally we owe it to our 19 million elderly to change our perspective. We must focus in a deliberate and consistent way upon the problems and the concerns of the elderly. We must bring the creative energies of our society to bear and remedy the tragedies presently commonly associated with aging.

To accomplish this goal will engage

the best efforts of us all. We in the legislative branch carry a special burden because it is our job to frame the laws within which the aged will order their existence.

By establishing a Select Committee on Aging, the House of Representatives will be able to draw together the various strands of legislative responsibility that are presently scattered, on a part-time basis, among some 10 House committees. Focusing committee action in one special committee will permit problems of aging and alternative solutions to be comprehensively considered. It will provide a forum for the creation of innovative legislation.

I urge those of my colleagues who have not fully considered the problems of the aged and who have not fully assessed the responsibilities of Congress in this area, to take time out from their busy schedules and give the Select Committee on Aging proposal their undivided attention. The quality of life for 19 million people may well rest in part upon whether the House chooses to address itself directly to the problems of aging by the establishment of a Select Committee on Aging. The other body has an analogous committee; why should only one branch of Congress be the guardian of the elderly?

CAMPUS UNREST

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the following are two letters I have received from a constituent of mine, Ronald Standler, and I believe they should be included in the RECORD. Mr. Standler, a student at the University of Denver, has written an excellent report on the problem of campus unrest and I think that his suggestions are valuable. I recommend them to my colleagues as valid approaches to a sensitive and complex issue facing all of us today.

The letters follow:

DEAR MR. LUJAN: The modern era of student protest demonstrations began at the University of California Berkeley Campus in October 1964, just six years ago. Campus disorders are important to understand because the present and future leaders of our country are going to be influenced by the past and present turmoil. Even more important, violent protest threatens the physical existence of the universities; and political reaction to violent protest threatens to induce a new era of repression throughout our nation.

In preparing this paper I carefully read a stack of material over nine inches high and selected a number of points which I thought were correct. I have omitted chronicling the events at any university; I have not listed ideas with which I disagreed; I mentioned only what appeared to me to be useful techniques for maintaining the proper functions of universities.

I have not yet received the report of the President's Commission on Campus Disorders, so in a sense this paper is an independent look at the same material. I want to thank you for sending the prepared statements of forty witnesses before the Commission; those statements were the best material on campus disorders that I have seen.

In my textual footnotes I enclose in paren-

theses an abbreviation which refers to a title of a book listed in the bibliography, followed by the page number of the work cited.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AF.—Walter P. Metzger: *Academic Freedom in the Age of the University*, Columbia University Press, 1955.

BB.—Katope & Zolbrod: *Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values*, World Publishing Company, 1966.

ESNL.—"Extent of Subversion in the 'New Left'", Testimony of Inspector Cecil M. Pharris, San Francisco Police Department, before the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 21 January 1970.

FM 19-15.—Department of the Army Field Manual, "Civil Disturbances and Disasters," United States Army Military Police School, 25 March 1968.

RCOD.—"Riots, Civil, and Criminal Disorders," Hearings before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Parts 21-25, 1 July 1969 to 6 August 1970.

YAF.—*University Research Committee: A Faculty-Student Inquiry into the Causes of Campus Disorders*, sponsored by Young Americans for Freedom, released early October 1970.

DOE-X.—Designates reference to material from a prepared statement delivered before the President's Commission on Campus Unrest 15 July to 5 August 1970. "Doe" is the author and "X" is the page number of his testimony.

PURPOSE OF A UNIVERSITY

Before we examine student violence and how to control it, I think it is good to reflect a moment on the purpose of a university. John Platt, speaking before the Midwest Conference of College Administrators in 1968, stated five principal activities: (*Science*, 15 Aug 69, editorial page).

1. "Scholarship—the knowledge of everything that a man has done or written or thought."
2. "Teaching—the transmission of knowledge to the next generation."
3. "Creativity—generation or discovery of new insights or new knowledge."
4. "Public service—the application of all this knowledge in writing and consulting and inventing for its value to industry and government and the public."
5. "Innovation"—both ideas and material gadgets "that enlarges the achievements of man and transforms societies."

These purposes include the critical examination and continuous appraisal of existing knowledge. The university, particularly its library facilities, serves to preserve the thoughts which constitute our intellectual heritage. Some critics of modern universities have suggested that research not be conducted in a university; that the purpose of the university was to teach. But if a university does no more than teach it will be merely a super high school; moreover, as Professor Robert C. Amme has stated, "One purpose of a university is to create knowledge, not merely regurgitate it." (R. Standler, "Physics Major Counters Attacks on Denver Research Institute," *University of Denver Clarion*, 11 May 1970, page five). The university faculty, by engaging in a blend of teaching and research, can present to its students modern knowledge with enthusiasm rather than that of a stale teacher whose last contact with a practicing scientist (or other innovator) was in his own college days.

These purposes are good if the university is a community of scholars, but the modern university with its gargantuan undergraduate enrollment contains many students who are not serious about obtaining an education. A discussion of this point will lead us to one of the reasons for student unrest.

Let me quote Professor Andrew Hacker (BB, 208-9): "The millions of teen-agers filling up our colleges and universities are there for career purposes. They know, better than their parents, that a degree is absolutely necessary for financial and social success; and they are willing to spend four not-too-arduous years to become properly accredited. Most undergraduates have enrolled for eminently practical majors—business and engineering for the boys and education for the girls. Those doing liberal arts subjects are the minority, and very few of these have any illusions that they are engaged in learning for its own sake.

"Most of today's students are not intellectuals, nor are they capable of becoming so. They do not object to large, anonymous classes. They have no ideas of their own to put forward and they want to be told what they have to know. Eight out of ten students discover that they have nothing to say at such times as they do meet with a real professor at close range."

Others have expressed similar opinions. Indeed, Dr. John W. Gardner wrote a small book on this subject (*Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent too?*, Harper & Row, 1961).

Dr. S. I. Hayakawa emphasized parental and societal pressures on young people to attend college: "From about the age of 15 onward, young men and women, whether or not they have a bent for the intellectual life, are pushed and prodded by parents and teachers—and even more by community expectation—to get into, if not a "good" college, any college. Campus disorders come not from those who are in school because they want to be, but from those who are trapped there..." (Hayakawa, 1)

Dr. William McGill has characterized the modern university as a "storage area for bored young people who have no particular interest or drive toward learning, but who feel that a college degree is essential to their future welfare." (McGill, 7)

The universities could, in theory, unilaterally end this state of affairs by disowning their colleges of business administration, schools of hotel and restaurant management, physical education and home economics departments, and other programs of dubious academic merit. Requiring letters of recommendation from high school teachers of prospective incoming freshmen and a statement of purpose of each undergraduate applicant would allow the university to restrict its admissions to those who were serious about desiring advanced training. But these drastic changes would bring down upon the state universities the wrath of taxpayers and, hence, the legislature.

The large group of "students" on campus who are not sincerely committed to academic endeavors are excellent material with which to build student protest demonstrations. As Russel Kirk put it, these people who are "present on the campus only . . . for the prospect of a snob-degree, or for certification as potential employees . . . could not care less what happens to the higher learning; and they will venture nothing in defense of the Academy." (YAF, II-4)

Since many of the issues in campus protest demonstrations are national issues, as we shall see presently, one must ask: why are the universities the focus of dissent?

The chief of police for the University of California Berkeley Campus, Mr. William P. Beall, Jr., stated, "I do not believe that the choice of the campus or the [Berkeley] community [as a base for revolutionary action] was accidental. The University [of California at Berkeley] campus is a large one and presents a high degree of anonymity for the person who wishes to use its many facilities. It has a great heritage of free inquiry, trust, and mutual confidence. It presents many opportunities for parttime employment which

provides a means to live while leaving a great deal of time open for other pursuits. It has within its premises a large concentration of impressionable and volatile young people." (Beall, 7)

One can elaborate on the "impressionable and volatile young people" idea. California State College at Los Angeles has been free of major disruptions. Some of the reasons for this lack of violent demonstrations put forth by S. Cooley were:

The median age of the students was 26; 80% were over 21. Stability was imposed on the student body by marriage (42% of the students were married; 29% had children) and by employment (52% worked at least 20 hours/week, 20% worked 40 hours/week). Mr. Cooley concluded, "married, working, goal-oriented students preclude mass political or philosophical movement of students." (Cooley, 1-2)

A young college student just out of high school has probably never held a steady job and is still dependent upon his parents for financial support. These students are likely to regard themselves neither as children nor adult members of society. That is, they are isolated from society. Since they do not feel that they are a part of established society, it is easier for them to shout revolutionary slogans.

ISSUES IN CAMPUS PROTEST

Probably the most difficult task in writing this paper is to produce a section on the issues of campus unrest. I am not claiming that this section is representative of the views of any particular student or group of students. But the list of issues and comments may give a general indication of some concerns. I should also like to make clear that in presenting this section I have chosen material which I think illustrates some important attitudes and opinions of protesting students. I myself do not necessarily support the issues and opinions expressed here.

The principal issue is the War in Vietnam. Most students that I know who express concern over various social and political issues also oppose our military activity in Vietnam. It seems that if one is concerned about anything, one also opposes escalation of the war and any prolonged commitment of our forces in Vietnam.

Related to the marked dissatisfaction of students with the Vietnam war is protest against all aspects of the "military-industrial-complex." Recruiters for Dow Chemicals (manufacturers of napalm) and our military services have been picketed, obstructed, and abused by students. Many students (and faculty) have demanded an end to ROTC programs on campus. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has stated that 16% of the demonstrations on college campuses during the 1969-70 school year focused on ROTC. (Hoover, 1, 4) There has been a reappraisal of all scientific research which has received financial support from the Department of Defense.

However, it is quite clear that if tomorrow our government were to pull all of our men, material, and money out of Southeast Asia, campus protests would continue. (Sponberg, 7; Fleming, 1, 11)

Even so, President Fleming of the University of Michigan noted that an end to the war would reduce campus tensions more than any other single achievement. (Fleming, 1-2, 11)

Dr. Fleming has, I think, stated the best explanation for the strong student reaction to our invasion of Cambodia: "Prior to Cambodia I believe the majority of the students were reluctantly, and with some grumbling about the timetable, accepting our government's intention to withdraw from Vietnam. Cambodia, which from the military point of view may very well have had to be a surprise, hit them like a thunderbolt. With no advance preparation students saw what appeared to be a complete reversal of the gov-

ernment's policy and a broadening of the war in Asia. No amount of explanation could possibly placate them in that period of high emotion." (Fleming, 2)

Another issue is what students view as unfair laws. As you know it is a federal crime to use, possess, or sell marijuana. Apparently, the use of marijuana is no worse than that of alcohol or tobacco. (The damaging effects of alcohol or tobacco on the body are well documented and saying that marijuana is no worse is *not* saying that marijuana is safe or beneficial.) It seems to be most unfair to permit adults to enjoy alcohol and tobacco while denying a similar pleasure to students who choose to smoke marijuana. The anti-marijuana law is a good example of our elders not liking students to have fun in ways which the elders do not approve. This kind of law did not work in the case of Prohibition, and I don't think it is going to be any more successful with marijuana. The existence of this law also forces the police to create substantial ill will among the students when the dormitories are raided for marijuana.

As a result of the marked contrast between statements in chauvinistic history and civics textbooks and reality, the contrast between the idealism of the statements that "all men are created equal" and the 15th amendment to our Constitution, and the racism not only of Mississippi but also of the Northern states, youth has a right to be disillusioned.

The "patriots" who wrote and selected the history books in public elementary and high schools seem remarkably gifted in ignoring or rationalizing our rich legacy of blunders. J. Otis Cochran, a black law student, characterized campus unrest as "a rebellion against hypocrisy." (Cochran 5)

According to J. Edgar Hoover, 13% of the demonstrations on college campuses during the 1969-70 school year had "marked racial overtones." (Hoover, 1, 6) Racism is perhaps the best example of where our nation has failed to meet its own standards.

A large number of people have mentioned that youth does not place as much value on material achievements as their elders do. (Flacks, 5; Hayes, 15; BB, xvi, 221-2) In the opinion of some students the industrial revolution, science, and engineering have only given us pollution, ghettos, built in obsolescence, materialism, and urban blight. The result of this view, as Chancellor McGill neatly stated is that, "We are witnessing a youth revolution against technology." (McGill, 10)

Also among the issues of campus unrest there are various local issues. These will range from protest over the punishment given to students in the last demonstration, protest over a new rule from the university administration, police brutality, poor food in the school cafeteria, etc. But I agree with Dr. Heyns (RCCD 4901) that national problems are more important to students than local campus issues.

While it may be in vogue to condemn all student protest, one must realize that student protests influenced the Government's decision to begin civil rights programs and withdraw from Vietnam. (RCCD 4945; opinion of Dr. Heyns and Senators Percy and Ribicoff) The issues of student protest are certainly not the unique concern of young people. The high degree of morality and idealism of protesting students have been discussed by Dr. Keniston. Most protesters who were surveyed at Berkeley and San Francisco State College defined morality as a matter of social contract "created by each community to promote the public welfare," or in terms of idealistic principles (e.g. Golden Rule, sanctity of human life). In the case of the social contract the rules could be changed if they "proved unworkable or destructive." This group composed what Dr. Keniston called "post-conventional level of moral reasoning", and it is the most advanced form of morality. The usual form of morality, held

by a minority of protesting students and by a majority of non-protesters, defined morality as what one could do without being punished or condemned by society. From this study Dr. Keniston concluded "student activism has a genuine moral basis." (Keniston, 5-6)

The preceding reasons most often given for campus unrest are valid points of concern among young people. Many students are sincerely concerned about these issues. And yet some of the students will join protest demonstrations to be with their friends, to escape from homework and lectures on a nice autumn or spring day, or just to do something different from routine college activities.

Probably most participants are motivated by a mixture of genuine concern about the issues and the excitement provided by the protest demonstration. The exact proportion of concern and fun is probably impossible to determine. Among those motivated primarily by serious concern, I suspect that many believe that physical protest is the only method of protest to which the Establishment will respond. Many student protesters have never written their Congressman a letter, and even fewer have read a published volume of testimony delivered before a Congressional committee. They seem to have neither the patience, knowledge, nor stamina to work within the system.

WHY VIOLENCE?

Professor Flacks has suggested that the "basic source of desperation on campus" comes from the fact that the students, after having examined our society and government, "cannot identify any elements of established political leadership that offer authentically promising alternatives" to a continuation of war, racism, pollution, etc. (Flacks, 2) When non-violent protest did not produce results, violent protest became more common. Professor Flacks observed, "... it is clear that the war itself served as a moral justification for disruptive or destructive action." (Flacks, 7) I think some students do use this justification, but it is a flimsy one containing an obvious hypocrisy: the students accept as good the violence they perpetrate while condemning violence of our government in Vietnam (and incidentally, police brutality incurred while suppressing violent protest).

In the last section I mentioned that some young people have rejected material fulfillment as a goal. This may make destruction of property more acceptable to them since they do not respect the value others attach to their property.

Students really are frustrated by the failure of the Establishment to do as the students wish or demand. "... they say, 'the System' fails to respond to their cries. What does this strident-sounding phrase, 'the System didn't work,' mean in practice? Stripped of the rhetoric, this simply means that students did not succeed in building a democratic majority movement for their ideas. Campus violence has its origin in the despair of young people at the possibility of convincing a majority of the American people to support changes which they wish to see take place. The politics of confrontation and violence are alternatives—coercive alternatives—to building a majority movement for change." (Kelman, 2)

A similar analysis was presented by Mr. David A. Keene, who phrased student discontent this way: "they are confusing the right to speak with the right to be obeyed." (Keene, 5 also in YAF, II-30)

A prognosis was presented by Mr. Steven Kelman: "Campus violence will continue as long as students, concerned with the problems of our society, continue to regard the American people not as potential allies in solving these problems, but as an enemy to be confronted." (Kelman, 4)

Apart from the well-known destructiveness of Molotov cocktails, firearms, and throwing rocks, there is another form of

campus violence that deserves explicit mention. When a speaker, usually a conservative or a member of the Establishment, speaks before a campus audience, the radicals may interfere with his speech by yelling obscenities or chanting slogans. Al Capp, a cartoonist and a frequent speaker before campus groups, stated that "in [his] opinion, beating a man into silence with filth is as brutal as beating him into silence with a club." (RCCD 4518) I am not in complete agreement with him—I would prefer to be yelled at than clobbered—but the point is clear: radicals can prevent free speech just as effectively by yelling as they can by assault and battery. Yelling is not an intellectual process, it is really a form of physical assault. What is upsetting to me is that the radicals are incapable of understanding that freedom of speech also applies to people with whom they disagree. I am unable to explain this blindness on their part.

The severity of campus violence is indicated by J. Edgar Hoover's figures that during the 1969-70 school year alone there occurred eight deaths, 462 injuries, and 9.5 million dollars of damage due to protest demonstrations on college campuses. (Hoover, 1-2) A survey of local and state police departments by the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Division of the Department of the Treasury concluded that 20% of the bombings in the United States from 1 Jan. 69 to 15 April 1970 have been attributed to campus disturbances. Campus disturbances account for the majority of bombings of known purpose. (RCCD, 5339-42, 5348-9)

AVOIDING VIOLENT PROTEST

Perhaps one of the best ways to avoid student protest is to have an administration that is actively seeking to improve the college. By looking for things that need changing and changing them, the administration, takes the initiative from the radicals on the local issues. The school administration should also make an active effort to justify its policies to the students, to convince the students that the policies are reasonable. (Dearing, 8; Keene, 8, also YAF, II-32)

Once a protest demonstration is in progress it may be possible to keep it peaceful and even constructive by using the faculty as a moderating influence. "At a time when most authority figures are suspect, including specifically campus administrative officers, teaching faculty appear to retain a considerable measure of moral authority. The mere presence of such faculty members in a developing confrontation, a building occupation or other potentially highly disruptive campus manifestation, can do much to retain or introduce a tone of reason, of friendly good humor, and individual self-awareness. Thus a highly charged atmosphere which could turn to a concerned gathering into an unruly mob can be effectively grounded by a small number of faculty members willing to talk, listen, and respond as members of the same academic community as the students. However, their [faculty] interest must be genuine, neither faculty nor students will submit to manipulation, and both are quick to sense or to suspect a mere administrative maneuver." (Dearing, 3) The attitude here, naturally, is to listen to the students first and not to "straighten [them] out on all [their] goofy ideas." (Lundborg, 16)

City police and National Guard should never come on campus except when requested by the college administration. The university should maintain its own security force, preferably unarmed, to enforce routine rules (e.g., parking violation). When a college is plagued with violent disruption, it has no reasonable choice but to call for external law enforcement personnel. I should like to suggest some considerations in the tactical deployment and methods of city police and National Guard on campus.

When campus violence is thought imminent by college officials, it may be well to place a contingent of National Guard or city police on reserve several blocks away from the campus. I think it would be wise to avoid having armed, uniformed police in riot gear or troops in combat uniform standing at parade rest in full view of a non-violent student protest demonstration. The students will view this as a repressive, totalitarian tactic designed to infringe on their freedom of assembly and freedom of speech. Tensions will rise and a violent confrontation with police will be more likely than if the police were not visible to the demonstrators.

If there is a definite purpose for the presence of the police on campus, e.g. to clear a building which contains a sit-in, the police should assemble off campus in sufficient strength and then quickly move to the site of the action. Every effort should be made to make arrests quickly and efficiently with a minimum of force. Faculty and student marshals should accompany the police to urge nonviolence among the protesters and to be able to dispel possible future rumors of police brutality. (Hook, 8; RCCD, 4611) As soon as the activity is completed, the police should withdraw from the campus. In all matters, advance planning is essential: campus security, the school administration, local police, National Guard, faculty and student marshals should meet before any protest demonstration occurs.

If the administration concludes that a demonstration must be terminated, there are certain considerations that may prevent unnecessary casualties. The use of a court injunction rather than laws (e.g. trespass, illegal interference with an educational institution, unlawful assembly, etc.) as the legal authority to end a demonstration has been suggested. (Maier, 12-14; Wilson, 2) This method has the purported advantage of placing students in defiance of a court rather than police. Student marshals between the troops and demonstrators may be able to prevent student violence. Adequate warning over loudspeakers should be given to demonstrators before gas is fired, troops advance, arrests are made, etc. Troops should move slowly so that the demonstrators have time to respond. When attempting to disperse a demonstration with advancing troops, or troops using tear gas or water, the commander should be certain that unblocked escape routes are available to the crowd. These routes should be identified to the protesters over loudspeakers. (FM19-15, sections 1-9, 7-4b(3d), F-9)

The use of tear gas is repugnant to most people; I would suggest the use of something less esoteric and less severe—namely water. Used on a high trajectory, water will be a considerable nuisance; but it will not cause any more trauma than rainfall. As an Army manual notes, it is "highly effective during cold weather." (FM19-15, section 7-4b (3a)) A stronger application of force is to direct a high pressure stream along a flat trajectory, however this should be reserved for use when the high trajectory mode has proved unsatisfactory.

The usual picture of the National Guard advancing with bayonets fixed and unsheathed on their rifles is an effective one. However, I am not certain that this is always the best idea; indeed an Army manual states that "the use of unsheathed bayonets against the rioters at close range may be considered an unfair advantage and be looked upon as excessive force. This may well negate the desired psychological effect." (FM19-15, section 7-4e) The less aggressive posture of having bayonets fixed but covered with the scabbard may be useful. (FM19-15, sections 7-4f, F-7c)

There are also a number of very commendable rules on the firing of rifles and shotguns by troops which I shall not list

here. (FM19-15 section 7-4b(5-6), 7-4e(2-3), 7-11b, F-7b-g)

A very effective technique for exposing the radicals' claims to speak for all students and for putting campus unrest into perspective is to hold a referendum. (Maier, 3-8; Steiger, 5) Each student should present his registration certificate when he votes, which can be marked to prevent his voting more than once. This requirement disenfranchises outside agitators and others who congregate on campus during a major disturbance.

It is a fact that most of the injuries and all of the deaths resulting from campus disorders have been associated with the efforts of the police and National Guard. (Flacks, 7; Keniston, 1; Kennedy, 4) One calls to mind the two students murdered by racist police at Jackson State College in Mississippi and the four murdered by the National Guard at Kent State in Ohio. Senate hearings revealed that the National Guard broke open 80% of the dormitory rooms in Scott and Cooper Halls at North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University during a search for snipers even though the staff issued pass keys to the troops. (RCCD 4850) This official violence is even more serious when one realizes that many non-protesting students who learn of this over-reaction by the police and National Guard will be radicalized. (Steiger, 4) A large number of students are apathetic or not motivated to participate in protest demonstrations over the war in Southeast Asia. However, not too many students can avoid being concerned when their fellow students are shot, beaten, and abused by police and National Guard.

The very nature of a university requires that it be open to the public. High school students and other citizens need to use the university library; professional people need to attend seminars and advanced classes; people may wish to view art exhibits, listen to recitals, and look through the university's telescope. And many of the faculty, students, and staff live outside the university perimeter. There is no way that the university can be secluded from the community in which it exists.

But the fact remains that a large number, often a majority, of people arrested during campus protest demonstrations are not students at that university. During the first half of 1970 only 13% of the arrests by the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) campus police involved UCB students. Only 14% of those arrested in the 14 July 69 "People's Park" disturbance were UCB students. Dr. Roger W. Heyns, UCB chancellor, stated, "You can be sure that the more violent it [the demonstration] becomes, . . . the higher proportion there is of outsiders, of nonstudents. This is a general observation. In many of these instances the majority of them are not students." (RCCD 4946) During the trouble at San Francisco State College from November 1968 to March 1969, 48% of the arrests involved people not students at SF State. (ESNL, 93)

A number of youthful sympathizers are attracted by news media reports of the demonstration. Another problem was related by the city manager of Berkeley, Mr. William C. Hanley. "[During the Telegraph Avenue disturbance of 30 June 68] it became obvious that a tremendous concentration of vehicular traffic was clogging all the streets in the area—making it impossible for emergency vehicles to respond to calls for assistance or to reach the scene . . . [of] criminal actions. Sightseers, anxious to 'make the scene', were continuing to pour in from all directions. . . ." (RCCD 4989-90)

As tragic as the loss of life is, a university should not be closed to avoid possible deaths among students, faculty, and police. To close the school is a cowardly act by the administration which pleases only the radicals whose goal was to shut down the college.

Some instructors have cancelled classes, with or without approval from their department chairman and the dean. Other instructors have met with their classes to discuss current events rather than the proper course syllabus. This is unethical practice. The teaching staff is paid to meet with their class and present the regular class material and they have an ethical as well as a contractual obligation to fulfill. There will always be, I hope, a few students who want to study what the course title and catalogue description promised. These students must not be disappointed. If a student has any rights at all, he has the right to expect to see his instructor presenting the proper subject material during scheduled class hours. Even a majority vote of the students can not alter this right.

PUNISHMENT OF STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATE IN VIOLENCE

A violent demonstration may prevent serious students from attending class, using the library, or studying in a calm, peaceful campus environment. The university exists (or should exist) for the benefit of serious students and faculty. Those people who interfere with the rights of scholars to study should be punished.

Any student who, as an individual or as a member of a group, participates in the following should be punished:

(1) Physically hindering entrance to or egress from any part of a university building after being told to leave by a uniformed police officer or recognized school official.

(2) Creating a noise level (particularly with reference to electronic sound amplification) which interferes with activities conducted in a university building after being told to cease by a recognized university official.

(3) Disrupting a speech or lecture presented in a university building by heckling the speaker.

(4) "Taking over of a building, or part of a building, by exclusive occupation, or by the denial of the freedom of movement of persons having a right to be there." (Sullivan, cited in YAF, I-15)

(5) Vandalism, theft, and/or arson of library, professor's office, classroom, research facilities, or other university property.

(6) Carrying a firearm, long knife, bomb, or other deadly weapon onto the campus without permission of the administration.

(7) "No group may be admitted into a private office unless invited, and then not in excess of the number designated or invited by the occupant. Passage throughout reception areas leading to private offices must not be obstructed." (Columbia University Interim Rules, RCCD, 5275)

(8) Assault and battery on campus.

In addition to sentence pronounced in a court of law, any student arrested by police on campus during violation of any of the above rules shall automatically "be suspended from the university ["for one year from the beginning of the semester in which the suspension was initially imposed"] in seven days unless, prior to that time, he obtains a ruling from . . . the disciplinary tribunal . . . that he was not a participant in an unlawful demonstration. If a student testifies or presents other evidence denying his participation in [a violation of the rules] . . . he shall be exonerated unless a clear preponderance of the evidence establishes a violation." (Columbia Rules, RCCD, 5279-80)

There is no reason why the university should tolerate the continued presence of a student who has participated in campus violence. I would not suggest that students be punished for verbal acts except where the noise level interferes with a speaker's freedom of speech or university functions. In these instances the student's speech becomes a physical assault. Otherwise, students

are free to advocate violence and say anything else they please.

Suspension of a student denies him permission to enroll during the period of suspension, and it denies credit to the student for all classes in which he is enrolled when suspended. I think a student is not entitled to receive degrees or other honors that were scheduled to be awarded during the time of his suspension. After a period of suspension the student may make application to the university for admission, and he would probably be considered on the basis of his academic record without regard to past disciplinary actions which had been taken against him. A more severe penalty is dismissal—it forbids the student to re-enter the university except "only on specific approval of the Chancellor. Expulsion: permanent termination of student status without possibility of readmission to any campus of the University." (RCCD 4898) Expulsion is very rarely used. (RCCD 4922)

In the past demonstrators have demanded amnesty from college disciplinary proceedings and the colleges have often granted it. This was a deplorable state of affairs; fortunately the trend now seems to be to impose reasonable penalties on disruptive students. Amnesty should never be granted. If a person is innocent, or if he is guilty under exonerating circumstances, then, of course, he should not be punished. But an individual should never be relieved of responsibility for his actions.

DANGER OF REPRESSION

Dr. Robben W. Fleming, President of the University of Michigan, put it nicely: "Students . . . either ignore or refuse to face up to the fact that their education is heavily subsidized and that they cannot totally alienate their benefactors without suffering a withdrawal of their support. The public, on the other hand, cannot understand some of the antics of young people and therefore wants to punish all of them."

The problem is exacerbated on every large campus by the presence of a small but violently radical group. They may be students, or non-students or both. They are utterly totalitarian, and totally beyond reason. A number of them have severe psychiatric problems. Suspension or expulsion from school does not solve the problem of their presence since they manage to find it possible to remain in the community. They not only do not care that they alienate the public which must support the university, this is their fervent desire. They will actively work to provoke police actions in the hope that relatively innocent participants or bystanders will be hurt and that student opinion will then swing against the police and against the university.

"At the other extreme are those members of the public who believe that the only way to deal with the problem is by force, including, if necessary, live ammunition. Such an approach inevitably throws large numbers of students into the arms of the radicals, and creates a bitterness on campus which only the years can mend. * * *

"One should not leave this subject without mentioning the great damage which some elements of the press and broadcast media have done to campuses. It may be true that their publics are more interested in the sensational than the constructive, but there are countless examples of almost total irresponsibility by both the press and television with respect to campus disorders.

The way in which some students can turn on before the television cameras would be amusing if it were not so devastating in communicating an inaccurate view to the public." (Fleming, 7-9)

The chairman of the board of the Bank of America, Mr. Louis B. Lundborg, stated "I am not afraid of the left-wing radicals will win. I am only afraid of how they will be de-

feated. The natural sequel to left-wing radical rebellion is right wing reaction and repression. History shows only too plainly that repression doesn't repress only the bad guys; it ends by controlling and repressing everyone—particularly everyone who disagrees with the party in power. The line of reasoning underlying this point of view might go something as follows, and I quote:

"The streets of our country are in turmoil. The universities are filled with students rebelling and rioting. Communists are seeking to destroy our country. Russia is threatening us with her might and the Republic is in danger. Yes, danger from within and without. We need law and order."

"The words, gentlemen, are attributed to Adolph Hitler in the year 1932. The quote has recently come under a cloud of suspicion as to its authenticity; but to anyone familiar with the Germany of 1932, there is no doubt that this sentiment was part and parcel of the Hitler platform and of the Hitler appeal. (Lundborg, 6-7)

Dr. Roger W. Heyns, Chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, stated: "It is a fact of our life that the range of alternatives available to us is progressively narrowing as a result of two factors: The intransigent determination of radicals to make extreme demands to provoke conformation. * * * The other set of forces is more complex. It consists of public opinion informally stated and manifested in the position of their representatives. The range of solutions they can accept is more and more limited as public anxiety grows and as the obvious need for the protection of the community grows." (RCCD, 4966)

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

J. Edgar Hoover has said that radical students "have raised a clear danger of repressive legislation aimed at controlling campus violence which could threaten the very essence of academic freedom." (Hoover, 10)

Academic freedom is a very difficult concept to define. A brief definition by Lovejoy and Dewey which was cited by the conservative philosopher, Professor Sidney Hook, as being one of the best is as follows:

"Academic freedom is the freedom of the teacher or research worker in higher institutions of learning to investigate and discuss the problems of his science and to express his conclusions, whether through publications or the instruction of students, without interference from political or ecclesiastical authority, or from the administrative officials of the institution in which he is employed, unless his methods are found by qualified bodies of his own profession to be clearly incompetent or contrary to professional ethics." (BB, 68)

Professors have the same civil liberties as any other citizen. This includes the freedom to speak on current political issues. But unless the class is studying current political events, such remarks should not be made during class time; and, of course, the student must not be required to agree with the professor's opinions. (AF, 116, 126-7, 175) The American Association of University Professors 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the authoritative American document on the subject, states that in public utterances a professor "should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman." (RF 214, also page 385 Autumn 1968 AAUP Bulletin)

The last point is particularly important. A large number of students, and some faculty and administrators, have suggested involving the university in political causes. I think this would destroy academic freedom. If the university itself is to become a political force, it certainly should be subject to regulations appropriate to a political party or

lobby. One immediate consequence is that universities engaged in political activity should not be supported by public tax money.

Dr. Edward Teller has been adamant in his criticism of 33 university presidents who wrote an open letter to President Nixon on Cambodia. (*Albuquerque Tribune* 25 May 70; testimony before the President's Commission on Campus Unrest page 14) "Those 33 presidents had, of course, the right as individual citizens to criticize our administration. They are men of great reputation whose views would have been heard had they chosen to speak up without using the names of their academic institutions. That they found it necessary nevertheless to band together and speak as presidents of their great schools cannot be excused." (*Tribune* article cited above)

I think matters of selection and tenure of faculty, curriculum, and various academic regulations should be the exclusive concern of the faculty and academic deans (not the entire administration). (Sponberg, 14) If one permits trustees, regents, or other non-academic personnel to meddle with these matters, one runs the risk of grave damage to the academic freedom of the university. (AF, 115, 135, 207, 221-8) A faculty member certainly ought to enjoy the same political and religious freedoms as any other citizen. I see no objection to having Communists, atheists, or other "undersirables" on the faculty. I feel very strongly that a professor should never be required to take a loyalty oath.

Political advocacy is one of the issues in academic freedom. Many politicians have complained that the instruction given in the schools and certainly the attitude of youth seems to emphasize what is *wrong* with our country. Professor Richfield made an interesting point on this matter when he said: "Students know that stressing our strengths is no less political advocacy than harping on our weaknesses. Students have shown much contempt for a patriotism which emphasizes strengths and shuns a free and open discussion of weaknesses. They see only too clearly that to make such an emphasis is to take a stand. And that such a stand is one which inhibits change." (Richfield, 2-3)

The last point I want to make about campus unrest and academic freedom concerns the rights of the scholars I mentioned in the section on punishment. Professor Hook has stated, "... an obvious consequence of the politicization of the university is the erosion of academic freedom—of the right to teach and the right to learn—of faculty and students. Once the university as a corporate body takes a political stand, members of the faculty who disagree with that stand are harassed. When classes are suspended for purposes of political demonstration or colleges are closed down by strikes, the teacher's freedom to teach has been abridged and the right of students freely to attend their classes destroyed." (Hook, 5)

ROLE OF POLITICIANS

There are a handful of nationally prominent politicians who have profited from the schism between the "Silent Majority" and the college students. I am thinking specifically of Vice-President Agnew, Secretary Mitchell and his wife, and Governor Reagan of California. Every time they find a new disparaging name to apply to students or faculty, they increase the bitterness students feel toward the government. Many statements before the President's Commission on Campus Unrest included among their recommendations that "violent political rhetoric" cease immediately. (Stalcup, 4, 11; Senator Hugh Scott, 1; Flacks, 8, 11; Cochran, 2) It might not be a bad idea if politicians tried to live up to the American Association of University Professors restrictions on public utterances, with the exception that politicians do, naturally, represent their constituents and are spokesmen for official gov-

ernment policy. In this sense the obligation that goes with holding high public office precludes (or should preclude) making in-temperate expressions of personal feelings lest they be misinterpreted as official government statements. (cf. the President's remarks on the guilt of Charles Manson before his trial was completed) Also, too many "law and order" statements sound very similar to the purported statement of Hitler quoted a few pages back.

For too long participants in protest demonstrations have been branded as disloyal, traitors, and Communists. Protest demonstrations, particularly non-violent ones, have been used to call attention to some of our nation's more glaring injustices and problems. There is nothing treasonable about trying to improve one's country.

Please forgive me for the length of this paper but the issues are complex, and, moreover, I am very concerned about this subject.

Respectfully yours,

RONALD B. STANDLER.

DEAR MR. LUJAN: I have received and read the Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. I am very impressed with the thoroughness of the report and would recommend it to everyone who is interested in campus disorder. I am particularly pleased to see that much of the material in my paper, including some of my personal opinions, were also stressed in the report.

I have several more observations. If tear gas is used, micropulverized CS should be dispensed from a helicopter and the rotor wash used to direct the powdered CS toward the crowd. This prevents the crowd from playing the game of throwing gas grenades back at the troops. (cf. Report 258, 267, 288-9)

At Kent State two units, Troop G and Company A, were the only units that fired their weapons. (Report, 277) There is strong evidence that both units were fatigued. The day of the shootings was the sixth consecutive day the guard units were on duty and the third day they were on campus. (Report, 239, 250) Company A was on duty all night; after less than 1½ hours of sleep they were ordered to return to duty. (Report, 259) After one more hour of duty they shot the students without receiving an order to fire. (Report, 273) Similar (but less violent) problems with police fatigue have been noted in Berkeley. (RCCD, 4991, 4993-4) One cannot expect tired, overworked people to be alert and courteous; however this surely does not excuse the National Guard gunfire at Kent.

In addition to fatigue, there was another reason why the Guard opened fire without receiving an order. At all times the Ohio National Guard carried a fully loaded rifle, including a round in the chamber. (Report, 263, 283) FM19-15 lists this posture as the final step in a list of graded applications of force. (FM19-15 sections 7-4f, F-7-c) The shooting was in clear violation of accepted military practice. (FM19-15 sections 7-4b (5-6), 7-4e(3), 7-26, 7-28, F-7d-h) (also Report, 178, 279-280) The fusillade of 61 shots produced thirteen casualties at ranges up to 250 yards, all of whom were students in good standing. (Report 233, 273-4) One of the fatalities was on her way to class when she was murdered; she was never identified as a participant in the non-violent assembly which the National Guard dispersed. (Report 275, 267, 288)

The special reports on Kent State and Jackson State are among the most disturbing material I have ever read. The Commission had full access to the lengthy FBI reports and conducted hearings at both schools. There was no justification for the murder of the six students and wounding of twenty-one by the police and National Guard at the two schools.

Respectfully yours,

RONALD B. STANDLER.

DADE COUNTY RESPONDS TO APPEAL FROM SERVICEMAN

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to share with our colleagues a very heartwarming story which has been unfolding in my district. It concerns many of my constituents now, but it started with a letter from a serviceman to his family.

WO Steven Woods of the 571st Medical Detachment at Quang Tri, South Vietnam, wrote to his parents on October 20, 1970:

Lately I've been doing a lot of work with the Children's Hospital. The kids come here from all over with many different things wrong with them. They are the ones who are hurt most by war. So many of them don't have any parents or family. It's a real shame because many of them are just infants. If you have any old baby clothes, maybe you could send them over. They sure would be appreciated by a lot of people.

From this simple humanitarian request grew a project which offered many Floridians the chance to extend the spirit of Christmas halfway around the world.

But the story is more eloquently told in a letter I received from Warrant Officer Woods' mother, Mrs. James O. Woods of 8305 Southwest 119 Street, Miami, Fla. I commend the attention of our colleagues to that letter and to an article by Charles Whited, a Miami Herald columnist. Together they paint a very warm picture of human kindness and brotherhood in an era noted more for its darker hues of violence and war.

The letter and article follow:

MIAMI, FLA.,
December 31, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I will try and tell you as briefly as possible a lovely, lovely story about thousands of good people!

It all started last October when our son, Steve, wrote home from Vietnam that he was doing volunteer work in the Children's Hospital and found very desperate, unfortunate children. After treating their patients, the medical teams have nothing material to give their patients other than the love and affection they need so much. He phoned home to tell us not to send him any more personal items—just clothing for the war-torn kids in these wards—that's all he wanted for Christmas. I was so concerned that I phoned the high schools in Dade County and asked if they would like to help—the results were tremendous. Mayor Clark is issuing a proclamation to these young people because they truly have been great Americans! Mayor Clark has really been wonderful to help by having his publicity man, Raymond Lang, work with me to promote public interest. Everyone has been so concerned!

I just phoned Charles Whited to ask about why I hadn't seen Steve's name on the list for Christmas cards to service men in Vietnam; we ended up talking about Steve, and Charles, too, became very concerned! Charles wrote two articles—Dec. 8, and Dec. 22; as a result, people became very aware this situation really existed—our fellow Americans were concerned about the Vietnamese people they would never see.

This clothing drive has given us the opportunity to let our fighting forces in Vietnam know that we are with them all the way—100%. They risk their lives to save these people at a very great expense—so let's

go all the way and give them something to give these people to start their lives again. My son writes home that he is needed and that the Vietnamese people are human beings.

Yes, there are organizations in South Vietnam to help rehabilitate the victims of war. There is not a direct mailing clothing drive—from the people—for the people! By sending this clothing through the U.S. Mails, we know the clothing will get to where it is intended. I'm sure our medical teams in the combat zones would really appreciate the opportunity to help complete their job of helping get these people back on their feet. We all realize that this should have been started sooner, but I feel as long as we have one service man in Vietnam, we should stick behind him 100%.

This is not just a dream because it has worked already; we have sent clothing to Steve and he has gotten them into the right hands. This is most important!

I only wish you could be here to share each moment with us as we see an entirely different picture unfolding before us—not a world of protest, defiance, and violence, but a world of compassion, feeling, and love of all mankind. Let's give the young people a break! The day the children brought the clothing over was one of the greatest experiences of my entire life. Kids that had never seen each other were having fellowship with one another you cannot describe! They formed a brigade from their cars and station wagons to pass the clothing into the house. They were the greatest! Afterwards we took out the guitars and sang together. Now, tell me—Isn't this better than protest!!!!

There are so many people who have helped and who have offered to help—I fear I would let some one out if I made a list. Jim Ashlock at Eastern Air Lines gave us 100 percent support, National Brewing donated well over 200 shipping boxes, Palmetto Hardware gave us wrapping material, the Miami Herald, the T.V. Stations (Channels 10, 4, and 7), young and old alike; we just had a 94 year old woman from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints helping pack boxes. We have set up a post office box and an account at Dixie National Bank—“Thank You to Dust Off,” with the money donated by our fellow Americans. Yes, this is a beautiful world we live in, and the people in it are beautiful too!

This brief note has grown into a book, but I cannot say enough for the citizens of the greater Miami area and of the great country in which we live, and I'm very thankful for being an American. My fondest dream is that we don't have to stand up and shout, “I am a good American!”, but everyone on the face of this earth will realize this because of our very deeds to mankind.

I hope you find time in your busy schedule to give us any type of support you have to offer. My prayers go with this message and May God Bless our great country and the people in it.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE WOODS.

[From The Miami Herald, Dec. 22, 1970]

TONS OF CLOTHES FOR WAR WAIFS

(By Charles Whited)

Two tons of children's clothing were spread Monday across the living room of the Woods family home, and Florence Woods and her mother, Mrs. Delora Roberts, had been busy sorting.

“This is fantastic,” Mrs. Woods was saying. “I can't believe it.”

The Woods family is devoting its Christmas this year to the wounded, orphaned, ragged children of South Vietnam; and what began as a modest effort by Mrs. Woods is ballooning beyond anything she imagined it would be.

As I wrote in a recent column, it all started when their eldest son, Steve, pilot of a medi-

cal evacuation helicopter in Vietnam, notified his parents in Dade County that all he wanted for Christmas was clothing for the children.

And he explained how kids caught up in the fury of war often wind up in military field hospitals, sick and injured and almost naked. The hospitals have no clothing for them.

So Florence Woods, mother of five, started scrounging. In the process, she spread the word among high school service clubs.

The results were astonishing.

BOXES, ARMLoadS

Clothes began pouring in the Woods home at 8305 SW 119th St.

They were rounded up by such clubs as the Elites and Les Jeunes Filles of Palmetto High, Anchor clubs from Coral Park and Miami Springs, Anchor and Senior Power from Hialeah, the Valkyries of Miami-Norland, and groups from Jackson and Killian.

The clothing was sorted in by the boxes and armloads: shoes, sweaters, underwear, coats, pants, shirts, dresses—some of it brand-new, with store tags attached.

"These kids," said Mrs. Woods, "they're wonderful."

But then new problems developed. How to get it all to Vietnam? For weeks, the Woodses had been mailing boxes (40 of them in all) at enormous expense. There had to be a better way.

Florence Woods talked to officials of three airlines, and got tentative commitments to fly the clothing to Saigon. But military transport, she figured, would be better. She wired the White House. An aide to President Nixon called her. They would see what could be done.

Mrs. Woods and her husband, James, an Eastern Air Lines mechanic, are hopeful that the first shipment will be flown to Vietnam next week.

There, arrangements must be made to get it into the hands of the medical evacuation men—called "Dust Off" pilots—for distribution to all military hospitals having children.

To make packing and shipping easier, a beer company has offered to donate standard-size beer boxes, large enough to hold five complete outfits, including shoes.

CHOPPERS SHOT UP

While all this was going on, word came from Vietnam that Warrant Officer Woods had flown into enemy territory to rescue two downed American fliers from almost certain capture by the Viet Cong.

In his first attempt to pick up the men, his helicopter was shot up so badly he had to fly back and get another chopper to complete this mission.

Mrs. Woods sorted clothing. To get through the living room, she had made paths between the piles. And her mind was on the kids who would one day wear them—youngsters she would never see.

"These children have nothing. They are the forgotten kids of the world. But they are making this Christmas the most meaningful of our lives."

PUBLIC EXPRESSION OF FAITH DURING SPACE FLIGHTS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Eve 1968, the men of Apollo 8 gave the world its first prayer from space. Their message is as appropriate now as it was then and I think it would do all of us well to consider their words

as we here embark upon our own particular journey which is the 92d Congress. The Astronaut's prayer reads as follows:

Give us, O God, the vision which can see Thy love in the world in spite of human failure. Give us the faith to trust the goodness in spite of our ignorance and weakness. Give us the knowledge that we may continue to pray with understanding hearts, and show us what each one of us can do to set forward the coming of the day of universal peace. Amen.

Regrettably at the time, some of these noble words apparently fell on deaf ears because certain individuals subsequently instituted court action aimed at prohibiting astronauts from conducting any religious activities while in space. Upon learning of this ill-conceived plan I sponsored a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that exercises of faith as practiced by astronauts engaged in space flight are compatible with the rights of freedom of speech and religion which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

Today I am reintroducing this resolution. I believe that Astronauts Alan B. Shephard, Stuart A. Roosa, and Edgar D. Mitchell who will be manning Apollo 14 when it lifts off on the last day of this month may want to express their religious faith or make comments of a religious nature during their journey through space. I want these courageous individuals to know that the Congress of the United States supports their right to spiritual comfort. I want them to know it is their constitutional right as well as their birthright.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the men of Apollo 14 will not leave the surface of the earth unsure of their rights on this issue. Congress can take action now and explicitly proclaim that astronauts have the legal right to publicly express their religious faith during the course of space flight.

SOVIET PROTESTS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an extremely penetrating analysis of Communist moves to mistreat Americans in the Soviet Union was carried on January 16 by WBBM Radio—Chicago. I believe this particular editorial really "hits the nail on the head" and is, in fact, very thoughtful commentary that I wish to share with the Members:

SOVIET PROTESTS

Soviet Russia has started a program of deliberate mistreatment of Americans in Russia. It has done this in an effort to make Americans stop anti-Soviet protests.

Anti-Soviet protests in this country are not something that is new. We've had them a long time and for a wide range of reasons. Most of the protests have been peaceful. Only a few cases have involved damage or injury. We deplore those particular instances—even though we appreciate the anger of the protesters over Soviet treatment of minority groups in Russia.

What the Russians do not understand is

that protest in this nation is tolerated if it is peaceful. We do not object to protests as long as they are orderly and do not cause harm.

But in the Soviet Union, no one protests unless it is with official backing of the government. Because of this, the Russians naturally assume that it is the same in this country.

As Americans, we should not be surprised that some of our citizens are being stopped on the streets of Moscow and threatened with bodily harm. Nor should we become too upset over damage to American property. What we must understand is that the Soviet Union simply assumes all other governments are responsible for such actions, just because the Soviet government controls these incidents in Russia. Nevertheless, we should hold Moscow accountable for the safety of every American now inside Soviet borders.

CONGRESSIONAL HANDLING OF BUDGET FAULTED

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, James Reston, in a January 17, 1971, editorial, presents a constructive criticism of the manner in which Congress treats the Federal budget.

The awesome size and complexity of this budget require major alterations in the way Congress handles it. A single forum must be given the task of an annual, comprehensive review of the entire range of fiscal and monetary issues presented by the President's budget. There are difficulties in this proposal in deciding what the forum will be—whether a joint committee, a combination of present committees, or a new committee. Nonetheless, it is imperative that the difficulties be resolved, and the committee established.

The editorial follows:

THE 187TH STATE OF THE UNION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Within the next few days, President Nixon will deliver the 187th State of the Union address in person to the members of the House and Senate, and a few days later he will publish his budget. Then an odd and unfortunate thing will happen.

Very quickly the President's broad sweep and overview of the condition of the nation, and his definition of priorities in the budget will tend to get lost in debate, not on the total picture and priorities of the President, but on bits and pieces of it, each torn out of the larger concept.

This would not happen in a parliamentary democracy and need not happen under the Congressional system, but it does. In the House of Commons, for example, several days could be set aside for general debate on the state of the nation. The leader of the Opposition would make a considered response to the Prime Minister's speech. Other members for and against the Prime Minister, would then debate the address, and at the end there would be a summing up by the leaders of both parties.

This procedure has two advantages: first, it keeps the great and fundamental questions before the people long enough so that attentive minds can get some coherent vision of where the nation stands and where it is going; and second, it enables the members

to see the problems of, say, defense and social reconstruction in relation to one another before they begin dealing in committee with their special parts of the whole.

The Congress of the United States doesn't debate the State of the Union message and the budget so much as it dismembers them. After some desultory observations for the press, often quite partisan in nature, the Congress will divide up the President's program and refer it to the various committees. There is no over-all committee of the Congress that examines the President's total program or seeks outside testimony on how others see the state of the nation or the priorities of the budget.

Nor is there any committee of the Congress that can keep the House and Senate within a spending limit and make the separate committees choose their priorities and relate their expenditures to a total the nation can afford. The result is that the United States is the only major nation in the world today whose Cabinet cannot conduct a rational and predictable fiscal policy.

The problem is not that the members of the Armed Services Committees fail to scrutinize the defense budget—though they often tend to become salesmen for the Pentagon's request—but that they do not scrutinize defense expenditures in relation to health or welfare expenditures.

As the National Urban Coalition said in its report on national priorities the other day, budget allocations are often determined through what might be called the "let's-see-what-we-gave-them-last-year-and-give-them-a-little-more-this-year" approach, the budget is prepared without any prior public scrutiny; and "at no time does any one body in Congress consciously and deliberately scrutinize the budget as a whole, with an eye toward setting over-all priorities."

One reason for this, of course, is that the chairman of the various committees would not welcome any overall legislative committee setting a total budget ceiling that might limit their freedom of decision.

The result of this is that the Congress of the United States, like many other American institutions today, tends to be dominated by specialists who know a great deal about their separate subjects but very little about the whole. Each is managing a little bit of the machine, but is often unacquainted or ill informed about its related parts and sometimes is remarkably vague about where it's going or whether it's on course.

The Founding Fathers were clear about the duty of the President to keep the great questions for decision before the Congress and the people. They said in the Constitution that "he shall from time to time give to the Congress information on the state of the union," and except for William Henry Harrison, who died one month after taking office, and James A. Garfield, who was assassinated, the tradition has been maintained.

What the founders could not possibly have foreseen was that public questions in America could become so complicated, and private distractions so numerous. But, anyway, they provided a simple remedy: that the President should call the clan together once in a while and sort out the big things from the little things, which is the original dilemma of the human race.

This, at least, is what the State of the Union message is all about. It is an attempt to reduce diversity to identity. It's the President's map of the year. His staff has been working on the budget since the last daffodils, and he has been working on his speech for weeks.

There is a lot of talk around here about Congressional reform in the 92d Congress—getting rid of the seniority system letting

people vote privately to banish obvious dubs, and other sensible things—but nothing dramatic is going to be done on all this.

Still, the Congress has moved a little in the last session. It has challenged Presidential power to make war without a fuss and even threatened to cut off funds from ridiculous adventures, which is not much, but something.

So maybe there could be a debate about the State of the Union message and the budget before the Congress loiters down into the annual argument over the Senate rules. It could give us a clue about where we are all going, and some of the passengers might like to know.

TAX EQUITY FOR UNMARRIED INDIVIDUALS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to give all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns. My bill is a revision of a measure first introduced during the last session of Congress by our late colleague, William St. Onge.

The current discrimination against single taxpayers is the result of an historical quirk. In the 1940's many States adopted community property laws which provided that one-half of a couple's income had been earned by the spouse, whether or not the spouse was working. Congress then changed the Federal tax laws to conform to this situation, thereby lowering the Federal tax burden on married people in all States, but neglecting to take into account the economic punishment inflicted upon the unmarried.

This bill would not discriminate against married persons filing joint returns, but would simply remove the unfair and inequitable rates now paid by single taxpayers. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 attempted to mitigate the discrimination against the single taxpayer, but unfortunately it did not go far enough. A single taxpayer can still pay as much as 20 percent more in taxes than the married taxpayer. Approximately 25 million taxpayers would be affected by this legislation.

In order to take into account the fact that married couples have additional expenditures not incurred by singles, I also urge a continuing review of the personal exemption allowances, and deductions for such items as child care expenses. I have previously proposed raising the personal exemption to \$1,200 per dependent.

I am hopeful that one of the first items of business in this 92d session of Congress shall be to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that single persons shall not be taxed at a rate greater than the rate paid by a married couple earning the same income.

I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time the text of the bill and a list of its cosponsors:

H.R. —

A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(a) Section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rates of tax on individuals) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (b) and (c);

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as (b); and

(3) by striking out so much of subsection (a) as precedes the table therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual, other than an individual to whom subsection (b) applies, a tax determined in accordance with the following table:"

(b) Section 2 of such Code (relating to definitions and special rules) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (a) and (b); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (a), (b), (c), respectively.

(c) Sections 511(b)(1) and 641 of such Code are each amended by striking out "section 1(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1(b)".

(d) Section 6015(a)(1) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the gross income for the taxable year can reasonably be expected to exceed \$10,000 (\$5,000, in the case of an individual subject to the tax imposed by section 1(b) for the taxable year); or"

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall prescribe and publish tables reflecting the amendments made by this Act which shall apply, in lieu of the tables set forth in section 3402(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage methods of withholding), with respect to wages paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Joseph Addabbo, Democrat of New York.
Les Aspin, Democrat of Wisconsin.
Walter S. Baring, Democrat of Nevada.
Nick Begich, Democrat of Alaska.
Frank Brasco, Democrat of New York.
Hugh Carey, Democrat of New York.
Charles Carney, Democrat of Ohio.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat of New York.
John Dent, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
Harold Donahue, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Robert Drinan, Democrat of Massachusetts.
Thaddeus Dulski, Democrat of New York.
Don Edwards, Democrat of California.

Marvin Esch, Republican of Michigan.
Walter A. Flowers, Democrat of Alabama.
Donald Fraser, Democrat of Minnesota.
Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat of Maryland.

Barry Goldwater, Jr., Republican of California.

Seymour Halpern, Republican of New York.
Lee Hamilton, Democrat of Indiana.
Orval Hansen, Republican of Idaho.

Michael Harrington, Democrat of Massachusetts.

James Hastings, Republican of New York.
Margaret Heckler, Republican of Massachusetts.

Lawrence Hogan, Republican of Maryland.
William Hungate, Democrat of Missouri.
Walter Jones, Democrat of North Carolina.

Carlton King, Republican of New York.
Edward I. Koch, Democrat of New York.
Norman Lent, Republican of New York.
Mike McCormack, Democrat of Washington.

Jack McDonald, Republican of Michigan.
Stewart McKinney, Republican of Connecticut.

Abner Mikva, Democrat of Illinois.
Joseph Minish, Democrat of New Jersey.
Farren Mitchell, Democrat of Maryland.
Robert Nix, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
Thomas O'Neill, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Bertram Podell, Democrat of New York.
Roman Pucinski, Democrat of Illinois.
Graham Purcell, Democrat of Texas.
Charles Rangel, Democrat of New York.
Howard Robison, Republican of New York.
Benjamin Rosenthal, Democrat of New York.

Edward Roybal, Democrat of California.
John Saylor, Republican of Pennsylvania.
Fred Schwengel, Republican of Iowa.
Robert Tiernan, Democrat of Rhode Island.
Jerome Waldie, Democrat of California.
William Widnall, Republican of New Jersey.

Bob Wilson, Republican of California.
Wendall Wyatt, Republican of Oregon.
Sidney Yates, Democrat of Illinois.
Gus Yatron, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
William F. Ryan, Democrat of New York.
Ella T. Grasso, Democrat of Connecticut.

TERROR IN SOUTH VIETNAM: THE PULPING OF A PEOPLE—IV

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, today my office was invaded by a group of women who call themselves the Women's Strike for Peace. These people seem to feel that we should abandon the people of South Vietnam—and the rest of the people of Southeast Asia.

While they are working in the United States, their allies in Vietnam continue their carnage against the civilian population of South Vietnam. The following roundup of terrorist activities is just one small chapter in the continuing chronicle of Communist violence directed against people who want only to live in peace.

In order to alert my colleagues to the suffering of the South Vietnamese people, the deliberate policy of vicious atrocities against them, and the true nature of communism in general, I will continue to insert this roundup as compiled by the national police of South Vietnam, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on a regular basis.

I do not expect this account, "telling it like it is," to alter the course of groups like the Women's Strike for Peace as they push forward with their efforts which, if successful, would bring on a widespread massacre in South Vietnam. The facts probably have little influence on people of this ilk, who feel compelled to play with innocent human lives for emotional reasons of their own. However, I do think it is necessary that my colleagues, men of judgment and reason, be aware of this information which does not seem to make its way into the general mass media coverage of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

It is also necessary that we understand that, as the Representatives of the people of the United States, we have the power to bring this graduated massacre to a halt. For this purpose I have again introduced a House joint resolution which gives the North Vietnamese Government 30 days in which to withdraw its armies from the territory of its neighbors and release all American prisoners of war or find themselves officially at war with the United States of America.

This, in my opinion, is the road to a just and honorable peace—a peace entirely different from surrender—peace that will bring with it security for the helpless civilians of South Vietnam, rather than slaughter.

The daily terrorist roundup follows:

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES, DECEMBER 21, 1970

At 0540 this morning (Monday), approximately 1 kilo of TNT exploded in a warehouse of the Vietnamese train company in Saigon's 3rd precinct. The charge was hidden in the warehouse. There were no injuries, but an early estimate places the damage to the building at 30%.

In the Provinces, National Police report 7 incidents of enemy terrorism in which 2 Vietnamese civilians were killed, 11 wounded and 1 kidnapped. Details follow:

December 19: One civilian was wounded by a mortar which landed near the An Nong bridge, Phu Loc dist., Thua Thien Prov.

December 18: A 31-year-old woman was killed when she stepped on a mine. The victim was gathering fire wood near Trach Huu hamlet, Hung Dien dist., Thua Thien Prov.

December 17: A civilian threw a grenade in Thanh Quy hamlet, Dien Ban dist., Quang Nam Prov. One civilian was wounded.

December 16: A civilian was assassinated in An Hoa hamlet, Mo Cay dist., Kien Hoa Prov.

December 15: Also in Kien Hoa, the enemy kidnapped a PSDF leader from Binh Nguyen Hai hamlet, Truc Gian dist.

In Bac Lieu Prov., 2 civilians, 1 PSDF and a deputy hamlet chief were wounded in a skirmish with VC.

December 11: Five civilians were wounded in a clash with an enemy platoon in Ha Thanh resettlement camp, Gio Lien dist., Quang Tri Prov.

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES, DECEMBER 23, 1970

In 19 acts of enemy terrorism, eight Vietnamese civilians were killed, 40 wounded and six kidnapped. Details follow:

December 20: One RD cadre was wounded in a VC mortar attack on My Thinh hamlet, Duc Long dist., Chuong Thien Prov.

In Darlac Prov., one civilian was killed and five wounded when the enemy fired four 82mm rounds into Ko Sier hamlet, Ban Me Thuot dist.

Four civilians were wounded by enemy mortar fired into the Mo Duc dist. town, Quang Ngai Prov.

One PSDF was ambushed and killed near Xuan Phuoc hamlet, Dien Ban dist., Quang Nam Prov.

December 19: Five civilians were wounded as the result of a VC attack on Nghia Trung hamlet, Dai Loc dist., Quang Nam Prov.

Also in Quang Nam, two VC, dressed in ARVN uniforms, entered a civilian restaurant and assassinated the owner. They also wounded two civilians.

One woman was kidnapped from Son Cong hamlet, Huong Tra dist., Thua Thien Prov.

Again in Thua Thien, six civilians were wounded when the enemy shelled and attacked An Nuong hamlet, Phu Loc dist.

Six VC kidnapped the hamlet chief of Dong

Loi hamlet, Phong Hiep dist., Phong Dinh Prov.

December 18: One platoon of VC attempted to enter Trang Su hamlet, Phuoc Ninh dist., Tay Ninh Prov. However, they were driven off by the local defense forces. One woman was killed during the engagement. Enemy casualties are unknown.

Six civilians were wounded when the enemy shelled Loc Hai village, Phu Loc dist., Thua Thien Prov.

One PSDF was killed and two others wounded in an engagement with the enemy near Tan Loc hamlet, Thuan Nhon dist., Phong Dinh Prov.

December 17: A VC unit assassinated the hamlet chief of Trung Thanh hamlet, Thuan Trung dist., Phong Dinh Prov.

A woman was killed when she stepped on an enemy mine near Cao Doi hamlet, Phu Loc dist., Thua Thien Prov.

The hamlet chief, a PSDF member and six civilians were wounded when a VC command-detonated mine exploded near Phuoc Dien hamlet, Duc Pho dist., Quang Ngai Prov.

A woman was wounded when she detonated an enemy booby trap mine near Chanh Luu hamlet, Ben Cat dist., Binh Duong Prov. Also in Binh Duong, one man was kidnapped from My Phuoc village, Ben Cat dist. The victim was the father-in-law of a local hamlet chief.

December 15: One woman was assassinated in Ngoc Lam hamlet, Dien Ban dist., Quang Nam Prov.

December 14: Three young men were kidnapped from Bao Dieu hamlet, Cu Chi dist., Hau Nghia Prov.

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES, DECEMBER 28, 1970

Latest reports reaching National Police Headquarters describe 17 incidents of enemy terrorism. In these attacks, 12 Vietnamese civilians were killed, 32 wounded and seven kidnapped. Details follow:

December 23: An enemy unit attacked the An Hoa Hamlet office, Quang Xuyen Dist., Gia Dinh Prov. One member of the PSDF was killed and the office damaged.

In Tuyen Duc Prov., a Catholic priest was killed when he stepped on a VC mine while walking in the church garden in Du Sinh Hamlet, Dalat City.

One civilian was kidnapped from Cam Pho Hamlet, Hieu Nhon Dist., Quang Nam Prov.

December 22: 20 VC attacked Phuoc Thanh Village, Dat Do Dist., Phuoc Tuy Prov. One PSDF was killed and nine wounded, including the Village Chief and the Police Chief. Five VC were killed.

In Quang Nam Prov., one civilian was kidnapped from Dong Hoa Hamlet, Dien Ban Dist.

A VIS employee was assassinated in Quang Quy Hamlet, Vung Liem Dist., Vinh Long Prov. The attack also wounded one child.

One civilian was wounded in an attack on Chau Thanh Hamlet, Long My Dist., Chuong Thieu Prov.

December 21: One enemy company attacked Long Chau Hamlet, Hieu Thien Dist., Tay Ninh Prov. Two civilians and two PSDF members were wounded.

Also in Tay Ninh, an enemy platoon attacked Long Cong Hamlet, Khien Hanh Dist. One civilian was killed. The Hamlet Chief, three PSDF and two civilians were wounded. Enemy casualties are unknown.

Two woodcutters, working in the Ham Tan Dist. Binh Tuy Prov., were kidnapped by a small VC unit.

Three 15-year old boys were kidnapped from My Hoa Hamlet, Thanh Hai Dist., Ninh Thuan Prov.

December 21: A VC booby trap mine with a timing device exploded in the market place in Chanh Phu Village, Ben Cat Dist., Binh Duong Prov. Four children were killed. Two RD cadre and one PSDF were wounded.

December 19: A VC platoon attacked Thuy Lap Hamlet, Tien Phuoc Dist., Quang Tin Prov. One village official was killed and five PSDF wounded.

December 17: The enemy assassinated the Deputy Hamlet Chief of Nhat Le Hamlet, Dong Ha Dist., Quang Tri Prov.

December 15: Two civilians were wounded when they stepped on a VC booby trap grenade near Trung Hai Hamlet, Ke Sach Dist., Ba Xuyen Prov.

Also in Ba Xuyen, the Hamlet Chief of Tan Qui Hamlet, Hoa Tu Dist. was killed in an enemy attack.

In a third Ba Xuyen incident, one civilian was wounded in an enemy attack near Trung Hai Hamlet, Ke Sach Dist.

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES, JANUARY 2, 1971

Twenty incidents of enemy have been reported in which 26 Vietnamese civilians were killed, 38 wounded and 12 kidnapped. Details follow:

December 30: Six terrorists entered Van Xa Trung hamlet, Huong Tra dist., Thua Thien Prov. and kidnapped two men.

December 29: A village official was killed when terrorists fired on a boat in Dinh Thuy village, Mo Cay dist., Kien Hoa Prov.

A Hoi Chanh was assassinated in Phu Thuan hamlet, Phu Hoa dist., Binh Duong Prov.

One civilian was kidnapped from Tuong Hoa village, Phong Dien dist., Thu Thien Prov.

December 28: A Hoi Chanh was kidnapped from Phu An hamlet, Phu Hoa dist., Binh Duong Prov.

The VC attacked Dak Yp hamlet, 10 kms north of Kontum city, Kontum Prov., wounding 10 civilians. Hamlet defense forces killed nine of the enemy attackers.

Two civilians were assassinated near Tam Hap hamlet, Phuoc Ninh dist., Tay Ninh Prov.

A terrorist sniper shot and seriously wounded the hamlet chief of Binh An Xuan hamlet, Giong Trom dist., Kien Hoa Prov.

Two civilians were kidnapped from Phuoc Tho hamlet, Phuoc Noi village, Binh Tuy Prov.

The VC fired four 82mm mortar rounds into Phu Tan hamlet, Tuy An dist., Phu Yen Prov. Three civilians were wounded.

December 27: One policeman was killed in an enemy attack on My Tuong hamlet, Giao Duc dist., Dinh Tuong Prov.

One member of the PSDF was killed when a VC squad attacked Thang Dong hamlet, Que Son dist., Quang Nam Prov.

A three-wheeled bus, carrying 17 people, ran over a mine near Mo Cong hamlet, Phuoc Dinh dist., Tay Ninh Prov. 12 of the passengers were killed and five wounded.

A PSDF team, patrolling in the area of An Quoi hamlet, Trang Bang dist., Hau Nghia Prov., stepped on a series of grenade booby traps. The explosions killed two civilians and wounded eight PSDF.

December 27: Two civilians were kidnapped from Phu Son hamlet, Tuy An dist., Phu Yen Prov.

The hamlet chief and one civilian were killed and six civilians wounded when terrorists detonated an explosive charge in a private home in An Hanh hamlet, Phu Cat dist., Binh Dinh Prov.

One adult and two children were killed and five children wounded by terrorist set explosives in Kieu An hamlet, Phu Cat dist., Binh Dinh Prov.

December 26: Three PSDF members were kidnapped from Phu Phong hamlet, Tuy Hoa dist., Phu Yen Prov.

December 25: The hamlet chief was killed in a VC attack on Tan Oc hamlet, Phu My dist., Binh Dinh Prov.

December 23: One man was kidnapped from Thanh Trung hamlet, Phuoc Ninh dist., Tay Ninh Prov.

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES, JANUARY 5, 1971

Five enemy terrorist incidents have been reported by the National Police. In these incidents, three Vietnamese civilians were killed, five wounded and six kidnapped. Details follow:

December 30: Approximately 25 VC sappers attacked the National Police district headquarters in the Chong Thanh dist., Binh Long Prov., using satchel charges and grenades. Two policemen were wounded. One VC was killed and the enemy was seen carrying away at least eight other casualties, some of whom may have been killed.

Three children were wounded when they stepped on a mine in the Ham Thuan dist. of Binh Thuan Prov.

December 29: The VC assassinated one civilian in Tan Hao village, Giong Trom dist., Kien Hoa Prov. Four civilians were kidnapped as the enemy left the scene.

December 26: An acting hamlet chief was assassinated in the An Loc dist., Binh Long Prov.

December 24: One woman was assassinated in Tan Hoa Hiep hamlet, Tan Chau dist., Chau Doc Prov. Two other women in the hamlet were kidnapped.

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES, JANUARY 6, 1971

Three Vietnamese civilians were killed, four wounded and two kidnapped in six terrorist incidents reported. Details follow:

December 30: One civilian was kidnapped from An Trach Tay hamlet, Thanh Toi village, Kien Hoa Prov.

A 55-year old man was assassinated with a knife in Dinh Thanh village, Tri Tam dist., Binh Duong Prov. The VC left a "death sentence" note on the body, accusing the victim of being a "spy for the GVN".

December 29: A deputy hamlet chief was killed in an enemy attack on Lac Binh hamlet, Don Duong dist., Tuyen Duc Prov.

In another section of Tuyen Duc's Don Duong dist., the VC fired a B-40 at a hamlet defense platoon on patrol, killing a national policeman.

December 28: Four civilians were wounded when a VC unit fired eight 82mm mortar rounds into Phu Tan hamlet, Tuy An dist., Phu Yen Prov.

One civilian was kidnapped from Chi Duc hamlet, Tuy An dist., Phu Yen Prov.

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES, JANUARY 7, 1971

Fourteen incidents of enemy terrorism have been reported in which 19 Vietnamese civilians were killed, 17 wounded and 3 kidnapped. Details follow:

January 5: Six mortar rounds were fired into an area surrounding the Hien Thien dist. compound, Tay Ninh Prov. One round struck a home, killing three children.

January 4: A VC sapper attack was launched against the Phuoc Ninh dist. compound, Tay Ninh Prov. The sappers were able to enter the compounds from the southwest and inflict considerable damage to property and equipment. Casualties included one district officer killed and eight other persons wounded, including the district chief.

January 3: The VC assassinated a deputy hamlet chief at Go Phu hamlet, Tu Nghia dist., Quang Ngai Prov.

January 2: A VC unit attacked the resettlement camp in My Quang hamlet, Son Tinh dist., Quang Ngai Prov. Two PSDF were killed and four PSDF and one PF wounded.

Terrorists killed a man while he was on his way to work in the fields near Duc Hung village, Pleiku Prov.

One RD cadre was killed and two wounded in an engagement with the enemy near An Thoi hamlet, Phong Thuan dist., Phong Dinh Prov.

December 30: In Plei Ring De hamlet, Pleiku Prov., the enemy assassinated the deputy hamlet chief and wounded the deputy village chief.

One woman was kidnapped from Nam Phuoc hamlet, Phu Loc dist., Thua Thien Prov.

Also in Thua Thien, a woman was kidnapped from Thuy Tu hamlet, Huong Thuy dist.

December 29: Four civilians were killed in an attack on Plei Hoby hamlet, Pleiku Prov.

Also in Pleiku, mortar fire killed four civilians in Plei Tot Tau hamlet.

December 27: One civilian was kidnapped from Hoa An hamlet, Phong Thuan dist., Phong Dinh Prov.

December 26: Two women were wounded when they stepped on a booby trap mine near Dang Nam hamlet, Cho Gao dist., Dinh Tuong Prov.

December 22: Terrorists assassinated a woman in Dong hamlet, Sam Giang dist., Dinh Tuong Prov.

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES, JANUARY 8, 1971

Seventeen incidents of terrorism have been reported in which 13 Vietnamese civilians were killed, 15 wounded and 28 kidnapped. Details follow:

January 6: One civilian was killed and six wounded when a VC squad fired B-40 rockets into a house in the Huong Thuy dist., Thua Thien Prov.

January 5: An unknown size enemy force kidnapped 11 villagers from an area five kms. northeast of Kontum city, Kontum Prov. These prisoners were released within seven hours.

A VC unit penetrated Cai Trau hamlet, Thanh Tri dist., Ba Xuyen Prov. and kidnapped four PSDF members.

One civilian and one National Policeman were ambushed and killed while walking on National Route 4 in Song Phu village, Binh Minh dist., Vinh Long Prov.

A deputy hamlet chief of Phu Cuong hamlet, Phu Loc dist., Thua Thien Prov. was assassinated.

Also in Thua Thien, 10 VC entered Van Xa hamlet, Huong Tra dist., assassinating one civilian and kidnapping another.

Two civilians were killed and two wounded when an enemy explosive device detonated in the Chieu Hoi office in An Xuyen hamlet, An Tuc dist., Binh Dinh Prov.

January 4: Three PSDF were killed and three wounded in an engagement with an enemy unit near My Thanh hamlet, Ke Sach dist., Ba Xuyen Prov. Enemy casualties included four killed.

Six civilians were kidnapped in the Hoai Duc dist., Binh Tuy Prov. One RD cadre was killed and one member of the Vietnamese Information Service wounded when they stepped on a booby trap mine near Bong Trang hamlet, Ben Cat dist., Binh Duong Prov.

January 3: Four PSDF were kidnapped from Trung Xuan hamlet, Phu My dist., Binh Dinh Prov.

A National Police applicant was assassinated in Cai Trau hamlet, Thanh Tri dist., Ba Xuyen Prov.

One PSDF was wounded in an engagement with the enemy in Thanh Qui hamlet, An Son dist., Binh Duong Prov.

Also in Binh Duong, two PSDF were wounded when they stepped on a booby trap near Ben Cui hamlet, Ben Cat dist.

January 2: One man was kidnapped from Phu Lac hamlet, Binh Khe dist., Binh Dinh Prov.

December 30: An enemy unit kidnapped one civilian from the Cam Hai refugee camp, Cam Hai village, Hieu Nhon dist., Quang Nam Prov.

December 24: One civilian was taken from his hamlet and assassinated. The incident

took place near Tan Thanh hamlet, Tan Chau dist., Chau Doc Prov.

**ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES,
JANUARY 9, 1971**

Three terrorist attacks have been reported in which one Vietnamese civilian was killed, three wounded and seven kidnapped. Details follow:

January 4: One man was assassinated in Dac Hanh hamlet, Hoai Duc dist., Binh Tuy Prov.

January 2: Seven PSDF were kidnapped from Tan An hamlet, Tan Quan dist., Binh Dinh Prov.

January 1: The VC fired four rocket rounds into Cuoi Cut hamlet, Cu Chi dist., Hau Nghia Prov. Three civilians were wounded.

**ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES,
JANUARY 11, 1971**

Ten reports of terrorism have been reported in which 12 Vietnamese civilian were killed, 14 wounded and one kidnapped. Details follow:

January 7: One woman and a child were killed when the VC fired three 60mm mortars rounds into Da Quy hamlet, Lac Duong dist., Tuyen Duc Prov.

In Binh Dinh Prov., an An Ngal hamlet official was assassinated. The hamlet is in the An Nhon dist.

January 5: One PSDF group leader was assassinated in Chinh Nghia hamlet, Tuy Hoa dist., Phu Yen Prov.

January 4: One civilian was killed when he stepped on a booby trap in Phu Huu village, Nhon Trach dist., Bien Hoa Prov.

Another mine explosion killed two civilians in Trang Bom village, Duc Tu dist., Bien Hoa Prov.

One child was killed and seven civilians wounded in an enemy attack on Mach Trau hamlet, Son Hoa dist., Phu Yen Prov. As the VC departed, they also kidnapped one PSDF member.

Also in Phu Yen, one PSDF member was wounded in an attack on Tan Vinh hamlet, Son Hoa dist.

In a third Phu Yen incident on this date, one child was killed and six civilians wounded when a VC platoon mortared and attacked Thanh Hoi hamlet, Son Hoa dist.

January 3: One civilian was assassinated in Duc Hanh hamlet, Hoai Duc dist., Binh Tuy Prov.

An enemy unit stopped a motorbike in Vinh Cong village, Binh Phuoc dist., Long An Prov. The VC assassinated the driver and his passenger, both males.

**ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES,
JANUARY 12, 1971**

Twelve reports of enemy terrorism have been made in which 14 Vietnamese civilians were killed, 9 wounded and 7 kidnapped. Details follow:

January 9: A sampan was ambushed by terrorists in Chu Thien village, Thuan Nhon dist., Phong Dinh Prov. The village chief and a civilian were killed. An RD cadre aboard the sampan was wounded.

Two PSDF members were wounded in an enemy attack against Tan Phu Thanh village, Chau Thanh dist., Phong Dinh Prov.

January 8: A civilian truck hit a mine in the Loc Ninh dist., Binh Long Prov. One civilian was killed and one wounded.

In Phong Dinh Prov., two PSDF members were kidnapped from Nhon Ninh hamlet, Thuan Nhon dist.

A civilian was killed when he stepped on a mine in Rang Bom village, Duc Tu dist., Bien Hoa Prov.

January 7: One civilian was killed and three others wounded when they stepped on a mine near Phong Phu hamlet, Tuy An dist., Phu Yen Prov.

An enemy unit attacked the village administrative office in Xuan Hoa village, Phong Thuan dist., Phong Dinh Prov. One RD cadre was killed and two others wounded.

January 6: A VC platoon entered Ben Vang hamlet, Khlem Hanh dist., Tay Ninh Prov. and assassinated two men. Upon leaving the hamlet, they kidnapped a Hoi Chanh.

January 5: In Quang Duc Prov., an enemy platoon stopped a bus on the road between Ban Me Thuot and Gia Nghia. The VC kidnapped four women, whom they claimed were the wives of National Policemen or ARVN soldiers.

One man was assassinated in Giong Dua hamlet, Duc Hoa dist., Hau Nghia Prov.

Two PSDF, one member of the VIS and one civilian were killed in an attack on Nghia Phuoc village, Nghia Hanh dist., Quang Ngai Prov.

January 4: The wife of the hamlet chief was assassinated in Long Thanh hamlet, Sam Giang dist., Dinh Tuong Prov.

**COMMITTEES ON THE
ENVIRONMENT**

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency and the naming of William D. Ruckelshaus as its first Administrator, the Nixon administration has graphically demonstrated both its concern for preserving our natural heritage and its willingness to come to grips with the problems of pollution in a comprehensive fashion.

In my mind, Congress also has a vital role to play in this area, a role which it cannot fulfill due to structural difficulties in the very organization of the legislative branch. What I mean by this is that the House, for example, cannot even focus committee responsibility for framing a comprehensive approach to the problems of the environment. As responsibilities for environmental legislation are presently fragmented among the Committees on the Interior, Public Works, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Government Operations, and Science and Astronautics, there is small wonder that the congressional attack on pollution is in such a state of disarray. Moreover, while legislative procedures in the other body are somewhat more organized, they also could stand restructuring and reform.

In an effort to provide focus and coherence to the legislative branch's war on pollution I am introducing two different bills: one would establish a new joint committee on the environment, the other would establish a new House Committee on the Environment.

I personally think that the more effective degree of congressional involvement would be obtained if a joint committee on the environment were established. At the present time joint committees exist in the areas of Atomic Energy, Defense Production, the Economy, Federal Taxation, the Library, Government Printing, and Reduction of Federal Expenditures. Surely the pollution problem ranks in importance with these subjects. Surely the

problems of conserving our precious environmental resources are of sufficient weight to require joint consideration by both bodies of Congress.

If, however, the other body proves, as it did on the crime issue, unwilling to work jointly with the House toward solving environmental problems, then the establishment of a House Committee on the Environment would at least enable this body to focus its attack on these concerns more directly than it has been able to do in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to expedite action on both these proposals. For while the joint committee approach is more desirable, we must be prepared to move in the direction which offers the best and more immediate chance for the legislative branch to join the executive branch as a more fully functioning partner in this Nation's efforts to stop the continuing deterioration of the environment.

**THE HANDGUN CONTROL ACT OF
1971**

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Handgun Control Act, along with my colleagues Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. REES, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. YATES. Another session of Congress has gone by and still nothing has been done to deal with the approximately 24 million handguns in private hands around the country. If we are to deal with the problems of crime in our society, we must go beyond rhetorical exhortations about law and order, and beyond dangerous, ineffective gimmicks. The legislation my colleagues and I are introducing today goes to the heart of the problem of crime by striking out against the chief weapon of violent crime: the handgun.

According to the National Violence Commission, handguns are used in 96 percent of all armed robberies, 86 percent of all aggravated assaults, and 76 percent of all gun homicides. What is worse, these percentages are increasing despite enactment of strict handgun licensing laws in many cities of the country. Of police officers killed in the line of duty nationwide during 1960-65, 80 percent were killed with handguns. Truly, the handgun is the criminal's favorite weapon.

I realize that gun control of any variety is still a controversial issue in America. But if we in Congress are serious about stemming the tide of violent crime in our cities' streets, the one action which would contribute more than any other to that goal is reducing the availability of handguns. In 1968, 2½ million new handguns were manufactured or imported

ed for sale in the United States. There are now at least 24 million handguns in private hands in our country, about 80 percent possessed by persons in cities, towns, and suburbs.

THE HANDGUN CONTROL ACT OF 1971

The Handgun Control Act of 1971 prohibits the importation, manufacture, transfer, and transportation within the United States of any handgun, except by law enforcement officers, military personnel, or certain persons licensed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Among those designated as potential licensees are importers and manufacturers qualified under the 1968 Gun Control Act who might engage in the importation or manufacture of pistols for law enforcement authorities, the military, or other licensees. The only kinds of nongovernmental groups which can qualify for handgun licenses are sporting and recreational pistol clubs approved by the Secretary. To be approved, these pistol clubs must have no members who are themselves disqualified from handgun ownership under Federal or State law, and must have facilities and procedures for storing the club's handguns when they are not being used for sporting or recreational purposes. All of the operations of licensed clubs must be conducted in conformity with Treasury regulations.

The bill does not specifically ban the possession or make illegal ownership of handguns. It does, however, prevent such weapons from being imported, made, transferred to another, or transported, with the exceptions noted above. Under these circumstances, it is possible that many present owners of handguns will not wish to retain them. There is, therefore, a procedure for voluntary turnin of privately owned handguns of Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials, who are authorized to reimburse the owner for the value of the weapon, or \$25, whichever is more. The cost of these reimbursements will ultimately be paid by the Federal Government. It is likely that some citizens will turn in their weapons voluntarily without desiring reimbursement, as happened when Chicago instituted its comprehensive licensing requirements.

The bill is not intended to preempt further regulation of handguns by the States, and there are provisions explicitly leaving to the States the right to further regulate the possession of handguns.

The jurisdictional basis for this congressional action would be the constitutional grant of power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. A set of findings emphasize that the serious and worsening handgun situation in America, and the criminal and other violence which result from it, are a burden on interstate and foreign commerce. The bill is intended to relieve that burden by the fullest exercise of congressional power possible under the Constitution.

TO END HANDGUN CRIMES AND VIOLENCE

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if Congress were to enact this bill, we would within several years see a marked decline in the rate of violent crime in America. The experience of other countries seems to bear this out, although comparisons of cultures is admittedly difficult. Nevertheless, comparisons may prove useful

and provide a target at which to aim. In Japan with rare exceptions only police officers carry pistols. In 1966, firearms of all types figures in only 99 crimes during the entire year. In addition, Japan's homicide rate is one-third that of the United States and, as one would expect, the rate of firearms accidents is much lower than here.

Perhaps a more useful comparison may be made with Great Britain, a country from which our own legal traditions come and a staunch defender of individual rights over the centuries. The rate—not the number but the rate—for homicide is one-eighth that of the United States; for robbery is one-tenth; for aggravated assault is one-seventeenth. During the year 1963 when 5,126 Americans were being murdered by firearms, only 24 Britons died of the same cause.

I use these examples not because I intend to imply that the situations in the United States and other countries are exactly comparable, but to show that other countries, whatever their own problems, have been able to lick the problem of firearms violence. I believe that we in this country owe a better effort than we have yet made against handgun violence to our law enforcement officers who are on the front lines in the war against crime, to our children who deserve a world less violent than we have known, and to ourselves.

This bill says nothing about long guns. It would not confiscate any handgun now legally owned by a private citizen. But it would help to dry up the incredibly huge supply of the criminal's favorite weapon which has made effective State and local regulation of handguns impossible.

The people who deal with violent crime on a daily basis—our law enforcement officials—recognize the importance of controlling the supply of handguns in the hands of private citizens. The bill I have introduced has the support of James Conlisk, superintendent of police in Chicago; New York Police Commissioner Murphy; the Chicago Bar Association; and Mr. Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

It is my firm hope that hearings on this bill will take place in the near future, at which time I expect that the full threat handguns represent to us all will be vividly portrayed by the testimony of law enforcement officials, criminologists, and others. Perhaps this is the year that Congress will accept its responsibility in this area. It is already too late for the thousands of innocent people, including policemen, who have been maimed or killed by handguns. Let us wait no longer.

ALINSKY VIEWS THE PANTHERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial commentary in the Chicago Daily News Monday, January 11,

caught my eye. I believe it is quite pertinent and logical. May I add, Mr. Speaker, that I rarely see the day when I can agree with Saul Alinsky but in the confines of this editorial I do believe he makes a proper point:

ALINSKY VIEWS THE PANTHERS

An old pro in the dissident business—Chicago's Saul D. Alinsky—took a hard look at the Black Panthers the other day, and sized them up in this manner:

"When the Panthers began I found myself quite sympathetic. But what's wrong or right about them is academic now. The moment Huey Newton glorified the shooting in Marin County courthouse they blew it. I think the Panthers are asking for it. They've never been as strong as indicated, and there's a suicidal obsession now.

"A guy has to be a political idiot to say all power comes out of the barrel of a gun when the other side has the guns. A lot of their rhetoric has become a bore. You start saying 'whitefascistracistpig' and people turn off.

"Here's Newton saying he can't get justice in an American court and all the time he's saying that he's out on reversal by a superior court. The Panthers will still get a bubble of publicity, but their days are numbered."

We've had our differences with Saul Alinsky, but in this case both his expertise and his logic seem beyond challenge.

CHARLES C. CAIN, JR.

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with sorrow the death on January 8 of Charles C. Cain, Jr., retired editor and publisher of the Attleboro Sun, one of the great newspapers of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts which I represent. Charles Cain was an outstanding newspaperman for more than half a century. But I think he may be remembered best as a man who truly loved his community, and who felt it his obligation both as a newspaperman and an individual to work for the good of his community.

I believe that dedication to his community is the mark of a great newspaperman. Charles Cain measured up to that ideal. An editorial in his newspaper paid high tribute to Mr. Cain's "determination to make the Sun a servant of the communities which it served." It added:

He realized early in his career that a newspaper must be a part of the community in which it lives; that it must support and contribute to that community; that they both will decline or prosper together.

It is a fitting tribute. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the editorial and an article from the Sun about his career.

Charles Cain, who retired in 1957, joined the Attleboro Sun in 1904. He became editor in 1906 when he was less than 20 years old. As editor, he contributed to the paper's growth and the formation of an outstanding staff. He was a leader in the adoption of the Attleboro city charter. He built a notable record in support of civic and charitable causes, which is described in the following arti-

cle. He became publisher in 1929. He was active with numerous fraternal and community organizations. He took an active interest in politics, as well, and held appointive positions resulting from his friendships with several Massachusetts Governors.

He will also be remembered in the city of Taunton because, in fact, he served two major communities with equal devotion. Mr. Cain's boyhood was spent in Taunton, and he lived there while editing the Attleboro newspaper. He served on the Taunton municipal council, including several years as president, and took part in that city's community life. He began his newspaper career with the Taunton Herald-News.

I extend my deepest sympathy to those members of his family who survive him, his sister, and his four children and grandchildren, and to his former colleagues. His passing will be mourned by many whose own lives were enriched through his.

The text of the editorial and article from the Attleboro Sun read as follows:

CHARLES C. CAIN, JR., DIES; HEADED SUN

Charles C. Cain, Jr., retired editor and publisher of The Attleboro Sun, died today at Sturdy Memorial Hospital after a long illness. Mr. Cain, of 46 Payson St., was 84. He had been hospitalized less than a week.

Funeral arrangements are being completed by the Patrick J. Duffy Funeral Home.

Mr. Cain was born in Medford, June 9, 1886, the son of Charles C. and Mary (Wood) Cain. His father was an expert machinist with the Hinckley Company in Medford and later went to Taunton to handle the expansion joint department for the Taunton Locomotive Works.

Charles, Jr., spent his boyhood in Taunton, being graduated from Taunton High School in 1904. He was awarded a scholarship at Brown but instead of accepting he continued on the staff of the Taunton Herald-News, then edited by Dudley M. Holman with James L. Lincoln as city editor. While still in high school, young Cain covered the aldermanic meetings at city hall and reported the New England league and other baseball. He was also a correspondent for Boston and New York papers and was a district man for the Boston American when it started in 1904.

JOINS STAFF

His work as correspondent for the Attleboro Sun led Virgil Blackinton, then publisher, to offer him a place on the Sun staff and he came here in 1904. In 1906, the Sun was reorganized under John H. Vallette as publisher and Mr. Cain became editor though less than 20 years old. In 1916 he became vice president of the Sun and, in 1929 on the death of Mr. Vallette, became publisher after completing 25 years on the paper.

When the Sun was sold in 1957 the new owners requested Mr. Cain to remain as publisher for several months. After that he was consultant to the Attleboro Development and Industrial Commission.

STRONG PAPER

Under his direction as editor, the Sun became firmly established and, when he became publisher, this growth continued because of the excellence of the staff the Sun gathered and trained. Mr. Cain took an active interest in civic affairs through many years and led the agitation for a change from town government because no hall was big enough for the town meetings. A series of editorials he began in 1909 and which he wrote culminated in 1913 with his detailed plan for an Attleboro city charter. It was the joint work of him and Atty. J. J. Coady and it led to the adop-

tion of the charter in 1914. Though he steadfastly refused to hold city or district office, Mr. Cain was thoroughly conversant with politics and gave his aid in many a campaign.

CIVIC PROJECTS

Meanwhile the 1906 inauguration of toy collections with the firemen aiding needy children, the securing of the first zoo for Capron Park, the establishment of the jewelry school with U.S. aid, the return of the war clock to Georgia and the Confederate visit here, the 1944 plan and the exposition that heralded it were only some of the many projects that the Sun sponsored. Various relief funds, starting with the San Francisco earthquake fund in 1907 and including several that aided children and fire victims, made Attleboro generosity famous.

SERVES CITY

Up to the time he was publisher, Mr. Cain continued to live in Taunton and on his first try there he was elected to the municipal council as an at-large member and served eight years, during several of which he was council president. He was a member of the Taunton library board for 12 years and a member of the Taunton municipal light board for three years.

In politics he was a Republican and served on the city Republican committee but that did not prevent Gov. David I. Walsh from appointing him a trustee of Taunton State Hospital in 1914. Other governors, Republican and Democratic, reappointed him and he served 35 years, being chairman for nearly 25 years and resigning in 1949.

FRIEND OF COOLIDGE

He served three years in the Mass. State Guard from 1917 to 1920 after vainly attempting to join the Army and, as a second lieutenant in the guard, was on duty nearly three months during the Boston police strike. Gov. Calvin Coolidge named him to the governor's military staff and the friendship between him and Mr. Cain was reflected in the choice of Mr. Cain as a presidential elector in 1924 when Mr. Coolidge was elected president.

Mr. Cain was a member of the Elks, serving Taunton lodge as Exalted Ruler and afterwards being made a life member of Attleboro lodge. He was a member and an officer of Taunton council, K. of C. and later transferred to St. John's Council here. He was a past president of Attleboro Lions and appeared in the cast of nearly all their plays, a noteworthy feat being his starting role as Sheridan Whiteside in "The Man Who Came to Dinner".

He was one of the founders and long the vice president of the G.A.R. Dining Club and was formerly a member of the Lincoln Group of Boston and the Abraham Lincoln Association of Springfield, Ill. During the four years the Sun owned the Norwood Messenger, he was a member of the Rotary Club and Historical Society there. He was a member of the executive committee and chairman of the protection division of the civilian defense here and was also a regional director during the war. He also belonged to several newspaper associations.

Mr. Cain was married in 1910 to Anna L. Linnane of Woods Hole. She died a few years ago. He is survived by four children and several grand-children, as well as a sister, Mrs. William H. S. Rogers of Attleboro. The children are Charles III, who is with the Associated Press in Detroit; Mrs. Leon Fremault, Mrs. William Cronin of this city and Mrs. Chester VanderPyl of Warwick, R.I. Among the Detroit grandchildren is Charles IV.

CHARLES C. CAIN, JR.

Charles C. Cain, Jr., former editor and publisher of the Attleboro Sun, in a long career, established many fast friendships with community leaders and citizens, and had an

insight into much that happened here for many years.

Through his early endeavors as a reporter, he became acquainted with his adopted city and its people intimately and devoted himself with all his ability to seeking improvements in the affairs of the whole population. He treated with kindness those who had occasion to contact him during his various capacities at the newspaper, and he was ever ready to render assistance to those in trouble.

As a newspaperman, Mr. Cain appreciated the responsibilities of the profession and contributed to its colorful history in Attleboro by his devotion to high principles. These were best exemplified by his determination to make the Sun a servant of the communities which it served. He realized early in his career that a newspaper must be a part of the community in which it lives; that it must support and contribute to that community; that they both will decline or prosper together.

This policy has never changed at the Sun and it will continue as a fitting memorial to this man whose dedication to the responsibilities of his profession guided him throughout his lifetime.

AIR WAR IN CAMBODIA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the air war now being carried on by the United States in Cambodia clearly violates the intent of the Congress in adopting the substance of the Cooper-Church amendment as a part of Public Law 91-652, the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971. It also violates President Nixon's own statement of June 30, 1970, that:

There will be no U.S. air or logistic support (for South Vietnamese military operations in Cambodia).

Accordingly, I am today introducing, with the support of 64 of my House colleagues, an amendment to the Cooper-Church provision of the Special Foreign Assistance Act so as to make clear that the prohibition contained in that act must apply to all American combat operations and all American operations in support of combat operations.

The text of our clarified version of the Cooper-Church provision follows, along with a list of the House Members who have joined me in this effort:

REVISION OF COMPROMISE COOPER-CHURCH

Section 7(a) of the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (PL 91-652) is amended to read as follows:

"Section 7(a). In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds authorized or appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used to finance the introduction of United States ground combat troops into Cambodia, to provide United States advisers to or for Cambodian military forces in Cambodia, OR TO PROVIDE UNITED STATES AIR OR SEA COMBAT SUPPORT FOR ANY MILITARY OPERATIONS IN CAMBODIA."

LIST OF HOUSE MEMBERS WHO JOINED IN EFFORT

James Abouzeck, Bella S. Abzug, Joseph P. Addabbo, Glenn M. Anderson, William R. Anderson, Herman Badillo, Bob Bergland, John A. Blatnik;

Edward P. Boland, John Brademas, Philip Burton, Shirley Chisholm, William Clay, John Conyers, Jr., Charles C. Diggs, Jr., John G. Dow;

Robert F. Drinan, Don Edwards, Joshua Ellberg, William D. Ford, Donald N. Fraser, Robert N. Giaimo, Ella T. Grasso, Edith Green;

William J. Green, Augustus F. Hawkins, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, Robert W. Kastenmeier, Edward I. Koch, Robert L. Leggett, Torbert H. Macdonald;

Spark M. Matsunaga, Romano L. Mazzoli, Abner J. Mikva, Parren J. Mitchell, William S. Moorhead, John E. Moss, David R. Obey, James G. O'Hara;

Bertram L. Podell, David Pryor, Charles B. Rangel, Thomas M. Rees, Henry S. Reuss, Teno Roncalio, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, J. Edward Roush;

Edward R. Roybal, William F. Ryan, Ferdinand St Germain, Paul S. Sarbanes, James H. Scheuer, John F. Seiberling, Louis Stokes, James W. Symington;

Frank Thompson, Jr., Robert O. Tiernan, Morris K. Udall, Charles A. Vanik, Jerome R. Waldie, Lester L. Wolff, Sidney R. Yates, and Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.

JASPER, ALA., PAYS TRIBUTE TO GEORGE "GOOBER" LINDSEY

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, Friday, January 29 is George "Goober" Lindsey Day in Jasper, Ala. The entire day has been set aside to honor Goober, one of Walker County's outstanding native sons.

We are all proud of Goober. He is currently appearing in the weekly television series "Mayberry RFD." He has appeared in several movies and made guest appearances on numerous other television shows. His warmth and spontaneous humor has made Goober a Hollywood favorite. And wherever Goober's busy schedule takes him, he never fails to put in a plug for his hometown and State. He is often referred to as Jasper's one man chamber of commerce.

I am pleased to have the opportunity of extending my very best wishes to George "Goober" Lindsey as Jasper honors him with this special recognition.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing, along with my remarks, a newspaper article taken from the Daily Mountain Eagle, of Jasper, which describes the activities planned to honor Goober and lists some of the accomplishments and achievements he has earned during his illustrious career.

LINDSEY'S A BUSY MAN: GOOBER'S NO PLAIN
GEORGE

Friday, January 29th, is "George 'Goober' Lindsey Day" in Jasper!

The Jasper Area Chamber of Commerce has named it so . . . the Jasper City Commission and Mayor has proclaimed it so . . . but the versatile, warm, TV, movie and recording star, who will be honored on that day, has made it so by being a "one man chamber of commerce" for his beloved Jasper and Walker county, Alabama.

A full day of activities and honors has been planned by the Jasper Area Chamber of Commerce for the day. It includes school,

college and plant visitations, motorcades, bands, representations, courthouse step ceremonies and entertainment.

The day will be culminated with a "Favorite Son Award" at the 24th annual membership meeting and banquet of the Chamber to be held at Walker College at 7:00 p.m. with George Lindsey as guest of honor. Tickets for the event are now on sale for chamber members and will be available to the general public after January 12 at the Jasper Chamber office. Who is George Lindsey?

As "Goober", the co-star of CBS TV's "Mayberry RFD," Jasper's George Lindsey portrays a downhome, goofy, happy-go-lucky character that has become one of the most popular in all of television.

Every Monday night he's just plain "Goober," but the rest of the time he's George Lindsey, a busy and happy man who never misses an opportunity to put in a plug for "Jasper, Alabama."

And those opportunities are many. His recognition as a humorist has made him the demand of such talk shows as "The Merv Griffin Show," "The Johnny Carson Show," "The Mike Douglas Show," "The Joey Bishop Show," and "The Steve Allen Show." As a popular country singer and humorist, George has guest starred on "The Jonathan Winters Show," "Kraft Music Hall," "Laugh-In," "Love, American Style," and numerous visits as special guest star on "The Glen Campbell Show."

He has just finished guest starring on a "Johnny Cash Show," which will be shown in early February, in which he does a 13-minute segment about Jasper.

George made his television debut on "The Jack Paar Show" in 1961. The same year he made his Broadway debut, as the comedy lead in the musical "All American" at the Winter Garden Theatre. From this, George received his first movie role in "Ensign Pulver," directed by Joshua Logan who had directed "All American."

Last year, George returned to Disney Studios as the voice of the leading characters in "The Aristocats," a two-hour animated movie now showing at the Alabama Theatre in Birmingham with an attempt being made to book it at the Jasper Theatre on "George 'Goober' Lindsey Day", January 29th.

Versatility is a definitive part of George Lindsey. He has appeared as almost any conceivable character on more than 40 major television shows including "Gunsmoke," "The Alfred Hitchcock Hour," "Voyage To The Bottom Of The Sea," "Twilight Zone," and Disney's "Wonderful World Of Color." Than came "Goober" on "The Andy Griffith Show," and his co-starring role as "Goober" on "Mayberry RFD."

As a recording star, his first Capitol album "Goober Sings," was so successful that the recording company rushed his second one, "95 Miles To Bakersfield" into immediate release.

George has served as a judge on the "Miss Universe Contest", makes a yearly guest appearance on "The Gran Ole Opry," the annual Country Festival of Music and tours on the midwest rodeo circuit.

Humorist, singer, performer, a star among stars, George's biggest pride is his family: his wife Joy, and two children, George Jr., and Camden Jo, with whom he lives in San Fernando Valley, California . . . but he still reserves a warm spot in his heart for classmates and friends of Walker College, Walker County High and Jasper Elementary school days.

This is the man whom we will acclaim on Friday, January 29th . . . this is the man who claims us every day of the year. This is George Smith Lindsey!

Jasper, Alabama yields only to "Mayberry RFD" for 30 minutes each Monday night. The rest of the time he's Jasper's "Favorite Son."

SWAN SONG

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Kenneth Crawford is at his best in the following column in Newsweek of December 28 in which he philosophizes about some of the events he has covered since he arrived in Washington in the 1920's. It is his last column before his retirement. His observances on the Washington political scene will be missed:

SWAN SONG

(By Kenneth Crawford)

Anyone who has lived as an adult through the last half century aware of what was going on has seen more history in the making than anyone who ever lived before him. There has been more change, more cataclysm, more invention, more progress in some areas and more deterioration in others than ever happened in any previous 50 years.

Anyone who has been a professional observer of public affairs through this period, most of the time here in Washington, as I have, has never had a chance to be bored. Neither has he had much of a chance to cogitate about the whither of events or to acquire any special wisdom. Anyway, journalists aren't paid to be wise, only to be agile enough to describe what's happening while it happens. It is left to wiser men in think tanks to add it all up. They try, but no two tanks get quite the same answers.

Some thinkers believe that man will commit suicide with the nuclear weapons his ingenuity has provided. Others are convinced that he will destroy his environment to satisfy his cupidity. Still others expect him to breed himself out of living space. A few feel that his ingenuity, cupidity and self-perpetuating urge, the very qualities that threaten him, will also save him, that he will come to see that none of his ambitions can be realized without exercise of restraint. The next 50 years will be crucial.

RESILIENT SPECIES

This being my last column before retirement, I wish I had the prescience to predict the outcome. All I have is a hunch, derived from witness of the past, that man—notably American man—has a future. He is a tough and resilient species. In my time he has been through two world wars and several lesser wars, a Great Depression and uncounted economic recessions; he has survived Prohibition, flood, hurricane, riot and his own follies. He is not easy to stamp out.

When I arrived in Washington in the 1920s the world was at peace. Coolidge slept in the White House and established Washington correspondents wore spats, carried canes and gave themselves airs. Had there been cooling apparatus, a later development, this Capital would have been as comfortable as it was smug. H.L. Mencken jabbed at complacency from one side and Norman Thomas from the other but nobody so much as said "ouch." Hoover would soon be projecting two cars for every garage.

When Hoover failed to deliver, the laissez-faire bubble burst, materializing Roosevelt and the New Deal. Washington has never been the same since. Neither has the country, nor, indeed, the world. At last it was being recognized that a society run out of frontiers, sustained by an increasingly complex and interdependent economy, had to submit to more government direction and control than it liked if it was to avoid periodic paralysis and chronic chaos.

FAIR PLAY

The second world war interrupted, but did not stop, the Roosevelt revolution. Europe had to be saved from Hitler and was. Few foresaw that Stalin would replace Hitler as a world menace once the war was won. But Stalin did and hot war passed into the cold war that is still going on, much as its on-going is denied by those determined to see no evil. Meanwhile, the struggle continues to achieve a workable mixed economy, privately run but government manipulated, and a welfare state capable of giving practical expression to the nation's compassion and sense of fair play, much as these sentiments are denied by those determined to see no good.

To some of us who have lived with this struggle over the years, the young and their journalistic spokesmen, who think they invented compassion and sensitivity to public morals, are a little hard to take. Even their ultimate example of immorality, the war in Vietnam, was in its genesis highly, if mistakenly, moral—an undertaking to protect a weak but potentially free nation from a strong but regimented neighbor. We would perhaps be more tolerant of the young if we occasionally paused to remember how we bedeviled the "merchants of death" of the first world war and the national leadership in the Coolidge and Hoover Administrations.

As for myself I am hopeful that my grandchildren will have a decent world to live in and that the nation will muddle through, as it always has. And I am grateful that when I left the campus, a certified B.A. but with no immediately useful equipment except ability to write a declarative sentence, I could think of no way to earn a living except in journalism.

REFORMING FOREIGN MEAT LABELING PRACTICES

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation requiring imported meat and meat products to be labeled "imported" at all stages of the food distribution chain.

Under present laws and regulations, foreign meat imported for manufacturing or processing purposes is normally shipped frozen and in 50- to 60-pound containers. While these containers specify countries of origin, no further special identification is made after the meat itself is processed by U.S. concerns. As a matter of commercial practice, a significant amount of this imported meat is thawed, ground, blended with fat trimmings from domestic beef and then sold over the counter as hamburger. As a consequence of this, when a housewife purchases a package of hamburger at her corner grocery store, she has absolutely no way of determining the kind of meat she is getting for her money.

While on its face this seems innocuous enough, a moment's reflection reveals that the current state of the law does present some undue health hazards for the American consumer. Most obvious is the fact that since the imported meat is normally frozen before entering this country, then thawed for processing, a subsequent refreezing by the ultimate consumer raises potential problems. The very real danger of this is attested to by

U.S. Department of Agriculture bulletins which state:

Cook thawed meat immediately or keep for only a short time in a refrigerator. Avoid refreezing thawed meat.

Yet, despite this knowledge of the hazards of refreezing meat, we stand idly by while housewives across the country run that very same risk by refreezing, through their ignorance, packages of hamburger containing previously thawed imported meats.

I am simply appalled, Mr. Speaker, that this condition has been allowed to persist. The public interest has been completely ignored in favor of certain special interests. I say enough is enough. The rights of the American consumer to know what they are purchasing are more important than continuing the privileges of a few to profit from legal loopholes.

I urge my colleagues to expedite approval of this proposal; this is a non-partisan and nonpolitical matter. It should be a major concern to all those interested in maintaining high standards and high quality in the American diet.

THE COORS PROGRAM

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, few American industries have done more to respond to the need for environmental improvement than has the Adolph Coors Co. of Golden, Colo. It should be good news to all in Washington working on environmental problems to know that Coors will soon be providing salvage and recycling of all containers, glass or aluminum, this year. In fact, this company contemplates by the end of 1971 there may be a recycling of everything the Coors Co. uses, not only aluminum and glass, but also wood, paper, and the rest.

I believe this letter explaining their program is of interest to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I include it at this point:

ADOLPH COORS Co.,
Golden, Colo., January 12, 1971.

HON. TENO RONCALIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RONCALIO: A year ago I wrote all legislators in Adolph Coors Company's 11-state marketing area to advise that our company was embarking upon a cash-for-cans aluminum recovery program. We did that because this company and its distributors are solemnly committed to fight litter and solid waste in order to help keep America the kind of place we all want it to be. In light of that commitment, I believe you will be interested to know these things:

Public response to the cash-for-cans program has vastly exceeded our expectations. During the first 11 months of 1970, our 166 distributors received 5,218,463 pounds of aluminum or more than 120-million cans. We paid the organizations and individuals who picked up that aluminum \$521,846 for doing so. The program is not restricted to Coors cans . . . we pay for all aluminum containers, of whatever brand. Literally hundreds if not thousands of youth, civic and service organizations are cooperating with this pro-

gram; they use the dime-a-pound proceeds for worthwhile community causes of all kinds.

As you can imagine, our cash-for-cans program did not always meet with immediate public enthusiasm in our various marketing areas. Getting people concerned and involved has been the major Adolph Coors Company management effort during 1970, and in some cases it has been a long, uphill fight. In areas where the community has gotten behind the effort, we are showing returns of over 60% of our cans. Since our studies indicate that not more than one percent of our cans actually end up as litter and that fully 99% of the users of our product dispose of the empty can properly, a 60% return not only all but eliminates the litter but makes an appreciable dent in the solids waste aspects as well.

Litter has been defined as the visible portion of the solids waste iceberg. Although unsightly and repugnant, litter is but a small fraction of the real, long-range environmental problem of solids waste disposal. We are confident that in the long run recycling of aluminum containers will be a more satisfactory answer than returnable glass bottles in minimizing solids waste. For example, both Pepsi Cola and Coca Cola report that they only average 90% return on returnable soft-drink bottles which are sold for home consumption. In densely populated urban areas, the rate of return drops as low as 75%. One thousand returnable bottles weigh about 750 pounds. At 90% return, each 1,000 bottles sold adds 75 pounds of glass to litter and solids wastes. One thousand aluminum cans weigh only 40 pounds. With no salvage at all the aluminum cans would comprise only about half the weight of solids waste that returnable bottles do. Yet we are confident of reaching a minimum 75% recycle level given the time to do so.

Although we regard litter as the pressing and immediate problem and our initial efforts with the cash-for-cans program have mainly been directed at correcting litter, we view the impending and ominous matter of solids waste and its disposal as the real and serious long-range environmental challenge. Thus, we regard aluminum can salvage and recycle as a permanent part of our overall operation. Of all of our management objectives it has the top priority. Our hope is that we will be allowed sufficient time to make it work. Our success to date exceeds our fondest hopes although we regard it as just a start.

Adolph Coors Company and its distributors will intensify their efforts to make the cash-for-cans program even more successful in 1971. We anticipate that far more aluminum will be recovered for recycling. More and more companies are turning to aluminum packaging because they realize its environmental value. Further, in 1971 our company will discontinue use of the tall tinplate can replacing it with an aluminum can of our own manufacture. When that changeover is complete, all canned beer marketed by Coors will be in aluminum cans.

A new and important program at Adolph Coors Company will provide for the salvage and reuse or recycle of our convenience bottles which have heretofore been nonreturnable. All such bottles will soon have a redemption value of one cent each. The majority of these will be suitable for reuse. Those that are not will be returned as cullet to a glass factory located a few miles from our brewery in Golden and melted up to be made into new bottles—that is—recycled. Glass like aluminum can be infinitely recycled.

Thus with the completion of our 1971 changeover on the tall can from tinplate to aluminum and the immediate adoption of a complete system of returnable bottles, every Coors can and bottle will have a cash return value. Both plans will be in effect throughout our entire marketing area . . . Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas,

Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah and Wyoming.

One other thing. A top management committee at our company now is meeting regularly to determine how we can recycle everything that Adolph Coors Company uses . . . not only aluminum and glass, but also wood, paper and the rest. We have found some answers; we are seeking a total answer. This effort also has top management priority.

Our company is totally dedicated to the business of keeping this nation clean and inviting. We share and appreciate your concern with this vital problem. You have my personal pledge that Adolph Coors Company will be an outstanding leader in the preservation of a quality environment for America.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM K. COORS,
Chairman of the Board.

ON BUDDING BASQUE UNITY

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the recent trial in Burgos, Spain, of the 16 Basque nationalists, turbulent as it was, made the Nation much more deeply aware of the extensive Basque community which resides in the western United States. Those of us who come from Idaho have long known of the contributions Basques have made to the West. Among our finest citizens, we are proud to have them. The Oinkara Dancers have identified the Basques and Idaho in the minds of many, and we take pride in their wide reputation.

I believe that some of America's greatest strengths have their foundations in the diversity of our citizens. With that thought in mind, I would like to share with you an article on our Basque community which recently appeared in the Christian Science Monitor:

ON BUDDING BASQUE UNITY

(By Jack Waugh)

BOISE, IDAHO.—They take pleasure in simple things—a flock of sheep in a silent meadow, the quiet cathedral of a mountain draw.

They tap strength from the individual self-reliance of a life alone. Even when they collect at festivals at Elko, Nev., or Boise, Idaho, what makes them shout and sing, dance and laugh are the events of the single skill: Who can lift the heaviest stone or the biggest weight, who can wield the quickest ax, or who can play the most poker-faced game of muz, the Basque country cousin to draw poker?

Which couple can dance most furiously to the throb of the stringed instruments? Which girl can whirl the fastest and smile the widest, which boy can kick the highest and shout the loudest, which wooden hoop slapped against a partners rings the loudest?

TRIAL PRODUCED AGONY

The Basques are that kind of people. And when 16 Basque nationalists laid their lives on the line in the dramatic court-martial in Burgos, Spain, last month it was an individual agony for every American-migrated Basque from Elko to Meridian, Idaho.

The Basques came to America in ghostly ways and disappeared back up into the mountains with their flocks of sheep, where their presence was felt but rarely seen.

Now 50,000 to 100,000 Basques live in the American West. It is hard to pinpoint it any closer because Basque is not in the vocabulary of the census taker. To him second-generation Basques are just plain Americans.

And the first generation that migrated from the Basque country astraddle the Pyrenees are simply entered as French or Spanish.

Two and a half million Basques still live in Basque country along the spine of the Pyrenees, most of them in four provinces of Spain and three provinces of France. But 2 million more live in enclaves big and little around the world, the biggest—250,000—in Argentina.

They began to leave the Iberian slope because by Basque tradition only one son inherits all of a father's land. Since the Basques are predominantly Roman Catholic and run to big families, this often left half a dozen other sons as prime candidates for migration.

GOLD RUSH BECKONED

Some were drawn to the United States in the fever of the Gold Rush in the middle of the 1800's. When the Gold Rush lost its glitter they began to push back up into the Rockies to herd sheep, and Boise became the United States to most Basques from the Old World.

They excelled with the shepherd's staff. It was a glove fit for their innate patience—which is like the cattle on a thousand hills—and for their seamless dependability.

The big sheep owners of the West did—and still do—draw heavily on Basques, not hesitating to entrust whole herds to their keeping, never fearing that at shearing or selling time 1 in 100 lambs will be lost.

Many Basques have long since splintered from the shepherd's staff. Paul Laxalt, a full-blooded Basque, descended from the French side, has just ended a term as governor of Nevada. Pete Cenarrusa, of the Spanish side, is Idaho's Secretary of State and one of its most successful politicians.

The Basques, with their language full of k's, x's, and z's and related to no other, and with their democratic form of self-government that goes back at least 10 centuries, which the Constitution drafters at Philadelphia drew on to shape American political forms, have never had a nation of their own.

They have existed in states of semi-autonomy within Spain and France, maintaining their uniqueness of speech and custom and their self-reliant style of the life alone.

KINSHIP REKINDLED

At one time they sought a separate state carved out of Spain and France. But there was no hope for that. Now, under the restrictive lacing of the Franco political fabric, some young Basques have become outgoing nationalists, separatists, and revolutionaries. And when the 16 went on trial in Burgos a worldwide Basque kinship was rekindled.

Their self-reliant life has kept Basques scattered and disunited. In the United States 15 Basque clubs, mostly in the West, have held a loose tie for some. And a Basque-studies program at the University of Nevada has tried to keep the thread of mutual tradition and history intact.

Now partly because of the trial in Burgos, a pan-Basque countercurrent to the scattering on a thousand hills is stirring. It has been, halfheartedly, for 30 years. But suddenly a new Basque yearning for ties of kinship is in flower. A new source of strength is being reached for. And from Burgos to Buenos Aires to Boise a new unity is quietly knitting Basque to Basque.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

COMMENTARY BY PRESIDENT OF POLAND

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in his annual New Year's speech on January 3, 1971, addressed to members of the Polish Government in Exile and representatives of Polish organizations and of the Polish community in Great Britain, His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, gave a very effective and penetrating commentary on the situation in Poland and the world. His message follows:

NEW YEAR'S SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND—LONDON, JANUARY 3, 1971

His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, addressed members of the Polish Government in Exile and representatives of Polish organizations and of the Polish community in Great Britain on January 3d 1971, as follows:

"Mr. Prime Minister, General, Mr. Vice-Chairman of the Council of the Republic, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish to thank you most heartily for the good wishes which you have conveyed to me for the Republic and for me personally. For my part I ask you to accept my best wishes for 1971.

These wishes do not concern only your personal lives, but refer in the first place to the situation of our Fatherland. For we, Poles, cannot be really happy even with the greatest possible successes in our personal lives as long as the Republic has not regained her freedom and independence.

The tragic events which took place in Poland towards the end of the year present a forceful illustration of the present state of the Republic. The Government which Russia has imposed upon Poland has decreed a substantial rise in food prices and at the same time raised the level of its exports by Russian ships. No wonder that this decree provoked a great wave of popular discontent and public demonstrations. In dealing with the demonstrators the regime brought in not only the police but even armoured might. There were hundreds of killed and wounded.

But also in the wider international field it can be said without exaggeration that in almost all cases of human conflict in the world a degree of Russian influence can be detected. Apart from the trouble spots in the Middle and Far East, in recent times Russia has undertaken an intensive activity in the Mediterranean. She has acquired naval bases on the coast of North Africa which enable her to extend considerably her activities throughout Southern Europe.

It must be remembered, however, that we have had difficulties also with our Western neighbour. Now at last the German Government, by signing the non-aggression treaty with the regime in Warsaw, has recognised *de facto* the frontier on the Oder and Neisse line. But it must be borne in mind that the Warsaw regime signed this treaty in the wake of a similar treaty between Bonn and Moscow. This in itself is an indication to what extent this regime is dependent on Moscow. For Moscow is deeply interested in

the maintenance of the *status quo* in East Central Europe which has been achieved by her in defiance of the stipulations of the Atlantic Charter.

It is of the utmost importance that the West should realize that Russia is, in fact, the only state in the world whose chief aim is domination over other nations by imposition of the Communist system, just as in Tsarist times Russia tried to impose her power in the name of Eastern Orthodoxy and the unity of the Slavs.

We can be sure, however, that Russia will fail to destroy the national consciousness of the Poles, just as Tsarist Russia has failed in this respect. To maintain this national self-consciousness is our common task. I am confident that in this task God will be with us.

It is especially important, Mr. Speaker, that we emphasize the continued existence and moral vitality of the Polish Government in Exile at a time when the Communist dictatorship in Warsaw is increasingly subservient to Moscow. Special mention must obviously be made of the recent changes in the Communist command which were caused by the increasingly unrest among the Polish people who for 25 years suffered under Communist misrule.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING AND REPORTING: THE URGENT NEED FOR REFORM

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been growing evidence that existing laws and practices regarding campaign financing and reporting are not only ineffective, but are severely undermining the public interest. Common Cause, a citizens' lobby group under the leadership of John Gardner, has filed suit against the Republican and Democratic National Committees for violating the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. And, before the 91st Congress adjourned, several days of hearings were held on this subject by the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct under the chairmanship of our colleague, Congressman MELVIN PRICE.

Because I feel these issues must be addressed squarely and boldly in the public forum, I insert in the RECORD a copy of my testimony before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Urgent and major overhaul to laws and practices relating to campaign financing are, I believe, one of the five or six changes we must make if we are to have a workable political system and society that functions equitably for all citizens.

In addition, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the experiences of the Poole Broadcasting Co. in Flint, Poole, a privately operated TV station, has been vigorously pioneering to find more economical and fair ways that TV can help candidates communicate with the electorate. Following my testimony is a copy of the statement of the president of the Poole Broadcasting Co., Mr. Albert J. Gillen:

CAMPAIGN FINANCING AND REPORTING: THE URGENT NEED FOR REFORM

I. CAMPAIGN FINANCING—THE LARGER PERSPECTIVE

Domestic and international issues which we face today are so complex and so tough that it is not easy to see our way through to good solutions in the near future. However, the processes of politics and government are the environment in which men and women in public service work to deal with the issues which confront our country. While we may not find easy answers to our problems, we can, nevertheless, reform and re-tool the conditions which affect who is elected, how they are elected, and the way they do their job after they are elected.

Today, the problem of campaign reporting and financing seriously cripples candidates and, to some extent, elected officials and undermines the performance of our entire governmental system. Financial obstacles, pressures, and disproportionate influences keep many good people from running for office and create an unhealthy potential for affecting the job performance of those who do run and those who are elected. If we understand the urgency, and if we resolve to make crucial and long overdue reforms in this area, we can upgrade and greatly broaden the number and quality of people who participate in elective politics, the quality of their performance, and, in turn, the faith and confidence of the electorate. As a result, this single set of reforms may do more to increase our capacity to deal with today's issues than anything else we can do.

The purpose of this statement is to express the urgent need for such reform, the obstacles to reform, the objectives and principles which should guide reform, and to outline specific areas and recommendations where reforms can be made.

II. THE NEED FOR REFORM

The problems created by outdated and almost totally ineffective laws governing campaign financing and reporting are legion. Among them are:

1. Of the estimated \$150 to \$250 million spent on campaigns in a major election year in the United States, only a small fraction—10-20% at the most—is reported.

2. Unrealistic and unenforced laws have led to a condition where evasion, manipulation and outright disregard for the law are the norm, not the exception. For all practical purposes, political financial contributions and expenditures are virtually uncontrolled.

3. The tacit acceptance of this sham and hypocrisy in high prices—both public and private—breeds a disrespect for the law, an insidious double-standard, and a deepening public cynicism about our political processes which, taken together, undermine public leadership and the "consent of the governed" on which our democracy depends.

4. That information which is reported is so incomplete and so after-the-fact that there is little basis for effective enforcement, for understanding the unhealthy influence of special interests on our political system, or for having the data available on which to base intelligent decisions for reform.

5. The costs of campaigning—both for nominations and for general elections—and in some cases doing the job and communicating with the constituency after election—have skyrocketed at an ever-increasing rate. The upward pressures include the costs of TV and other media techniques—even something as basic as postage; the costs of travel; communicating about more complex issues while competing with all the other bits of information which bombard the average citizen every day; and the cost of professional information research and management techniques which are necessary to allocate and use campaign resources effectively. At the same time, the necessary funds for waging campaigns have not begun to increase at a

proportional rate. The result is an ever-widening gap between the cost and the sources of income associated with competing in public service. The consequences are serious:

(a) Many good men and women are unable to run for office because they are in effect priced out of the competition.

(b) Politics is fast becoming a rich man's game.

(c) Those who do run for office are forced to find ways to make up this deficit and, all too often, must seek and accept large contributions from special individual or group interests.

This gap is further accentuated by the very real advantages that an incumbent office holder often holds over a challenger. Thus, there is an increasing potential for the "public interest" to be compromised or distorted through the sometimes subtle and often not so subtle pressures of disproportionate financial obligations.

6. Only a small fraction of the electorate participates financially in the costs of running for office—with the largest estimates being between 10-15%. This means:

(a) a small number of people can potentially exert an influence far beyond their numbers and

(b) more important, over 85% of our citizens do not have a sense of investment—either personal or financial—in the system. The danger here is that they—like one who is not a stockholder—are less likely to share an interest in, or a high expectation of performance from, an enterprise in which they do not participate. The dual consequences are that they may do less themselves and demand less of their elected officials.

7. The current chaotic patchwork of laws in this area at the local, state and federal levels are so confusing and riddled with loopholes that they actually encourage violations of the law. For the most part, they were formed decades ago when conditions and times were vastly different than today. The most blatant example of an unrealistic statute is that which prohibits the expenditures on a congressional campaign from exceeding \$5,000 and a senatorial campaign from exceeding \$25,000. This has led to the unbridled proliferation of campaign committees—allowing virtually unlimited amounts of contributions to a campaign, thus making a wholesale mockery of an existing, but outdated, statute. The by-product of violating these unrealistic ceilings opens the door on the one hand to excessive contributions and spending, and on the other, fragmenting, and thus obscuring the precise source of, cumulative large donations and contributors. And so, the public, and sometimes even candidates themselves, have no way of pinpointing the source and the magnitude of excessive special interest participation and disproportionate financial obligations. Large donors can further obscure their contribution and influence by giving through relatives, nominal "front" groups and by other devious means.

III. OBSTACLES TO REFORM

1. Disclosure and reporting is so fragmented and decentralized at local and state levels that there is virtually no way the public can have the facts they need in order to initiate intelligent, systematic and effective reform.

2. The complexity of the law and the lack of uniformity among the 50 states and the 1000's of local jurisdictions makes it exceedingly difficult to create a simple and universal pattern which will govern local, state and federal campaign financing and reporting.

3. The hypocrisy of existing laws and the consequent absence of any attempts to prosecute the violators has prevented the dramatic focusing of the crisis.

4. Incumbents at all levels of government have a vested interest in the system within

which they have been elected and are notoriously reluctant to change the rules of the game in which they now feel relatively safe. Thus, there is a lack of bold public leadership on the issue.

5. Special interests—whether large individual or group contributors—also have a vested interest in the existing inadequate system and enjoy the relative security of their present relationships with their potential for continued influence. And so, there is a lack of bold private leadership.

IV. THE STRATEGY FOR REFORM—OBJECTIVES AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Through campaign finances and reporting is indeed approaching a crisis situation, the outlook need not be altogether gloomy. One asset we can begin with is a growing body of expertise in the area. Among the excellent studies are:

Financing a Better Election System by the Committee for Economic Development

Regulation of Political Finance by the Institute for Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley

Congress and the Public Trust by the New York Bar Assn.

The Costs of Democracy by Alexander Heard, University of North Carolina Press

Electing Congress, the Financial Dilemma by the 20th Century Fund

An analysis of these kinds of studies makes it clear that lack of bold and sophisticated recommendations are not one of the obstacles to reform. There are, in fact, many sensible and practical reforms that can be made now, and there are still others that can be made now, and there are still others that we can make after we have collected more information and have done some testing.

What follows will be a strategy for reform which evolves from my own experience in politics, combined with the expertise of others who have studied this need. This strategy will be derived from the previous understanding of the need for reform and will proceed with the major ideas which should shape an effective strategy—and will conclude with specific recommendations, some which can be implemented now and some which suggest areas for more sophisticated refinements in the future.

One thing is clear, this is not an ideal world and one set of reforms, however, well thought out, cannot possibly resolve all the problems. There are many alternatives which can be considered and it is the job of public leadership and citizens at large to decide which reforms will encourage the best performance for our political system in the public interest—while at the same time incurring the least compromise to our freedoms and to our American sense of initiative and competition. It is further clear that conditions are changing more rapidly than ever before, and that real reforms cannot be a static gesture, but rather must provide for systematic ongoing revisions which keep pace with change in the future.

A. The objective of reform

A political system that functions truly in the public interest must be openly accessible to fair competition among the best men and ideas, at any given level and at any given time in the country. It is equally important that there be an informed electorate with a maximum of public participation in the political process. For this to happen there needs to be the highest degree of respect and confidence in the system and in its leadership, with the "consent of the governed" being freely and positively expressed.

B. Principles for achieving this objective

1. Meaningful reform should ensure maximum competition and fully open access to potential candidates and positions by reducing the financial obstacles to running for office and by cultivating sufficient no-strings-attached resources to adequately and

vigorously inform the public on the issues and candidacies of every election contest. While searching for realistic ways to hold down campaign expenditures, it is equally important to concurrently provide legitimate sources of income which can remove the pressure of anyone having to accept disproportionate donations from individuals and special interests.

2. Meaningful reform must be comprehensive, dealing with all aspects of finances and disclosure, rather than simply being negative and regulatory, or affecting just one or two campaign costs, e.g. T.V. broadcasting. The election process, and its necessary financing should be viewed as a positive and indispensable process of informing the electorate. As such, the issue is not one of simple restriction and regulation, but rather how to nourish this process, how to give it integrity and how to make it healthy and respectable from all aspects.

3. Meaningful reform must consider various means of providing new sources of income, including the possibilities of public subsidies, but should leave to the candidates and political parties, the responsibility for raising a substantial amount of the necessary funds. The ability to attract and raise substantial campaign resources, should be one of the tests which a candidate should be required to meet in his effort to earn public support.

In an ideal world, the concepts of participatory democracy suggest that every citizen should share proportionately in the financial requirements as well as the other dimensions of the political process—and this implies some form of either public subsidy by taxation or by vastly broadened voluntary financial participation.

4. Meaningful reform should seek to broaden the present small base of citizen financial participation on the theory that the more people who have a sense of personal investment in making the system work, the greater the corresponding force of the public interest that candidates and incumbents will have to respond to.

5. Meaningful reform should eliminate gross financial excesses which undermine fair competition. This is one of the most important priorities and a more easily administered task than imposing arbitrary or unrealistic limitations designed to force down the ceiling of even average levels of campaign expenditures.

6. Meaningful reform should shift the burden of certain campaign costs away from the candidate to the public treasury if they concern activities which affect all candidates equally and do not differentiate one candidate or campaign against another—e.g. voter registration, voter identification, etc.

7. Meaningful reform should place the highest importance in public disclosure and scrutiny as the method for spot-lighting and controlling financial excesses and improper influence. The purpose is to cultivate respect for the system and confidence if an informed electorate, rather than to impose arbitrary restrictions which risk forcing candidates and contributors to go around the law.

8. Meaningful reform should work toward eliminating the confusion, the inconsistency and the lack of pattern among local, state and federal jurisdictions. Simplicity, consistency, uniformity, and visibility and accountability should be the goals.

9. Meaningful reform should ensure that special interest groups, whether business, labor, religious, professional, educational or any other—(a) cannot exert influence beyond the number of their individual citizen participants and (b) are treated absolutely equal under the law so that any one interest group does not enjoy leverage greater than another.

10. Meaningful reform should provide for vigorous involvement of the two major par-

ties, but in no way inhibit the involvement of independent candidacies or additional party movements through inequities in financing and regulations.

11. Meaningful reform should not be a one-shot deal—but rather a bold first step with a permanent on-going mechanism for testing and implementing reforms as conditions continue to change.

V. SPECIFIC AREAS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORM

A. Drastically tighten reporting and disclosure requirements

1. There should be a required designation of one official consolidated committee for each candidacy for financial purposes—both income and expense. To avoid proliferation of committees, each candidate should be required to submit one consolidated committee financial statement regardless of how many groups may be working on his behalf and whether or not his candidacy is officially declared. The candidate and the chairman of each of these groups should be legally responsible for meeting this provision.

2. There should be regular reports by all official committees. Every committee including the official consolidated committee for each candidacy, should make annual and quarterly reports as well as a report 20 and 10 days before each primary and general election—and finally submit a complete record of income and expense within 30 days after election. The purpose here is to ensure that no income or expense is left unreported because they occurred before a candidacy was officially declared or after election day. Secondly, that certain reports are made prior to election day so as to provide the public with "before the fact" information upon which to judge the financial integrity of each candidate.

3. We must plug loopholes in financial reports. Reporting should include—in addition to cash accounting—further accounting for goods, services, loans, pledges or any other transaction which has a convertible financial value—even if it must be approximated.

4. We must eliminate any artificial distinction between the on-the-job finances of an incumbent which are used politically and his actual political campaign finances. Each incumbent should report any income and expense for the year not only for his campaign, but for executing his job over and above his statutory allowances. An incumbent could draw the line wherever he wished between on-the-job and campaign expenses. The public could then judge the entire picture—not just part of it.

5. We should eliminate any artificial distinction between candidate's personal and candidate's campaign finances. The official consolidated committee report for each candidacy should include that campaign-related income and expense which involves the personal income or expenses of the candidate himself.

6. We should require CPA audits for all candidacies, parties, committees, conventions, testimonials, etc. Just as a corporation or most legal enterprises are required to submit a financial audit by a CPA, this should be a requirement of all candidacies and other political enterprises as listed above. This audit should include sources and uses of funds, as well as assets and liabilities and should be required as an automatic part of every mandated report.

7. All candidates, parties, interest groups, and other political enterprises should be required to list the names and addresses of all contributors who, in the aggregate, have given over \$100.

8. All reports should be available to the public within two days after filing. One central reporting repository should be designated in each state and one should be designated for the federal government. The pub-

lic should have access at the designated repository to any report filed and should be notified as to which reports have not been filed. The designation of one repository in a state would eliminate the problem in a state like Michigan where many reports are required only at the county level, thus failing to provide a centralized, consolidated financial picture of a statewide or federal campaign anywhere in the state.

9. *The state and federal governments should assume the responsibility and cost of printing a public edition of all post-campaign final reports within 90 days after election.* This limited edition should be sent to all major newspapers and broadcast media.

10. *We should require reporting of campaign contributions by large contributors, individuals or groups.* In addition to requiring reports from those who accept contributions, we should also require reports from those who make them. Major contributors—as defined by any individual or group that contributes over \$1,000 in a calendar year to all political parties or candidates—should file one consolidated report listing the recipients, amounts, and dates of such contributions. This should be filed with the appropriate state and federal registry and certify that the donor is giving only his own money and not giving any other money through another person or group.

11. *Political parties should be subject to the same reporting requirements as interest groups and candidates.* Presently, political parties can abide by much less exacting reporting requirements than individual and interest groups and thereby can be a vehicle for loopholes.

B. Provide reasonable and equitable access to communications media

1. *We should repeal Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act requiring broadcasters to provide equal time to any and all major and minor candidates at any level of office.* The practical result of this act has been to discourage broadcasters from offering free time and coverage. Instead, Congress and the FCC should outline a policy which encourages broadcasters to exercise initiative in providing free time and coverage on an equitable and reasonable basis—leaving flexibility to the broadcaster to judge which candidates are so marginal as to not merit proportional coverage.

2. *All legitimate candidates should be assured fair, equal and adequate access to paid broadcast time.* This is a minimum condition.

3. *We should reduce the cost of broadcasting time through tax incentives or other methods of communication subsidy.* Increasing costs, especially TV, must not stand in the way of adequately informing the public about a legitimate candidacy or issues. Many methods have been proposed. One practical combination would be for broadcasters to sell time at the lowest commercial rate or some fraction thereof—for example, 50% of the lowest commercial rate. The cost to the broadcaster of this discount would be defrayed by allowing him a tax deduction equivalent to the amount of discount from the commercial rate. The provision of some basic amount of free broadcast time should be considered carefully. One big issue is who should bear the cost of free broadcast time—the broadcaster or the government (the public). Since there are many problems with either method, further study should be made as to how to best provide the incentives or the subsidies for some minimum amount of free time.

4. *We should recognize the extreme differences in broadcasting costs and coverage in*

different geographical and market areas. This is the biggest problem in the way of formulating a consistent policy involving political candidates and the broadcast media, for example, the difference between large metropolitan areas and small communities. A radio or TV station in a large metropolitan area may cover many constituencies and reach into several states. Whereas in a small community, a radio or TV station may only cover a fraction of one constituency. This problem of broadcast markets and their inconsistent relation to political constituencies must be studied further before a practical policy can be developed which will apply to all elections.

5. *We should make the U.S. mail accessible to all federal candidates—challengers as well as incumbents.* By providing what is the equivalent of a postal subsidy to each federal candidate, each could be allowed at least one piece of free (franked) mail to every resident of his constituency. The lopsided advantage of the incumbent will be somewhat reduced and fair competition to inform the voters will be enhanced.

6. *We should consider government subsidized political information brochures at the state and federal levels.* It would be possible for a state to provide equal space to federal and certain top level state candidates in political mailing to be sent to every household. Equal space could be offered to each candidate to be designed and utilized as he saw fit.

7. *We should explore the potential of public TV, educational TV and cable TV as media which in the future may offer vast opportunity for systematic and cost effective communication to localized political constituencies.*

C. Develop workable limits to curb excessive financial contributing and spending

1. *We should not impose arbitrary limits at the present time on total overall campaign expenditures.* The consensus among most experts on this subject is that overall limits are difficult to administer and may well be unenforceable. Or, they may result in driving certain campaign expenditures underground. These difficulties are compounded by extreme variations in the cost of campaigns in different types of districts. In addition, conditions are changing rapidly in different ways and at different rates throughout the country. Also campaign costs are going steadily up. We should be careful not to hastily set limits tied to some over simplified index which could not possibly apply equitably to all areas and elections. Instead Congress should commission a group to recommend a realistic and enforceable approach for limiting campaign expenses 2 to 4 years from now. These judgments must be based on more complete and sophisticated information than is available.

2. *We should repeal existing campaign expenditure limits for the House and Senate.* As previously mentioned, these anachronistic limits are at the heart of today's hypocrisy.

3. *We must strengthen public reporting and disclosure requirements.* Full disclosure and public scrutiny offer the best means of preventing and controlling excesses and abuses—at least until such time as workable limits can be developed. Even then, full disclosure should be the number one priority.

4. *Do not impose arbitrary limits on the broadcast media for similar reasons.* Attempts to limit one channel of communication may result in campaigns committing abuses and excesses through another channel, e.g. mail, billboards, telephones, etc. However, we should explore the feasibility of limiting the candidate who would use

television so excessively as to pre-empt the capacity of another candidate to communicate on television. In our desire to curb excesses on television, we should be careful not to dilute the extra-ordinarily positive potential that television offers as a media for informing the modern electorate.

5. *Develop realistic limits for contributions.* There is considerably more agreement between experts that the limits on contributions can be enforced, if at the same time other sources of income and methods of defraying campaign expenses are instituted. The degree of limitation is less important than the capacity to administer this limit and to live within it. There are various proposals for limits to individuals and groups contributing, e.g. \$2,000 to federal and statewide races, \$5,000 to the Presidential race and \$15,000 total to all elections within one calendar year.

6. *We should tighten the curbs on special interest groups.* Consideration should be given to either (a) the outright prohibition of any political contributions by any special interest group, or (b) requiring that every special interest group be subject to the same ground rules. Corporations, labor unions and all other special interest groups should be treated alike with respect to campaign contributions and involvement. Here again, the guiding principles should be that it is better to have a controlled and publicly visible participant, than it is to have an unrealistic prohibition that creates underground activity. To the extent that "political education affiliates" are a feasible alternative to outright prohibition from political participation then their membership, organization, financial participation, goods-service-manpower participation, should be entirely voluntary and independent from membership in the primary group. Every political action group should be subject to the full and stringent letter of revised reporting and disclosure laws. Present loopholes such as that allowing business partnerships to make political contributions, or that allowing testimonial dinners to escape the most stringent reporting requirements should be eliminated.

7. *Limit the personal funds that a candidate may contribute to his own campaign.* Set a realistic limit, such as \$25,000—or perhaps even considerably more—to prevent an extremely wealthy man from personally financing his campaign—allowing him an unfair advantage over an opponent who does not have such unique economic leverage.

D. Broaden the base of financial support

1. *Explore the feasibility of public subsidy as one part of the campaign financing mix.* Though most experts would agree that public subsidy is not practical or acceptable at this time, there is a growing interest in the potential of this method of financing in the future. The 2 biggest arguments in its favor are (a) it takes the pressure off private and special interest group influence and (b) it recognizes the political process as part of the general welfare which should be shared in by all citizens. The disadvantages to public subsidy are (a) the difficulty in equitably distributing and administering the subsidy (b) it's politically unacceptable at this time and (c) it is perceived by some as undermining the traditional American value of volunteerism and personal participation. In any case, the disadvantages seem to outweigh the advantages at this time. But if campaign costs continue their rapid rise, we will have to be prepared to think in terms of some partial method of subsidy at state and federal levels.

2. *Provide tax incentives for expanding citizen financial contributions—especially*

among the small givers. For example, allow a 50% tax credit on donations up to \$50. (\$25 maximum credit). A tax credit would be preferable over a tax deduction as the credit is more of an advantage to the low and moderate income givers while the deduction works more to the advantage of the upper income large donor. The purpose would be to greatly encourage direct, personal participation among as much expended part of the electorate so as to take the pressure off seeking and accepting large contributions. One method of administering this tax credit, while still keeping the involvement at the local level, has been suggested by many experts—it would involve the individual purchasing of political money orders through the local post office thus assuring records for the recipient, the contributor, and the government.

3. *Articulate governmental policy at the state and national level which would encourage non-political organizations of all kinds to engage in bipartisan political fundraising programs.* The cost of these programs could be a tax deductible expense. It is essential that individual participation in these original programs be entirely voluntary.

4. *Consider the possibility of a cash grant for legitimate major candidates in the election for President.* Although a grant of several million dollars to the campaigns of major presidential candidates would only partially subsidize their great expense, it would relieve the pressure on local fund-raising efforts and allow more of the money to be used in state and congressional campaigns where it is originally contributed.

E. Shift certain expenses from the candidates to Government

1. There are a range of costs in an election which result from activities which do not differentiate one candidate from another—for example, comprehensive voter registration; providing voter identification data to candidates and parties; the costs of disclosure, reporting, and auditing; the costs of providing basic information brochures on the candidates and issues. *Financial pressure on candidates could be reduced if all non-competitive expenses could be assumed by governments just as they now assume the costs of voting machines and certain election day activities.*

VI. ORGANIZING AND ENFORCING REFORM

We will not improve the current situation with good ideas alone. We need to organize and coordinate reform at local, state and federal levels and set up a mechanism for administering and enforcing these reforms without exception. We should take the following steps.

1. *Establish an independent, non-partisan, Federal Election Commission with full powers to administer and enforce campaign financing and reporting requirements and to organize an on-going process for evaluating, testing and recommending further reforms to the Congress.*

2. *Define policies, procedures and penalties for enforcement precisely, pinpointing responsibility for review, publication of abuses and violations, and enforcement.*

3. *Institute a management information systems task force under the Federal Election Commission to develop formats for reporting and disclosure—utilizing top experts in government, business and education.* These formats would be utilized by all candidates and reporting groups so that their data could be submitted in a form which is immediately useful for enforcement, for public understanding and for intelligently evaluating the need for additional reforms.

These formats should be as simple and as consistent as possible so that the data can be consolidated quickly within a given state and around the country, and so that disclosure can be made before the fact. . . .

4. *The Federal Elections Commission and the Congress should take whatever steps necessary to cause the 50 states to undertake reforms at the earliest possible time leading to a uniform and consistent pattern of election financing and reporting laws among federal, state and local jurisdictions.* Also, the Congress and the Federal Election Commission should recommend a model to the states which would create a much more uniform pattern of voter registration, voter identification, schedule of primaries and conventions and perhaps even the shortening of campaigns and reduction of the number of elected officials where appropriate. These reforms could vastly simplify and therefore help to reduce some of the expenses associated with campaigns. Federal subsidies and incentives should be available to those states which move in accord with an urgent and specified timetable.

VII. CONCLUSION

The need for reform has reached crisis proportions. There is no lack of good and effective approaches to reform. The missing ingredient is leadership. Congress must assume the leadership and in doing so has the opportunity to help renew our political system and to make it far more effective and responsive than it is now. At a time when our political institutions seem to be wallowing in ineffectiveness and when public confidence in the mechanism and men of government is at an all time low, Congress has no more urgent business than to face up to these reforms itself and to provide the national leadership for the 50 states to make concurrent reforms. There is no reason why this crucial act cannot begin right now and be boldly underway within a few months.

APPENDIX

Finally, I wish to include in the public record for committee consideration, a summary of the experience of Poole Broadcasting Company which is located in my Congressional district.

Poole, a privately operated station, has been vigorously pioneering to find economical ways that TV can help to bring candidates and the electorate into closer and better informed contact. Their experience, gained at their own initiative, should be shared with anyone considering the role of TV in elections, especially in campaign financing.

STATEMENT REGARDING POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS BY ALBERT J. GILLEN, PRESIDENT, POOLE BROADCASTING CO.

As operators of two VHF television stations in two cities—Flint, Michigan and Providence, Rhode Island—the Poole Broadcasting Company obviously is very concerned about meeting its responsibilities in presenting political candidates to its television audiences in both cities. It is and has been for some time the position of Poole Broadcasting that the public good would be best served through the following general procedures:

(1) There should be full public disclosure of the source of all political campaign funds to all politicians, both those who are successful in getting elected and those who are unsuccessful candidates.

(2) It is to the best interest of the public that political candidates should be best possible qualified candidates for any office, re-

gardless of race, sex, creed, color, religious affiliation or financial resources, and some equitable formula should be developed to assure that elected officials do not consist of just wealthy individuals.

(3) Since limitations on expenditures will necessitate regulations concerning where these expenditures are made, such regulations should apply to all advertising media or avenues of promotion and publicity, without exception. It is ridiculous to think in terms of the public interest being served to restrict political advertising in radio and television and find our newspapers, magazines and highways saturated with political advertising.

Over the past four election years the Poole Broadcasting Company has experimented with a number of ideas with the purpose of attempting to provide the public with additional information and exposure to those candidates running for political office.

(a) As a result of conversations with political parties, members of the general public and the League of Women Voters, in both its cities of license, Poole Broadcasting was convinced that an experiment should be attempted in offering a special political discount to those running for office. Over a period of a number of years, expressions from politicians indicated that they felt they were handicapped because they could not take advantage of large quantity discounts such as were available to large product advertisers and since campaigns were so short, political candidates could not take advantage of long term discount structures. Therefore, in the election year 1970, Poole Broadcasting Company instituted a special 25% discount applicable to political candidates only.

While it is difficult to report any long range results of this experiment, our conclusion is that as a result of the 25% discount, those political candidates who had already decided to advertise with specific budgets did so and, as a result, obtained more advertising time than they would have without the discount. Therefore, there was more exposure of the candidates to the public; hopefully, resulting in a more informed electorate. It is difficult to conclude whether or not there were political candidates who utilized television because of the discount who would not have used it without the discount.

(b) In the survey of community needs and interests in the Spring of 1970, done by WJRT-TV, Flint, there was feeling on the part of a number of community leaders surveyed that one of the community problems was the need for better people in the elected posts of county and city government.

In response to this need, WJRT-TV elected to make available to a large number of candidates television time and production facilities for the candidates to present their views on the issues to the voters. The specifics of this endeavor are as follows:

PRIMARY CAMPAIGN

An offer of five minutes of free time and production facilities to film the five minutes was extended to 149 candidates in a variety of races including Flint City Commissioners, Genesee County Commissioners, State Legislators in the Flint-Saginaw-Bay City area, U.S. Congressional candidates, U.S. Senate candidates and gubernatorial candidates. 112 candidates accepted our offer and their statements were aired during the 3-week period prior to the primary election. All candidates were asked to respond to questions drafted by the League of Women Voters. Each candidate was required to appear in his own behalf and if our free production facilities were used, was required to adhere to a set of procedures designed to facilitate ease of pro-

duction and uniformity of opportunity. The offer was extended to all candidates in a race even though there may have been a primary contest in only one party.

GENERAL ELECTION

For the general election we made the same offer to a slightly expanded list of contests and, as you would expect, a slightly contracted list of candidates. Specifically, 121 candidates were offered free time. 96 accepted and were aired. In the general election, prepared questions were not sent to the candidates; thus giving them more latitude in their use of the five minutes.

CONCLUSIONS

Playback received from candidates, political parties and the public in general, were all generally favorable. Lessons learned in the primary which caused revisions in the general election were minor, specifically, that the umbrella show in which the candidates 5-minute statements were presented, "Meet the Candidate," was limited to a maximum of one hour in length and was most frequently held to one-half hour, most of which ran in prime time. Secondly, all candidates for a given elective office were grouped together.

The political parties and the League of Women Voters were most helpful in encouraging candidates to accept the offer and take advantage of the free time. The League was of continued assistance in participating with the station in a variety of fairness judgments, such as which candidates should air in which time period and which candidates in a race should air in what order. These details were handled by lottery, with the station and the League jointly doing the drawing. The station, at no time during the primary or the general election, became aware of anyone feeling that they were treated less than fairly.

Indication is for the future that this program series was a needed public service and will be continued in future elections and probably extended to such events as off-time city elections in other cities covered by the station and possibly even as far as school board elections. This type of public service, although considerably more expensive in time, material and labor than other forms of public service, is well worth the cost.

(c) At its Providence station, Poole Broadcasting has attempted to set up debate situations so the public can actually see the political candidates in a face-to-face meeting, discussing the issues of the campaign. In 1970, WPRI-TV, Providence, offered seven one-half hour time periods and one one-hour time period to candidates for debates, with the time and production facilities being offered free by the station as a public service.

While this concept would appear to be an ideal format to best serve the public interest by providing the public with the best possible information about its political candidates the concept is fraught with many problems. In many cases it is impossible to get political candidates to agree to join in a debate. Evidently, there are numerous reasons why political candidates refuse to participate in debates and it is obvious that a television station is not in position of being able to do anything but cancel such a program when it finds itself without the full range of participants. It may perhaps be that sometime in the future the live debate will become an accepted vehicle by all political candidates and, if so, it is the opinion of Poole Broadcasting that this could well be the best possible manner in which to inform the public of the issues.

YOUTH—FULL PARTNERS IN A BETTER TOMORROW

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, a young man from Hesperia, Calif., wrote a memorable speech for an oratorical contest at the Optimist Club in which he was victorious. This fine young man, Scott Zalaha, is class president, editor of the school paper, a letterman in the major sports, and a member of the honor roll. I commend this speech to you not only as testimony to the fact that a majority of our youth are upstanding individuals, but for the perceptiveness and genuine intuitiveness that it displays.

I have spoken with Scott and been moved by his sincere desire to see that the generations strive to work together for a better America. With individuals such as he aspiring to leadership in the future, our country shall have nothing to fear.

The speech follows:

YOUTH—FULL PARTNERS IN A BETTER TOMORROW

(By Scott Zalaha)

The big question in my mind is, will there be a tomorrow for any partnerships? If the adults of today cannot or will not exercise their wisdom and influence over the youth as our forefathers have since the time of our inception—even since the time of Noah—I fear for the possibility of any future. The parents of today must start in the home to teach their children that there can be no partnerships without values and responsibility.

I, like any normal young person, would like to consider myself a partner in this society; but until I have attained some wisdom and experience, I can only expect to be a junior partner. When I have attained the best education possible to me and I have put into practice some of the wisdom and experience I have learned from my parents and other adults around me, I would like to think I have earned the right to be a full partner and then possibly a leader among men.

I do not feel our tomorrow is very secure as long as the adults, school administrators, government officials and the leaders of our communities, not only allow what appears to be total destruction of our learning institutions, moral standards and our system, but also seem to conform to the whims and desires of a small segment of the youth of today. In my opinion, the adults should set the examples for the youth to follow, instead of the adults following the fads and modes of that small segment of the youth of today. I find this is very true today and if this continues, what will be the distinction between the adults and youth?

In the years I have been in school, I've read and studied a limited amount of the history of our heritage—not only from history books but also from the basis of all heritages, the Bible. I have found our system based on parental guidance, respect for adults, teachers and law and order, very secure and satisfying. My appeal to the adults of our great nation is, please, don't let the youth become the senior partners but return to the role of advisor, example and even disciplinarian when

necessary. Our country and the world is constantly in a rotation of leadership. That is why it is absolutely necessary for the young people of today to plan for a better tomorrow, right now. It will soon be today's young people the eyes of the world will be turning to for answers and help. This is why it is also necessary to work as full partners. It will help make the paths brighter and the burdens just a little lighter. The reward of this is a decent and valuable society. Even a greater reward is a promise for a future in which to form new partnerships with the youth of another tomorrow.

One last thought which I have learned from a very dear, and I think wise, lady—my mother. At any time I begin to feel like a "know-it-all," she sits me down and explains to me that no matter how smart I become or how smart I think I am, she will always be wiser because she has lived some thirty years longer than I.

I think that I speak for the majority of the youth when I say simply this to the adult. Don't forget you are wiser than your children, you are wiser than the boy or girl next door, wiser than that student considering taking that drug, and even the real smart ones who burn down beautiful towns, banks and destroy our campuses. Recently the largest bank in America, the Bank of America, ran an ad in newspapers across the nation. I would like to quote a statement from this ad entitled "Violence in America," and I quote: "But all Americans, young and old, liberal and conservative, lose by violence."

All we ask is, please, preserve our todays so we can be assured the opportunity to join you in a better tomorrow.

In I Timothy 4:12 it states, and I quote: "Let no man despise thy youth, but be thou an example."

PRISONERS OF WAR—INHUMANITY OF HANOI GOVERNMENT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there has been furnished me by Gov. Maurice H. Thatcher—Canal Zone—and former Member of the House of Representatives, a timely, well-reasoned, and just editorial appearing in the Star & Herald of Panama on the 8th of December 1970 with respect to U.S. Prisoners of war held in Hanoi. The base, inhumane, and merciless treatment of our soldiers captured by the Vietcong armies in the Vietnam war is without parallel in civilized warfare.

The Star & Herald, established in 1849, has had a long and distinguished career. It was originally published in English and Spanish then, during the French effort to build the Panama Canal, was published in English, Spanish and French; and after the French quit the isthmus and the United States took over the building of the canal, it has been ever since published in English and Spanish.

The indicated editorial is as follows:

PRISONERS OF WAR

In his exchange of letters with Ho Chi Minh, shortly before the North Vietnamese

leader's death, President Nixon remarked on how difficult it is "to communicate meaningfully across the gulf of four years of war." Nothing proves the point more tragically than the inability of anyone to convey to the leadership in Hanoi the depth of the concern of people all over the world—and first of all in the United States—about the fate of prisoners of war in North Vietnamese hands.

This is a distinct issue that could easily be separated from the admittedly complex problems of military and political settlement of the war. The way to resolve it is plain and immediately at hand in President Nixon's call for an unconditional exchange of all prisoners on both sides. The numbers involved—some 35,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong held in the South, against some 5,000 Allied prisoners of war in communist hands—would even work to the advantage of Hanoi.

Yet North Vietnam has refused to yield an inch in this matter—even to the extent of refusing to publish an official list of the names of the men it holds and those it knows to be dead. This cruelty to the families of the prisoners is as pointless as it is heartless. Hanoi has likewise refused to abide by the Geneva conventions, to which it is a signatory, calling for inspection of prison camps—inspections that are made regularly by the International Committee of the Red Cross at camps in South Vietnam. And it has flatly rejected repeated appeals for mutual reparations.

If Hanoi simply does not care what people think about their handling of the prisoner issue, there is good reason to suppose they are not so unconcerned about their reputation in other quarters. Now adoption of a resolution in the United Nations calling for compliance with the Geneva convention concerning POWs has served warning that their stubbornness and callousness is costing them support and respect in many countries.

So far, however, there is still no evidence that either humanitarian concern or diplomatic disadvantage is likely to move Hanoi. The question remains: Why? The answer would seem to be that the North Vietnamese leaders think they can use American concern over the prisoners to blackmail the United States into ending the war on Hanoi's terms. If this is the case, then Hanoi better heed the United States' warning that efforts to use the prisoner of war issue in this way are "totally unacceptable".

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT,
NOVEMBER 1970

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the November 1970 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, NOVEMBER 1970

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of November was 2,880,346 as compared with 2,875,602 in the preceding month of October. This was a net increase of 4,744.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of November totaled 2,843,411. This was a net increase of 4,747 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of October. Employment by months in fiscal 1971, which began July 1, 1970, follows:

Month	Executive branch	Increase	Decrease
July 1970.....	1,942,517		-1,595
August.....	2,901,856		-40,661
September.....	2,851,875		-49,981
October.....	2,838,654		-13,211
November.....	2,843,411	+4,747	

Total employment in civilian agencies of the Executive Branch for the month of November was 1,681,353, an increase of 7,862 as compared with the October total of 1,673,491. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in November was 1,162,058, a decrease of 3,115 as compared with 1,165,173 in October.

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1969	November 1970	Estimated June 30, 1971 ¹
Agriculture.....	83,425	82,779	85,300
Commerce.....	25,364	27,564	26,700
Defense:			
Civil functions.....	31,214	29,747	31,000
Military functions.....	1,225,877	1,095,968	1,110,100
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	102,941	104,893	105,100
Housing and Urban Development.....	14,307	14,838	16,000
Interior.....	58,156	58,073	61,100
Justice.....	35,106	39,140	39,100
Labor.....	9,723	10,378	10,800
Post Office.....	562,381	567,309	585,000
State.....	24,658	23,312	23,400
Agency for International Development.....	15,753	14,030	14,400
Transportation.....	60,386	65,922	70,300
Treasury.....	79,982	86,827	93,500
Atomic Energy Commission.....	7,047	6,932	6,900
Civil Service Commission.....	4,970	5,214	5,500

Major agencies	June 1969	November 1970	Estimated June 30, 1971 ¹
General Services Administration.....	36,176	36,335	36,800
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	31,733	29,673	30,600
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	2,856	2,361	2,500
Panama Canal.....	14,731	14,473	14,900
Selective Service System.....	6,584	6,699	6,500
Small Business Administration.....	4,099	3,952	4,100
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	11,987	13,114	13,300
U.S. Information Agency.....	10,500	9,890	10,100
Veterans' Administration.....	147,605	149,862	150,200
All other agencies.....	26,200	27,702	28,900
Contingencies.....			15,000
Subtotal.....	2,633,762	2,526,987	2,597,200
Public service careers program.....		189	
Total.....	2,633,762	2,527,176	2,597,200

¹ Source: As projected in 1971 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

ERNEST PETINAUD

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, one rarely enters the House Restaurant without being warmly greeted by Ernest Peti-

naud, maitre d' of the House Restaurant and friend to all in Congress.

Yesterday was his 66th birthday and now is the perfect opportunity to express thanks to Ernest for 34 years of superb service and the touch of elegance he has contributed to the House. He has, over these years, made life more enjoyable, not only for thousands of Members of Congress, but also many friends and

The civilian agency of the Executive Branch reporting the largest increase during November was Post Office with 7,701 due to seasonal employment. Commerce Department reported the largest decrease with 1,309 due to the completion of a special census.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Army with 3,339 and the Navy with 888. The largest increase was reported by the Air Force with 1,458.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in November was 2,629,934, an increase of 5,586 as compared with October. Total employment outside the United States in November was 213,477, a decrease of 839 as compared with October.

The total of 2,843,411 civilian employees of the Executive Branch reported for the month of November 1970 includes 2,527,176 full time employees in permanent positions. This represents an increase of 800 in such employment from the preceding month of October. (See Table 2 of accompanying report.)

The Executive Branch employment total of 2,843,411 includes some foreign nationals employed abroad, but in addition there were 101,916 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during November who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in October was 102,037.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in the month of November totaled 29,959, a decrease of 53 as compared with the preceding month of October. Employment in the Judicial Branch in the month of November totaled 6,976, an increase of 50 as compared with October.

DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

The total of 2,880,346 reported by the Committee for October includes 18,629 disadvantaged persons employed under federal opportunity programs, an increase of 1,121 over the preceding month of October. (See Table 4 of the accompanying report.)

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation, excerpted from the Joint Committee report, on personnel employed full-time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during November 1970, showing comparisons with June 1969 and the budget estimates for June 1971:

visitors to the Capitol. He performs his duties with dignity and charm, constantly striving to maintain perfection. More valuable than his amazing ability to graciously host the dining room is his friendship which he so generously offers to many legislators. Often, it is a soothing word from Ernest that can calm or cheer a weary Congressman.

It has been my personal pleasure to

have known Ernest for 18 years. These have been 18 years in which nothing but consideration has been shown to me. I owe many happy moments to Ernest and I know that all in the House join with me in wishing Ernest Petinaud a very happy birthday.

CONGRESSIONAL RULES MUST BE CHANGED

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress has opened amid great and understandable concern about the need for the reform of a number of rules and practices governing the conduct of the Nation's legislative machinery. Already both parties have agreed to revise their rules so that seniority will not be the sole criterion for determining committee chairmen.

As one who supported this change I noted with great interest an editorial which appeared in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich., on Tuesday, January 19, 1971, entitled, "Congressional Rules Must be Changed" and I take the occasion on the first day of the new Congress to commend it to the attention of my colleagues so that these views may have the broader circulation that they deserve:

CONGRESSIONAL RULES MUST BE CHANGED

Reformation of Congress with a view to ending or modifying the seniority system and to make it more responsive to the will of the people and the needs of the times now is getting more than usual attention.

This is natural as the time is drawing near for the 92nd Congress to organize itself and go into its first session. This point is where the interest in revamping Congress reaches its peak and where action, if any, logically will be taken.

The subject is not new. Demands for reform, and particularly for junking the seniority system of electing committee chairmen and limiting the filibuster in the Senate have been recorded in history. The most noteworthy of these was a revolt against the unlimited power of the speaker of the House. Republican Speaker Joseph G. Cannon had so abused his power to control legislation and to name committee chairmen that a coalition of Democrats and liberal Republicans changed the rules in 1910.

The anti-Cannon revolt was a demonstration of the inherent strength of the system in that it showed a rebellion against a concentration of power in one man is possible.

A new rebellion may be in the works because many members of Congress feel that the seniority system makes the Congress a body not truly representative of the people who elect its members. The target is not one man, as in the case of the anti-Cannon move, but the seniority system, itself, and a few committee chairmen who seem to be abusing their individual powers.

The situation is unusual this year in that both parties have made studies of the seniority system and their committees will make recommendations to the party caucuses which will meet prior to the convening of Congress Jan. 21 and will take up the suggested reforms.

The study groups of both parties suggest that committee chairmen be selected by the caucuses and not necessarily on the basis of seniority. (In the case of the Republicans, the elections would be for "ranking member" of each committee inasmuch as the chairmanships automatically are held by the Democrats who control both houses of Congress.)

Thus the burden of making significant changes in the seniority system and getting rid of chairmen who have abused their position falls on the Democrats in Congress.

The changes will be resisted by powerful figures in both parties who see reform as a threat to their ability to influence Congress.

The rebels, if they may be called that, have a great deal going for them. They can point to horrible examples of committee chairmen who are not effective, who are senile, or are just plain arbitrary. Moreover, the public is more aware than ever of the weaknesses in the system.

The people, for example, are conscious of the domination of congressional committees in the House by representatives from rural districts, many of them in the South.

It is ironic, for example, that in this period when the plight of the cities is a matter of national concern, only six House chairmanships are held by representatives from urban districts, as compared with four from suburban areas and 11 from rural districts.

In the Senate, 10 of the 16 major chairmanships are held by southerners. Four come from the West, none from the Midwest and only two from the East.

This imbalance in the leadership of the Congress is due directly to the seniority system under which power naturally gravitates to members from "safe" districts, largely from one-party states.

The South may have lost the Civil War but it eventually won the Congress.

States which give life and meaning to popular government by the competition inherent in a strong two-party system pay a penalty for doing so by losing the right to a proper voice on congressional committees.

The need for reform becomes all the more acute in periods of stress and turmoil such as the United States is experiencing today.

The recipe for unrest, or even revolution, begins with a government which is unresponsive to the wants and needs of the people.

This is a time in which the cities, with their masses of people and pressing problems, and the new phenomenon which is Suburbia, with its growing pains, need to have a proper voice in the affairs of the Congress. At the very least, they need representation in positions of power in proportion to the numbers of people they serve. To put it another way, the "one man, one vote" principle is taking its worst beating in the organization of the United States Congress.

A few encouraging signs appear as parties approach the showdown on the seniority system. Liberal Democrats, including Michigan's Rep. John Conyers Jr. of Detroit, are speaking out boldly against what they call the "southern dictators." They are gaining attention by focusing their efforts on removal of three committee chairmen who are particularly bad examples of the system. They also are fighting to remove seniority rights from Mississippi representatives who did not run as regular Democrats but who expect to enjoy all the privileges of membership in the majority party.

This approach may be effective because it hits the system in its weakest points and dramatizes for the people the inequities which have endured through the years simply because the Congress did not choose to do what it must if it is to function properly and keep the respect of the people.

A \$25 TAX DEDUCTION FOR BLOOD DONATIONS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to give a \$25 tax deduction for blood donations. The bill is designed to provide the public with an added incentive to donate blood to nonprofit blood collecting organizations. I am pleased that 22 of my colleagues are cosponsoring the bill.

This winter the American Red Cross has experienced the greatest shortage of whole blood in its 22 year history of blood collection. One of the consequences of the shortage of voluntary donors is the proliferation of commercial blood banks providing on-the-spot cash to their suppliers. The money has attracted persons who do not meet minimal health standards, many being dope addicts and derelicts. Today the chances of contracting hepatitis from a transfusion of commercial blood is 10 times that of donated blood.

Blood has become a form of medicine, that is particularly important to the most sick patients in our hospitals. But patients in need of blood transfusions now face two dangers: the inavailability of blood and the infusion into hospital blood banks of hepatitis-contaminated blood.

My bill would improve both the quantity and quality of blood available to patients. Presently only 3 percent of the public donates blood through nonprofit organizations such as the Red Cross. If we can just increase this by 1 percent, the blood shortage problem will be eliminated. I believe that my bill, providing up to \$125 in deductions for an individual per year, for a maximum of 5 pints of blood would provide the necessary incentive to add the needed number of donors to the rolls. Most important, the incentive is directed at the blue and white collar workers who can benefit from a tax deduction at the end of the year and not to the derelict attracted to the commercial blood banks for a quick buck.

While most people view donating blood as a "charitable contribution" the Internal Revenue Service recognizes blood donations as a "service," which is not deductible, rather than "property" which is. While someone can take a tax deduction for a \$25 monetary contribution to the American Red Cross—perhaps the money he gained from selling his blood to a commercial blood bank—he cannot take a deduction for the pint of blood he gives to the American Red Cross. But I ask my colleagues, what greater personal property could a person give than his blood to save the life of another. For someone who is dying, a pint of blood is much more important than \$25 in cash donated to the American Red Cross.

The purpose of the charitable deduction provision in our tax code is to encourage contributions to nonprofit or-

ganizations serving the public's interest. Certainly donating blood contributes to the public welfare and is a practice that needs to be encouraged. There is no adequate synthetic substitute for blood. In addition to the transfusion of whole blood, a single pint of blood can be broken down so as to provide red cells for anemia or post surgery, white cells for leukemia victims, platelets for purpura sufferers, factor VII for hemophiliacs and plasma for burns and accident victims.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues, and I hope the Departments of HEW and Treasury will give this favorable consideration. At this time I would like to insert for printing in the RECORD a copy of the bill and a list of its cosponsors:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that blood donations shall be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended by redesignating subsection (i) and (j) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

"(1) BLOOD DONATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a donation by an individual of his own blood to an organization described in subsection (c) shall be considered to be a 'charitable contribution' of such individual in an amount equal to \$25 for each pint donated.

"(2) LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount of any individual's charitable contributions described in paragraph (1) which may be taken into account in determining the deduction allowed a taxpayer under this section for any taxable year shall not exceed \$125."

SEC. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income in the case of an individual) is amended by adding after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) the deduction allowed by section 170, to the extent attributable to charitable contributions of the type described in subsection (i) thereof."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to blood donated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Les Aspin, Democrat, of Wisconsin.
Jonathan B. Bingham, Democrat, of New York.
Frank J. Brasco, Democrat, of New York.
Jorge L. Córdova, Republican, of Puerto Rico.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat, of New York.
Don Edwards, Democrat, of California.
Hamilton Fish, Jr., Republican, of New York.
Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York.
Julia B. Hansen, Democrat, of Washington.
Michael Harrington, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
Henry Helstoski, Democrat, of New Jersey.
William L. Hungate, Democrat, of Missouri.
Edward I. Koch, Democrat, of New York.
Norman F. Lent, Republican, of New York.
Abner J. Mikva, Democrat, of Illinois.
James D. O'Hara, Democrat, of Michigan.
Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida.

Otis G. Pike, Democrat, of New York.
Charles B. Rangel, Democrat, of New York.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York.
James H. Scheuer, Democrat, of New York.
B. F. Sisk, Democrat, of California.
Jim Wright, Democrat, of Texas.

LEGISLATION TO END INDISCRIMINATE OCEAN DUMPING

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting, on this opening day of a new session of Congress, that we issue a loud and clear call to and on behalf of our countrymen to clean up and strive to protect forever our precious environment.

The wide variety of environmental bills introduced today by Members of the House indicates the growing national concern about pollution in all forms and is evidence of the determination of this body to meet this decade's most pressing problem.

I am particularly concerned with the increasing use of the oceans, gulf, Great Lakes, and other waters as the receptacle for chemicals, sewage, and garbage wastes along with other forms of pollution.

More than 70 percent of the earth's surface is covered by the oceans, using the term generally to include all major bodies of water. This vast area of water—some 140 million square miles—is critical in maintaining the world's environmental balance. The oceans affect our climate, the oxygen-carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere and they are of immense economic value to us as a source of minerals and food.

Pollutants are carried to the oceans through our waterways by vessels of all descriptions. They arrive by way of complex networks of pipelines. They are carried in the air only to filter or be washed down into the sea. And agricultural pollutants such as pesticides, animal wastes, and fertilizers also eventually reach the oceans.

There is accidental spillage of oil, sewage from vessels, and other forms of ocean pollution. However, the form of pollution that concerns us most is premeditated ocean dumping by industry and municipalities.

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

According to the President's Council on Environmental Quality, about 48 million tons of wastes were dumped at sea in 1968. These wastes included dredge spoils, industrial wastes, sewage sludge, construction and demolition debris, solid waste, explosives, chemical munitions, radioactive, and miscellaneous materials.

There are now at least 250 known official and unofficial disposal sites off U.S. coasts. Inforced sources say that number may well have doubled since most recent inventories. Half of the ocean dumping grounds are located off the Atlantic coast while the other half is divided almost evenly between the gulf and Pacific coasts.

That there is a clear trend toward increased use of the oceans as dumping grounds is undeniable. The volume of ocean dumpings is increasing rapidly. And this trend will undoubtedly accelerate as existing land-based disposal facilities and sites become more scarce and overburdened.

THE OBVIOUS DANGERS

I do not presume to be an authority on marine biology, though I am an avid student of this science. However, I do know that ocean pollution has already severely damaged the environment and will continue to do so at an increasing rate unless it is controlled now and eventually eliminated.

Pollution has already closed nearly one-fourth of the Nation's commercial shellfish beds; coastal swimming and other forms of recreation are already threatened—banned in some areas; thousands of square miles of ocean have been reduced to lifelessness by pollution and sport and commercial fishing is threatened.

There is no question that ocean dumping contributes to this serious problem and there is no question that something must be done now to stop it.

ALTERNATIVES TO OCEAN DUMPING

Naturally, to eliminate ocean dumping, there must be an alternative means and alternative places where waste materials can be disposed. And there are.

The mere fact that at present, less than 1 percent of our wastes are disposed of in the oceans, is proof that there are reasonable alternatives.

Let us face the truth. In this time of increasing consciousness by all Americans on the condition and appearance of our environment, the single main appeal of ocean dumping is that the United States currently has no jurisdiction to control it beyond the 3-mile limit. Those who advocate ocean dumping, for the most part, are those who would continue to sweep dirt under their carpet instead of applying their misguided ingenuity to use existing means of disposing of their wastes properly.

THE JURISDICTIONAL PROBLEM

Current regulatory activities and authorities are not sufficient to control ocean dumping. Though there are some controls over dumping within the 3-mile territorial sea, the most serious problem area is outside the jurisdictional limits of the States where there are no effective restraints or controls.

A number of bills on ocean dumping have been before the Members of the House. To my knowledge, none of them have offered an effective solution to the jurisdictional problem. Thus, no ocean dumping bill has been reported from the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The administration is on record as being opposed to ocean dumping as a long-range solution to the Nation's disposal problems. I am encouraged by reports that the President may support legislation aimed at curbing and eventually eliminating ocean pollution.

OCEAN DUMPING LEGISLATION

I am pleased to submit legislation today to control ocean dumping. This bill

comes to grips with the jurisdictional problem without tampering with the distance of the limits of our jurisdictional boundaries.

My measure establishes controls where we now have jurisdiction: Specifically at the loading docks and ports. To load any vessel with waste material intended for ocean dumping—a permit must first be obtained from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, which shall be charged with the responsibility of determining that each application for a permit considers the ecology of the marine environment.

This legislation also authorizes the Administrator to prohibit the loading, transporting or dumping of specific materials deemed damaging to the marine environment and it also empowers the Administrator to designate safe sites.

My legislation directs the Coast Guard to conduct surveillance and other enforcement activities and the bill provides stiff penalties for any violations. The text of my bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no owner or master of a vessel may load, or permit the loading of, any waste on such vessel while such vessel is in any port of the United States, if such waste is to be discharged in ocean waters, unless such owner or master first—

(1) obtains a permit from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Administrator") which authorizes the loading of such waste; and

(2) notifies the Coast Guard of such loading as prescribed in Section 3.

SEC. 2. (a) The Administrator shall issue to any owner or master of a vessel a permit authorizing the loading of waste on such vessel if the Administrator finds that the discharge of such waste in any ocean waters will not damage the ecology of the marine environment. In making any such finding, the Administrator shall consider the effect of such discharge on human health and welfare (including possible adverse effects on economic, recreational and aesthetic values) and on the marine ecosystem, taking into account the proposed location of such discharge and the concentration and volume of the waste to be discharged.

(b) In no event shall any permit be issued for the discharge of any waste whatever between the continental shelf and the coast of the United States.

(c) The Administrator shall have the authority to ban the loading, transporting and damaging to the marine environment or to human health and welfare.

(d) The Administrator shall have the authority to designate ocean dumping sites.

(e) Each permit issued under subsection (a) shall specify—

(1) the amount and type of waste authorized to be loaded and discharged;

(2) the exact coordinates of the location at which such discharge is permitted and a statement of the route to that location;

(3) such provisions as the Administrator deems necessary to insure that such waste will be transported to the discharge site without accidental spillage or leakage; and

(4) such other provisions as the Administrator deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Any owner or master of a vessel who is issued a permit under section 2 must notify the Coast Guard and the Army Corps of Engineers of the exact location where the waste covered by such permit is

to be discharged. Such notification must be given to the Coast Guard and the Army Corps of Engineers in such manner as the Administrator of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall prescribe and not later than four hours before the departure of the vessel.

(b) The Administrator of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall conduct surveillance and other appropriate enforcement activity to prevent violations of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) Any owner or master of a vessel who violates the first section of this Act or who violates any provision of a permit issued under section 2 of this Act shall be liable to a civil penalty of not more than \$50,000 for the first violation, and not more than \$100,000 for each subsequent violation. No penalty shall be assessed until the person charged shall have been given notice and an opportunity for a public hearing on such charge. Upon failure of an offending party to pay the penalty, the Administrator may request the Attorney General to commence an action in the appropriate district court of the United States for such relief as may be appropriate.

(b) A vessel, other than a vessel owned or bargeboat chartered by the United States, or other property used in a violation shall be liable in rem for any civil penalty assessed under this section and may be proceeded against in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof.

SEC. 5. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "discharge" means to place, release, discharge, or by any means whatsoever to dispose, of waste in ocean waters.

(2) The term "master" includes any person acting in the capacity of a master.

(3) The term "ocean waters" means any estuarine area, coastal waters, Great Lakes, territorial waters, and the high seas adjacent to the territorial waters.

(4) The term "owner" includes any private individual or corporate owner and any public owner, whether a department, agency, or instrumentality of a State or a political subdivision thereof, of an interstate governmental entity, or of the Federal Government.

(5) The term "United States" means the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa.

(6) The term "vessel" includes any vessel scow, or boat, whether or not documented under the laws of the United States, capable of being used to transport waste in ocean waters.

(7) The term "waste" means matter of any kind or description, including, but not limited to, dredge spoil, spill waste, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical, biological and radiological warfare agents, radioactive materials, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt, and industrial wastes.

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect immediately upon final passage as provided by law.

SEC. 7. On and after the effective date of this Act, any license, permit, or authorization issued by any officer or employee of the United States under the authority of any other provision of law shall be terminated and be of no effect whatsoever to the extent that such license, permit, or authorization authorizes any activity to which this Act applies.

I am inviting all Members of the House to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

I am also calling upon the Governors, the attorneys general, and the legislatures of all of the States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and all tributaries leading thereto to enact this legislation adjusted to their jurisdiction as a matter of State law so that there will be a heavy

surveillance over the loading, transporting, and dumping of any kind of polluting material that may pollute the rivers, bays, and harbors of the United States and all of the waters surrounding the Nation.

JOB MATCHING BY COMPUTERS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the increasing numbers of job seekers and job opportunities in our Nation pose the complex task of efficiently matching applicants and jobs.

The U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration has developed four computerized job matching systems which are in operation in several cities. These programs, however, are still developmental with many unsolved problems.

For the information of my colleagues, I am including the following article from the November 1970 issue of Manpower. It comprehensively discusses the state of this art as well as future plans for job matching by computer:

COMPUTER JOB MATCHING HOW AND HOW WELL
(By George P. Huber and Joseph C. Ullman)

The 1970 Manpower Report of the President notes that improved labor market information, by facilitating faster and better matches between jobs and workers, can reduce unemployment. The implications of the continuing efforts of the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration to modernize job placement through the use of automatic data processing techniques, however, go far beyond unemployment statistics. Computerized job matching, whatever final form it takes will have a substantial impact on employers and jobseekers—particularly the disadvantaged—as well as on the operations of the various State employment services.

To develop a national computer-aided job-matching network, the Manpower Administration undertook two major tasks. The first was the rapid and widespread deployment of a system of job banks. Job banks are not very sophisticated technologically, which made them particularly attractive as a means for making a start on job-matching systems.

BALTIMORE STARTS JOB BANK

The second task was to develop and implement several types of fully computerized matching systems so actual operating experience would be available to help determine the nature of the eventual nationwide system. Since the fully computerized system will be very sophisticated, and quite expensive, this task was envisioned as more long-range in nature.

The job bank concept was developed by the Maryland Department of Employment Security early in 1968, and the Baltimore Job Bank became operational in May of that year. The Job bank does not use the computer to match people with jobs or training slots. Rather, it uses the computer to record and store brief descriptions of all job openings known to the employment service in the area.

Each evening filled jobs are deleted, new openings received are added, and the updated list is printed out in the form of a job bank book, copied, and distributed early the following morning to all counselors and placement interviewers in the employment

service and cooperating community agencies. To avoid referring more applicants for a job than are desired by the employer and to keep from sending applicants to recently filled jobs, a central telephone order control unit is included in the job bank system.

As developed in Maryland, the job bank involved a fairly drastic reorganization of employment service placement operations. Previously, placement interviewers both received and filled orders and usually specialized in particular occupations or industries. Now, almost all job orders are taken by a central unit whose members do not specialize in any way or make referrals. Referrals are made by placement interviewers who also do not specialize and who do not take job orders. Further, the Maryland Employment Service did not previously share job openings with other employment-oriented nonprofit community agencies. Now, all employment service job orders are made available to these agencies by means of the job bank book.

MANY VARIATIONS PROPOSED

A third change in employment service organization usually associated with implementation of a job bank is the stationing of more placement interviewers in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Outstationing of interviewers is much more feasible now because the job bank book gives them up-to-date data on all jobs listed in the system, something that was not possible before.

Several advantages are claimed for the Baltimore Job Bank. Some of these, such as the potential for better management control associated with automatic data processing systems are inarguable. Others, such as an increase in job orders and in placement of disadvantaged persons, definitely occurred in Baltimore, but may or may not be attributable primarily to the job bank. Detailed before-and-after studies are being conducted in all cities where there are or will be job banks to determine whether their results are similar to Baltimore's.

The Labor Department plans to install job banks in 76 of the Nation's largest cities by December 31, 1970, and as of September 1 of this year 46 were operating.

In negotiating with the Department of Labor over the specific form for their job banks, the individual State employment security agencies have proposed many variations on the Baltimore model. Some of these variations are mechanical—for example, publishing job orders on microfilm and using viewers rather than printing the orders in book form. Others are organizational—such as retaining some specialization of placement interviewers, rather than using the every-man-a-generalist approach taken in Baltimore.

Generally, the Labor Department has encouraged local variations, although three conditions have been required in the earlier group of job banks. First, order taking and placement interviewing cannot be done by the same individual. The purpose of this caveat is to prevent "pocketing" by the interviewers, that is, keeping a personal inventory of openings.

Second, all job banks must provide for participation of community agencies. This coordinates community efforts to develop jobs for the disadvantaged and relieves employers of making multiple contacts with agencies serving the same applicant population.

Third, each State agency must create a manpower-data processing systems team in connection with its job bank. This is to assure that each agency will acquire the staff needed for subsequent development and implementation of a fully computerized matching system.

In the initial stage, all of the present job banks were urban and local in scope. However, some subsequently have expanded

geographically, and others have plans for expansion. The Baltimore Job Bank now includes Westminster, Annapolis, Bel Air, and Elkton, extending to the Pennsylvania and Delaware borders. Connecticut and Rhode Island are implementing statewide job banks, as will several other States.

INTERSTATE LISTINGS USED

In addition, despite the traditional insularity of State employment security agencies, several interstate job banks are already established. The Washington, D.C. Job Bank includes local offices of the Virginia, Maryland, and District of Columbia agencies, and the St. Louis Job Bank includes Missouri and Illinois offices, which are in different Manpower Administration regions as well as in different States.

It is probable that the computers of most job banks eventually will be able to communicate with each other, although the mode of communication has not yet been determined. In professional, technical, and managerial occupations at least, in which the job market is national, it would be desirable to provide quick exposure of openings throughout a large geographic area without significant delay for search within the local area. In all occupations and cities, it would on occasion be desirable to obtain prompt information about jobs outside the area. Much experimentation needs to be done to exploit the full potential intra-area dissemination of job bank openings.

Job banks do not make full use of the capabilities of the modern computer. One key capability not exploited is the computer's ability to process information at tremendous speed and consequently to consider many more possible matches than an interviewer can in a manual or job bank system. Fully computerized systems enable the interviewer rapidly and reliably to retrieve all job orders or applications which possess any desired combination of characteristics.

FOUR SYSTEMS BEING TESTED

If an interviewer in a large city had only a job bank at his disposal, it would be impractical for him to identify, for example, all of the \$2.00-per-hour night-shift job openings not requiring a high school education and located within a certain area, because he would manually have to page through a thick book. With fully computerized system, such customized searches of the entire order or applicant file can be conducted in milliseconds.

The Manpower Administration has underway or in the development stage four fully computerized experimental matching systems. Each is in a different State, and each is technologically and operationally different from the others. Before describing the various systems, it would be useful to discuss briefly some of the significant technological and operational alternatives being examined.

In the conventional manual employment service operation, both workers and jobs are classified by occupation with the six- or nine-digit numerical codes contained in the Department of Labor's Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT). Such a classification has been necessary in a manual operation, and to lesser degree in job bank system, for interviewers to retrieve applications and job orders efficiently. The disadvantage of classification is that information is lost because no two workers or jobs are identical, even though they might be identically classified.

Because computers can rapidly conduct searches for alternatives with unique combinations of characteristics, it is possible simply to describe workers and jobs with appropriate words (called descriptors), and to have the computer identify those worker-job pairs in which the worker descriptors

match the descriptors of the job. This approach avoids classification and its associated information loss.

The above argument suggests that descriptor systems are to be preferred to classification systems. However, this is not necessarily the case. Classification systems require less computer storage and processing time and facilitate the retrieval and reporting of management and labor market information.

The choice facing the Manpower Administration is much more complex than the simple decision to use a classification or a descriptor approach. There are many possible classification approaches and a variety of descriptor vocabularies, as well as numerous possible combinations of the two systems. Further, there are various methods of measuring how well worker and job are matched, whatever basic approach is used. The problem of choosing among the various possibilities is complicated by the fact that the employment service must serve workers and jobs covering the entire occupational spectrum.

Another difference among matching systems is the time it takes for the employment service to respond to the initial contact by a worker or employer. In the manual operation, response time usually is a matter of minutes, although the search conducted by the interviewer going through his part of the local office orders is not as wide-ranging as that done by a computer with access to all orders in a State. Thus, in the manual operation, clients receive essentially "real-time" service, although often it is only one-time service because repeated searches are not conducted automatically.

Through so-called "batch processing," a computerized matching system can compare applicants and openings every night, after newly received applications and job orders have been added, and print out the results the next morning for use by the interviewers. This technique broadens the search over that of the manual approach, and assures repeated, continuous service. However, batch processing means delayed service, which may be relatively unimportant to some workers or employers but a serious matter to others.

An alternative approach would be to give order takers and placement interviewers direct access to the computer, and permit them to enter applications and job orders in the system immediately and to conduct immediate searches. This "on-line" processing approach requires a great many communications terminals, and operating costs in a medium-sized State easily could be \$500,000 a year more than a manual system and, in terms of hardware, perhaps double the cost of a batch-processing system. In addition, there are difficulties in maintaining the files of such a system.

Again, the alternatives facing the Manpower Administration are much more complex than the simple choice between batch and on-line processing. There are many possible approaches to both types of processing as well as combinations of the two. And it is unlikely that any one approach will be best in every area because, to some extent, the choice is a function of population, industrial structure, and other variable factors.

TEST SYSTEMS DESCRIBED

The technological and operational questions discussed above only illustrate the many problems to be considered in designing a national computer-aided job-matching network. An exhaustive analysis of the many issues and alternatives is beyond the scope of this article. However, other relatively important issues include: (1) Weighing the relative importance of the various stipulated requirements of employers or applicants; (2) disseminating information in a more direct manner, such as mailing lists of matches or

pairings directly to employers or workers; (3) developing better classification or descriptor systems for matching workers without occupational skills with appropriate job openings or training programs; and (4) using high ratios of interviews to search terminals versus using low ratios.

The four fully computerized matching systems now being tested in California, Utah, Wisconsin, and New York serve a dual role: Providing operating experience which will allow the Manpower Administration to make better decisions about the nature of the national network, and serving workers and employers in their respective States.

Work on the California Labor Inventory Communications System began in 1962. The initial work involved using the DOT classification system, and an uncontrolled descriptor vocabulary (any word may be used as a descriptor). Since the summer of 1966, California has focused on developing and gradually implementing a batch-processing, descriptor-based system with a controlled vocabulary (only specified words may be used as descriptors). There are no real-time referrals, and batch-processing results are available within 8 working hours. Since January 1970 the system has been the exclusive mechanism for making placements in the San Francisco Professional Office, and since February 1970 it has been used to make over a third of the placements in the Los Angeles Professional Office.

Development of the Utah system began in the summer of 1966, and it was implemented statewide in January 1969. Both on-line and batch processing is used, and searches are based primarily on the traditional DOT classification system. The system has a high ratio of interviewers to communications terminals, and while searches are conducted in real-time, job orders and applications are entered on the computer memory in batch form.

Development of the Wisconsin system began in 1966. It was implemented for one occupational class in one local office in March 1970 and by August was serving the entire occupational spectrum in the Madison local offices. Orders and applications are entered, and searches conducted, on-line. The system attempts to obtain the advantages of both classification and descriptor approaches. It relies primarily on a classification scheme different from that in New York and Utah, but supplements this with descriptors from an uncontrolled vocabulary. It has a low ratio of interviewers to communications terminals.

Since the fall of 1967, New York has been developing an on-line processing, applicant-oriented matching system. The first phase of the system is classification-based, although descriptors will be added at a later date. Now operating in four New York City local offices, the system is specifically designed to serve disadvantaged applicants; it does not conduct searches on behalf of job orders, and it uses elaborate weighting and cross-indexing techniques to enhance the ability of classification schemes to make useful matches.

The choice of design and the pace at which fully computerized systems are implemented are important issues. Rapid implementation based on present knowledge may be extremely wasteful, because such systems would be quite inferior to those available a few years hence. On the other hand, it is possible that systems based on present knowledge may speed the placement of workers and improve the quality of placements. Thus, delayed implementation may be wasteful in the sense of lost opportunity.

ACCESS TO MORE OPENINGS

Present plans call for continued evaluation and development in a phased progression from the Baltimore-type job bank to more fully computerized systems. These plans

represent a considered compromise between the most rapid possible implementation and a desire to install the most efficient systems.

It is not now possible to assess completely the effects of computer-aided matching systems on the employment service and its clients. However, some inferences can be drawn concerning the probable effects of these programs by considering the impact of present and planned systems on job market information.

A major advantage of the job bank to the worker is the greatly increased number of openings to which he has access. A related advantage to the employer is the increased number of workers to which his opening is exposed. The increase over the conventional manual operation in the number of jobs listed and the exposure they receive was a major factor in the decision to expand rapidly the job bank program. However, the usefulness and impact of this increase is open to some argument, and a variety of evidence must be gathered before any firm conclusions can be drawn. As noted earlier, such evidence is being obtained.

One argument which suggests that the increase is limited in its usefulness is that in the manual employment service operation all job market information of a particular kind is handled within one office. For example, all accountant applications and openings are routed through the Professional and Commercial Office. A local job bank is unlikely to improve significantly the number or exposure of accountant listings, because the type of job openings or workers known to offices other than the Professional Office are unlikely to be of interest to accountants or their employers.

DATA POTENTIAL UNREALIZED

Another argument suggests that increases in the number and exposure of openings is of limited use at the lower end of the occupational spectrum. In a loose job market, an employer with openings in relatively unskilled occupations usually can fill them by having them exposed through a single employment service office, so listing in a job bank book may not be particularly advantageous. Conversely, in a very tight job market, an applicant searching for a relatively unskilled job may not need any more information than that which is available in a single local office.

Finally, in markets in which the employment service does not have good penetration, the total number of openings available to applicants may not be very large, regardless of how widely the listings are disseminated.

Job banks do not directly affect the amount of detail included in local job market information available through the employment service. Information about openings contained in job bank descriptions is essentially the same as the information on a conventional job order.

In practice, workers and placement interviewers now get less detailed information from job banks than they do under the conventional arrangement in which interviewers both take job orders and make referrals in particular occupations or industries. The order taker-placement interviewer who specializes often has detailed information about the requirements of a job or employer that is not contained on the job order. Thus, he may be better able to match workers and openings than the job bank placement interviewer with his less detailed information.

Considering both the number of openings listed and the amount of data available on them, it appears that, on balance, local job banks improve the job market information to most workers. For the least skilled, especially, the loss of detailed information associated with the job bank probably is not of great importance when weighed against the large increase in the number of openings. However, for the skilled worker or for the

employer, a local job bank offers little or no improvement in job market information.

Job banks appear to have the potential to make much greater improvements in job market information than they have so far. First, lack of detail of job bank data can be mitigated in several ways. The simplest approach is to add data to the job order. Beyond this, master job orders and master employer records could be developed to provide additional information to placement interviewers. (Master job orders are detailed reference copies of orders placed repeatedly by particular employers. Master employer records contain information concerning specific firms that is useful for an interviewer in making referrals or in job development.) Further, it is possible to retain some degree of specialization of order takers and interviewers without destroying the basic job bank idea.

Second, intercity job banks will increase the number and exposure of listings in highly skilled occupations, as local job banks have in less-skilled jobs. Because of the tight labor markets typical in skilled occupations, employers as well as workers will benefit from this broader dissemination of information.

Third, job bank books could be useful in providing up-to-date information about job markets to persons far removed from the job bank cities. For example, students in rural high schools could make much better decisions concerning migration, and would waste less time searching randomly, if they had access to current job bank books from nearby cities. The possible use of job bank data to influence migration flows is an intriguing area for study.

Finally, job banks have the ability to provide job market information quickly in response to ad hoc needs. Some innovative uses of this capability have already been tried. A high school counselor has a job bank book printed out by educational requirements of the jobs, and uses the book to show students the difference in job opportunities available to graduates and dropouts.

Fully computerized systems will be able to provide more data than is available in any present job market information system. They have two major advantages over job banks in regard to job market information. First, worker data as well as job opening data are included. Second, information collected for use in these systems must be very detailed, compared to a system in which the interviewer provides part of the placement-related information. Thus, detailed information about large numbers of applicants and jobs will be carried in the computer, and can be quickly retrieved.

MAJOR GAINS STILL AHEAD

Although the discussion in this article has focused on the matching of workers and jobs, fully computerized systems also will enhance other aspects of employment service operations. Computer technology can be used to speed and improve the assessment of workers and jobs. And better assessment will have payoffs in counseling as well as in placement. It also is planned to use computers to help develop jobs and training opportunities for persons for whom no openings exist in the files. For example, plans are being made to create a computerized "job opportunities bank" which will contain job leads rather than openings. Applicants will be matched against these leads for job development purposes.

All of the fully computerized systems are still developmental, and many design problems remain to be solved before they can significantly affect employment service operations. The continuing development of such systems will help the employment service move toward a national job-matching network. The number and magnitude of unresolved problems suggest, however, that the major gains from computerization still lie in the future.

AEROSPACE AND THE COMMON GOOD

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles M. Kearns, Jr., vice president for research, United Aircraft Corp., in a recent speech before the Hartford, Conn., Rotary Club, discussed the importance of science and technology in the aerospace industry and its important contributions to the quality of life. Because of the importance of Mr. Kearns' discussion I am including in the RECORD an excerpt of that speech which appeared in the Aviation Week & Space Technology on January 18, 1971. As the Congress considers the fiscal year 1972 NASA authorization it seems important to keep in mind Mr. Kearns' comments since much of our future progress in technology depends on the continuing contributions of our aerospace industry in a strong national space program. The article follows:

AEROSPACE AND THE COMMON GOOD

Critics of our current way of life level two broad charges against science and technology. The first implies that some unholy alliance loosely decried as the military-industrial complex exists which diverts the energies of the country to its defense at the expense of the common good.

The second charge is that the very prosperity of the country depends upon a technologically based system of industry and agriculture which by its nature deteriorates the environment. Further, they say, any attempt to change this situation will have serious social and economic consequences.

I am principally interested in the second of these two charges today. But before going on to it, I must state my own conviction clearly and unequivocally with regard to technology and defense.

History has shown repeatedly and, in fact, inevitably that the nation which permits itself to become weak has been overrun and swallowed by those competitive groups which have seen to their defensive capabilities, which have kept their armor polished and their weapons modernized.

Whether we like it or not, defense and technology are inexorably related. In the Second World War, the Polish cavalry—dedicated, daring and heroic though it was—was no match for the German Panzer.

We are confronted in the world today with conflicting ideologies. Unless we keep ourselves strong, they will replace our values with theirs.

In our country, thanks to the vision of our leaders, the support of our citizenry, and the dedication of our industrialists, scientists, engineers, technicians and craftsmen, we have created a body of technological expertise and teams of well-trained specialists which together make us able to defend our way of life against any outside aggressor. And, the aerospace industry is the single largest bank of engineers and scientists in the country.

Let me return to the second charge—that advancing technology and an improving quality of life are mutually exclusive.

Certainly, the pollution of our atmosphere, our water and our landscape cannot be permitted to persist. Obviously, something must be done about the congestion of our roadways and every effort must be made to reduce the noise level which surrounds us.

If we stand back and observe these problems we can see they arise from increasing

population density and affluence as much as anything else. As Walt Kelly's cartoon strip character, Pogo, says, "We have met the enemy and he is us."

There is a major question, though, as to which way to go. Increasingly there are voices being heard which say: Let's suppress technology and let's suppress those people who create new technology. The internationally famous city planner Constantinos Doxiadis was asked: Can we not save the situation by stopping the growth of human settlement? To which he answered: "First we must close all of our research institutes and universities and in addition kill our trained engineers, because if we let them survive, they will create new institutes, go ahead with research and develop new technology." Today, we are aware of social and other human problems, and we can solve these problems in a better way now than in the past. There is no reason, as Doxiadis says, that a great City of Man should not have all of the good qualities which we have learned since.

Consider, if you will, that the single most important characteristic which has brought man to his unique position among animals has been his ability to use the natural resources around him to his own advantage. The history of technology traces the gradual evolution of this capability, which has found its most fruitful flowering in the United States.

Although it has only 6% of the world's population, the United States generates and consumes over one third of the inanimate energy working for man's benefit. In spite of the sneers of some, we all bathe generously in the benefits—benefits which are the envy, and the ultimate objective, of the rest of the world.

I won't stand here today and claim that I have the solutions to our many problems or that these solutions will all come from the aerospace industry. What I would like to do, however, is to suggest that our aerospace industry has been a significant contributor to the quality of our life, and that it can make even greater contributions in the times ahead.

A better quality of life is desirable through abundant energy, better and more abundant food, more adequate medical care, better education for more people, better transportation, better housing for more people. There can be no argument of that. Just as technology has enabled us to make great strides towards these objectives, so it can also be applied to control, minimize and eliminate undesirable byproducts.

A NEW PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, after reading a recent magazine article, Mrs. Jane Mercure's eighth-grade English class at Woodrow Wilson Junior High School in Moline, Ill., prepared their original rewritten Pledge of Allegiance. It is a heartwarming expression of their bright love for our country and a wonderful example of what young people really feel for this Nation. In order that I might share it with my colleagues, I am including it as follows:

OUR PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

We pledge our trust in God for the peace and tranquility of our country, that we may defend our nation from enemies within and without, and do what is needed to keep our country as our forefathers made it. For God gave us this land free; let us keep it free.

BONN-MOSCOW TREATY

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, Dr. Dennis Bark, of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, delivered an outstanding address to the Commonwealth Club of California regarding the treaty between Bonn and Moscow of August 1970.

This speech is especially important because Dr. Bark is one of the outstanding Berlin scholars of the country. He received his doctorate at the Free University of Berlin and shortly will have the honor of having a book, based upon his doctoral dissertation, published by Berlin's Historical Commission.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Bark was the first person, to my knowledge, to publicly point out the weaknesses of this much-publicized treaty of August 1970. The address follows:

CHANGING EAST-WEST RELATIONS IN EUROPE—THE BONN-MOSCOW TREATY OF AUGUST 1970

(By Dennis L. Bark, research fellow, Hoover Institution)

Thank you very much Mr. Dalton for your kind introduction. I am also very grateful for the kindnesses of my good friends Mr. Garfield Merner and Prof. Edgar E. Robinson, and other members of the Commonwealth Club of California, all of whom have given me a very warm welcome to San Francisco after four years in Berlin.

Mr. Buserud and gentlemen: I am very pleased and honored to have been invited to address your luncheon on the subject of changing East-West relations in Europe, as they arise from the Bonn-Moscow treaty.

Both fantasy and fact are involved in the general reaction to this extraordinary pact. To some it seems a longed-for dream come true, that is to say a reconciliation with the Soviet Union. To others, for various reasons, the treaty appears to be a source of concern and even alarm. This difference of opinion is certainly in no way surprising. Many men of good will in the West have high hopes and ideals, and with respect to this crucial problem between the West and the Soviet Union, they have clung to these hopes and ideals for a very long time. This matter of time is a substantial part of the reason, I believe, why some have not greeted this treaty with unmixed jubilation. Perhaps they are wary of the claims made by the treaty's proponents that détente has now so suddenly been achieved on such vexing and long standing problems.

Why this should be so is the subject of my remarks this afternoon. The questions really are: Have the problems been solved? Or have they merely been discounted? If they have been solved, to whose satisfaction? The question is not whether to negotiate with the Soviet Union, but how to negotiate with the Soviet Union.

The Bonn-Moscow treaty was concluded on August 12, 1970. And even though the treaty has not yet been ratified by the West German parliament, is being written and spoken about as existing in fact. Indeed, there is every likelihood that the treaty will be ratified, if only because the pressure of world opinion would make its defeat appear as a cold war tactic of the West.

It is said that since the conclusion of the Bonn-Moscow treaty, the political mood in Europe has changed. We are told that the Age of cold war has been replaced with the

Age of détente. The coalition government in Bonn, under the Socialist Chancellor Willy Brandt, claims to be conducting a policy of "understanding" with the Soviet Union; a policy based on the mutual recognition of the existing realities in Europe. The political and economic realities in Europe are now, at long last, being recognized, or so it is said. The curtain of ideology is being raised, and peaceful coexistence has finally scored a victory.

I am not at all sure that all the realities existing in Europe today are being recognized, either in Bonn or in Moscow. Experience teaches us that West Germany has concluded a treaty with the Soviet Union, which (1) will be honored by Moscow only as long as the treaty is compatible with the short, and long term goals of Soviet policy; (2) which aims at consolidating the Soviet power position in Eastern Europe; and (3) which has given West Germany not a single concession on any major European problem. This is a strong statement, but I believe it is justified on the basis of the record.

The five articles of the treaty itself are relatively simple: The two parties affirm their desire "to maintain international peace and achieve détente." They agree to further "normalisation" in Europe, in accordance with "the actual situation existing" on the continent. Both parties resolve "to refrain from the threat or use of force," in all matters affecting international or European security, as well as in their mutual relations. They pledge "to respect without restriction, the territorial integrity of all states in Europe within their present frontiers," which are declared to be inviolable. Two borders are, however, specified by name and I must recur to them later. Both sides agree to promote economic relations as well as scientific, technological and cultural contacts.

Both Bonn and Moscow have solemnly voiced their conviction that the treaty will (1) contribute to European security, (2) contribute to the solution of existing problems on the continent, and (3) work toward peaceful cooperation between all European states. This sounds fine! But it reminds us of the scores of bilateral treaties with Czechoslovakia, for example, or with Poland, or with Hungary, that the Soviet Union has violated unilaterally. And it calls up the image of hands across the walls of a divided city. Amid the clamor that West Germany has chosen a path of normalization, the perspective is becoming blurred. Indeed, the easiest way to misinterpret a political document, is to confine the analysis to its text. It would be wise to look not only at the text, but at the motives behind this widely acclaimed détente. All the realities involved must be considered, not just those leading to a specific interpretation. It is the equivocalists who make analyses of political events interesting—and sometimes dangerous. But in the Christmas rush to buy political facts on a selective basis, the realities of the New Year are likely to be distorted.

The West does have a legitimate interest in coming to various agreements with the Soviet Union, as reflected in the SALT negotiations. But it must also be recognized that just as the SALT talks are not a sign of détente, but reflect a mutual interest in strategic weapons competition, so do the Soviet negotiations with West Germany reflect the Soviet concern with consolidating the status quo and with persuading West Germany to bail Russia out of her economic difficulties. These negotiations do not reflect a Soviet desire to see genuine peaceful accommodation with the West. A claim of that kind would be, in the words of a former Soviet Premier on his way to negotiate with Western leaders, "a huckster's approach". And the Premier added, "We do not have any concessions to make, because our proposals have not been made for bartering".

The Soviet Union is seeking to strengthen her role in Eastern Europe and at the same time to persuade the West to approve it. Russia wishes to receive western technology, but in return has offered only visions of détente and mutual trust. The Soviet Union advocates a European Security Conference, which has received West German support, but which aims at a division of the West. In turn, a disunited Europe could gradually become estranged from the United States. If the United States should remain passive without providing a clear-cut sense of direction or definition of goal, Western European countries would become more susceptible to the chimerical assurances of Soviet communism.

The Bonn government proclaims with assurance, that the Soviet Union recognizes the realities of the situation as it exists in Europe today. I believe that is beyond question. Russia recognizes the realities as they are understood in Moscow. But can so much be said of the Brandt government itself? One should note that in June of this year, two months before the signing of the Moscow-Bonn treaty, an editorial in *Pravda* stressed the significance of the communique released in Moscow in June, 1969, during the first International Meeting of 75 Communist and Workers' Parties in nine years. Communist goals in Western Europe were defined as follows: First on the list, was a break-up of NATO and the convocation of an All-European Security Conference. Second, was the imperative of securing "the inviolability of existing frontiers in Europe, in particular the frontier along the Oder-Neisse and the frontier" between East and West Germany. This goal was attained almost verbatim in Article III of the Bonn-Moscow treaty. Third, the Moscow communique of 1969 called for West German recognition of East Germany. In the Moscow-Bonn treaty, Bonn accordingly has given de facto recognition. Further, the Moscow document called for Bonn's renunciation of her "claim to represent the whole of Germany". Chancellor Brandt's government has renounced the claim to represent the whole of Germany, thus rejecting the mandate given him by free elections. And finally, the Moscow document demanded the recognition of West Berlin as "a separate political entity". West Berlin is not a separate political entity, but the Soviet Union made this claim again only two weeks ago, and there are indications that there are some in West Germany who would be willing to compromise on this issue.

Descriptions in Moscow and Bonn of these concessions are deceptively hailed as having created an atmosphere of accord and "understanding," but in reality they are directed toward the world public. The Soviet Union knows well that the justification for alliance, in spirit and in fact, is the conviction that there exists a potential threat. Create the impression that a threat is non-existent, and a gradual crumbling of the alliance will follow. How clear this is when we observe that men yearning for the sweet music of promised friendship and cooperation tend to forget with uncommon speed the atmosphere of alliance against a common foe, generated by such actions as the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Many people appear to have no memory at all when told that the alternative in dealing with the Soviet Union are between friendship or a continuation of the cold war.

Western optimists have reminded us repeatedly that Chancellor Brandt's Eastern policies rely for their success on a stable, healthy association with the West. In principle this is no doubt true. But the concessions made to the Soviet Union far outnumber the advantages gained by West Germany and, hence, by the West as a whole—to the extent that any gains at all can be ascertained at the present time. The real significance of the mutual renunciation of force,

for example, is highly questionable. The Federal Republic is not, has never been, and is not likely to be in a position to attack the Soviet Union. The Brandt government, indeed, signed the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty in 1969. The military policies and capabilities of the Soviet Union, however, are well known. Chancellor Brandt's trip to Moscow to assure the Soviet Government that the Federal Republic would not attack Russia would, thus, seem to be a matter of taking owls to Athens.

Although both Russia and West Germany agreed in the treaty to refrain from the use of force according to Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, the two important articles of that Charter, Articles 53 and 107, are not mentioned. In these two Articles the Allied powers who fought against the Axis in World War II, in effect against Germany, retain the right of intervention. In short, the Federal Republic has renounced the use of force in settling international disputes. But the Soviet Union retains its right of intervention.

Although the "borders of all states in Europe" were declared inviolable in the treaty, there were two strange cases that were, as mentioned, singled out for special attention. The Bonn government found it necessary to acknowledge by name the inviolability of two specific and disputed borders: the Oder-Neisse line with Poland and the border between East and West Germany. This recognition of the status quo in Europe is therefore not simply an acknowledgement of reality as the Soviet Union sees it. It is also a tacit acceptance by Bonn of the Brezhnev doctrine of the limited sovereignty of Eastern European countries. Moreover, whereas the Soviet Union has exacted Bonn's recognition of the reality of the division of Germany, it is not prepared to concede to West Germany the right of reunification by peaceful means. No mention of this vital matter is made in the text of the treaty itself.

Now, what of the changes in Soviet-West German economic and technical relations? It may be an exaggeration to say that the Soviet Union needs a new crop of German scientists and technicians, but it is undeniable that Russia faces serious economic difficulties. From West Germany it has sought and received the kind of economic assistance designed for underdeveloped countries, which might pay dividends later. Berthold Beltz, the chairman of the Krupp concern, has pointed out that one of the primary reasons for Moscow's support of the treaty is her need for German capital goods and technical know-how. And he has forecast that the present East European and Soviet share of West German foreign trade, currently at about 5% may rise to 15 to 20% in the next few years.

It is illuminating to observe the speed with which Chancellor Brandt sent his Minister of Economics, Karl Schiller, and his Minister of Science and Education, Hans Leussink, to Moscow after the treaty was concluded. During Mr. Leussink's visit, a German-Soviet Science-Exchange Pact was signed on September 28. The pact foresees cooperation in the fields of physics, chemistry, astronomy, biology, medicine, ecology, oceanography, data processing and educational development. The first exchange visit has begun. Three weeks ago two groups of German physicists left for Moscow. A group of Russian scientists is scheduled to visit the Federal Republic at the beginning of the year. In addition, Daimler-Benz is likely to announce soon the construction of a one billion dollar plant in central Russia for the annual production of 150,000 ten-to twenty-ton trucks. Such a plant would be the largest of its kind in the world, and it may be partially financed by the West German government. Some critics, recalling how Warsaw Pact troops were trucked into Czechoslovakia in 1968, hardly consider this a measure to

limit the mobility of the Soviet army. The sole Soviet contribution to the West German economy thus far has been an agreement to deliver natural gas.

And the trade offensive is not limited to the Soviet Union. This fall negotiations have been completed, or are in the process of being concluded, with Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, all aimed in one way or another at the trade Bonn can offer these countries.

Much has been said of the fact that Chancellor Brandt has made submission of the treaty for ratification to the Bundestag dependent on an acceptable solution of the Berlin problem. A solution would be very simple. It would be Soviet recognition of the reality of West Berlin's political, economic and legal ties with Bonn. It would also mean guarantees providing unrestricted access to and from Berlin. And it would require that West Berliners be permitted to visit their friends and relatives in East Berlin and East Germany. To compromise these realities would be inviting disaster. According to spokesmen in Bonn and Moscow, as I remarked earlier, the treaty is based on a mutual recognition of the realities in Europe as they exist today. The Soviet Union's position on Berlin this month is as clear as ever—all political, economic and legal ties between Berlin and Bonn must be eliminated, and the Soviet Union must be given the right to censor the West Berlin press, radio and television. This position is far from a recognition of the realities of West German and Berlin problems.

How does this all add up? More than four months after the conclusion in August of the treaty of détente between Moscow and Bonn, West Germany has given much to Russia, but not one change has been registered on the Berlin problem. New harassments have been the order of the day in the air corridors and on the interzonal highways. The realities of the Berlin wall, of the division of Germany, of the occupation of Czechoslovakia, of the consolidation of Soviet control of Eastern Europe, of continued interference with traffic to and from Berlin, all remain! Since 1950 Moscow has sought recognition of the Oder-Neisse line. Now this has suddenly been achieved. For 21 years Russia has sought West German surrender of its claim to represent all the German people. This too has now become a reality. For 21 years the Soviet Union has sought recognition of its East German regime. Chancellor Brandt has provided de facto recognition. The West, for 25 years, has sought a solution of the Berlin problem. It does not have it. Since 1949 Bonn has sought an improvement of relations with East Germany. Relations have not improved. Treaty is not détente. And just two months ago, in October, *Pravda* again published an enlightening article. Peaceful coexistence was defined as "... a form of the class struggle between Socialism and Capitalism." "The decisive factor of peaceful coexistence" was declared to be "the economic and military strength of Socialism."

The only predictable element in international relations is change. But it should never be influenced by the political euphoria induced by attractive promises. As Chancellor Brandt recently observed, West Germany needs both "cooperation and consultation" with the West and also, "understanding" with the East. But Bonn's need for "understanding" does not excuse equivocation on the definition of realities. Only the recognition of all the realities can result in a clear-sighted assessment of any political, economic or military situation.

The cold war continues as it has for the last 25 years under its various cloaks of propaganda and polemic. The mine fields still divide Germany. The wall still cuts across Berlin, dividing families and serving as an altar for the death of refugees. The political

borders dividing Europe remain. Soviet goals have not changed. Peaceful coexistence has not become détente. It is obviously folly to predict the future course of history. But it is dangerous error to ignore the lessons of the past. As we look toward the East, it is also well, as Aeschylus wrote some 2,400 years ago, to observe the flight of crook-tailed birds, marking which are of the right by nature, and which are of the left, how they consort together, and the enmities and affections that are between them.

East-West relations in Europe are changing. But sometimes the more things change, the more they remain the same, as *News Deutschland*, the Communist party organ of East Germany, recently observed in reference to this treaty. The following citation demonstrates a reality that should be as clear as the difference between détente and cold war. I quote: "The imperialist wolf appears to some as a generous grandmother. But in reality it is here as in fairy tales. Wolf remains wolf!"

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of the House joint resolution designating the week of March 21-27 as a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

In recent months both official and public concern over the prisoners of war and missing in action issue has assumed momentous proportions. The causes of this are varied. When President Nixon took office he directed Secretary Laird to bring this issue to the forefront and to fully acquaint the American people to the indignities and inhumane treatment that valiant American servicemen were receiving at the hands of their Communist captors. Congress has passed a resolution which I was proud to play a part in condemning the North Vietnamese for their treatment of American captives and calling for the humane treatment and early release of all American POW's. Finally, interested citizens and organizations have made a definite contribution by calling public attention in a variety of ways to the plight of our captured countrymen.

In my mind, setting aside the week of March 21-27 as a national week of concern for POW-MIA would help focus public and political concern within this country on this issue. Once focused this concern may provide the impetus needed to force the Communists to come to terms on this vital issue. Through the observances of appropriate ceremonies, the enemy can be made fully aware of the fact that this is one issue upon which the American people are united. For the POW issue is not a political issue, it is first and foremost a humane issue which must be resolved by resorting to humanistic rather than political concerns.

I urge my colleagues to join together in a nonpartisan spirit and speedily approve this most worthy proposal.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BEFORE THE SECOND AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS SOUNDING ROCKET VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST CONFERENCE AT WILLIAMSBURG, VA., BY THE HONORABLE THOMAS N. DOWNING

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, an esteemed colleague on the Science and Astronautics Committee, Representative THOMAS DOWNING, recently delivered a speech on the future of the space program that deserves wide attention. Speaking before the second American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics Sounding Rocket Vehicle Technology Specialist Conference at Williamsburg, Va., Representative DOWNING has touched upon some of the problems plaguing our space program. In addition, he has commented on the great value of a too-often neglected aspect of the space program: Sounding rockets. In a time of national reordering of priorities and a reassessment of our space program, I believe Representative DOWNING has offered some valuable suggestions:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS N. DOWNING

I am especially pleased to have been invited to keynote the second conference on sounding rocket technology here at Williamsburg. The NASA sounding rocket program has always been of particular interest to me; the subcommittee on which I have served for almost a decade has legislative jurisdiction over that program.

Moreover, as a Virginian, the Wallops Island station has a special place in my heart. Since its founding in 1945, Wallops has been in the forefront of small rocket operations over the years. And their performance of complex technical tasks has been a source of great pride for me. I doubt that any NASA installation gets more for its money, and I know of no place that operates on a smaller budget.

More than 7,000 sounding rockets have been launched from Wallops station with remarkable results. For example, take the Solar Eclipse program of last March. Imagine 30 rockets being launched in one day—17 within a twenty-minute period—and not a single launch failure!

Among other things, Wallops has also contributed substantially to international good will by opening its doors to technical personnel from foreign countries. They have shared their expertise with our friends from abroad by helping to train them in rocket technology and launch operations.

Sounding rockets have a long and distinguished history. We tend to think of the beginning of the space age as 1957 with the launching of Sputnik I. Surely, that event stimulated the rapid expansion of space activities in the United States. But sounding rockets were really the beginning, and their use dates back to a time when the exploration of space was a serious subject for only a few American scientists. I think it's fair to say that Dr. Robert H. Goddard developed and launched the first sounding rocket, or at least something that looked very much like one. In any event, his experimental device was clearly a precursor to what we know as sounding rockets today. The V-2 rocket launches by the military after World

War II, were, of course, the first noteworthy effort to carry experiments aloft.

There is no doubt that sounding rockets have contributed enormously to major scientific discoveries in the quarter century they have been in practical use, especially in physics and astronomy. They have proven to be powerful tools, and they constitute an essential ingredient of the space program. In recent years, hundreds have been launched annually. And the end of their usefulness is not in sight.

Much more research remains to be done between the maximum altitude that balloons are capable of achieving, and the minimum perigee of satellites. For these purposes, the sounding rocket is the only available tool for pursuing such investigations.

For other purposes, sounding rockets are, and will continue to be, the most economical method of operation. A good illustration is their traditional role of testing prototype equipment prior to its use in satellites. Moreover, the need for small rockets for gathering meteorological data in the indefinite future, taking direct vertical profiles of the atmosphere, seems assured.

Sounding rockets have many other advantages, but it hardly seems necessary for me to give any further details to an audience of experts such as those gathered here today. The truth is, what I have said thus far was not really designed to inform you, but rather to indicate that the value of these research tools is not lost on members of Congress.

There is one additional point I would like to make, however, before leaving the subject. In my opinion, one of the most important contributions of the sounding rocket program has been that which is made to education. Sounding rockets have been used extensively by university space science departments on the graduate level to provide our talented youth with opportunities to conduct genuine research in space and in the upper atmosphere using these relatively inexpensive devices. Actual participation in the space program is not generally available to our young people because of the high costs involved. It seems to me that sounding rocket experiments constitute the major exception to the rule, and therefore they have a special place in my set of values.

I am pleased to be able to say that the Science and Astronautics Committee has always supported the sounding rocket program. All members understand the value of the research and development made possible by small rockets, and I am confident of their continued support.

Some may wonder how bright the future of sounding rocket activities appears to be in the light of five years of declining NASA budgets. As you know, so far, the sounding rocket program has been maintained at approximately the same level of effort, despite substantial decreases in other NASA activities, and in the space program as a whole. This must be viewed as a real tribute to the merits of the sounding rocket program.

While the space science board of the National Academy of Science has strongly recommended expansion of the sounding rocket program, and although I personally would prefer to see a gradual increase in the program, I hesitate to predict any such increase in the next two or three years. Frankly, it doesn't seem realistic to expect increases. We're all aware that the Government is struggling to control inflation, partly by holding down Federal expenditures, at the very time that there are unprecedented demands of the Nation's resources for such worthy goals as improved housing and education, control of pollution and crime, to name only a few. Achieving the proper balance among the many and varied needs of the country is, of course, extremely difficult.

Nevertheless, an aggressive space program seems to me so important to the health and

vigor of the Nation that I fervently hope we have seen the last of declining NASA budgets. And if I may turn to a somewhat more general discussion of the space program as a whole, I'd like to make a few observations.

Many good things can be said about the accomplishments of the space program: From teflon frying pans, to a better understanding of solar physics; from world-wide communications by satellite; to advances in the science of astronomy that could not be achieved in any other way. The major impact of NASA's work is that it presses forward the state of science and technology on many fronts; and in a technological society such as ours, continued advancement is the key to the Nation's well-being. Our investment in space has already paid huge dividends, and promises to pay even greater ones in the future.

It seems to me, however, that the most important contribution of the space program is that it has furnished challenges and opportunities to some of our most talented people. After all, it is the people of a nation who make it great, and their spirit and the quality of their work that make it possible for a nation to achieve a position of leadership in the world.

Perhaps, if we were not faced with such vigorous competition by another nation, our principal rival, we could safely take a more leisurely pace in science and technology. But in the situation we find ourselves, I think we are running the risk of being second best in the world if we don't take the race seriously. And second best could be a precarious position for the United States.

The Soviet Union has shown no signs of reducing its efforts in space exploration; on the contrary, they appear to be quickening the pace. Yet, the United States has had five successive years of declining NASA budgets. In terms of percentage of gross national product, they are investing more than twice the amount in their space efforts as we are in ours. The contrast between the numerous space launches by the Russians during the past year, and the much lower level of American launch activity during the same period, is striking. Thus far during calendar year 1970, there have been 74 Soviet space shots compared to 31 for the United States.

There are other signs of the times, as well. Not long ago, Dr. John Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering stated that Soviet expenditures for military research and development are currently running forty-to-fifty percent larger than ours. If each country continues along these same lines, superiority of Soviet military weaponry is inevitable within a few years, according to Dr. Foster.

A major result of the cuts in U.S. space and defense expenditures is that one of America's major manufacturing industries, the aerospace industry, is now in a state of distress. Since the peak year of 1968, Aerospace employment is down approximately 300,000 jobs, almost twenty percent.

Some 45,000 of our scientists and engineers are presently unemployed, and an even larger number are underemployed. In addition to the plight of the individuals involved, which surely amounts to a terrible toll in human terms, we are witnessing a progressive deterioration of an important national resource—our pool of highly skilled manpower. How ironic that the United States should move from a shortage of scientific and engineering manpower to a surplus in just three years! Even more ironic is the fact that this decline in employment in the aerospace industry comes after a decade of the greatest successes in the history of science and engineering.

It is also noteworthy that the Soviets are graduating about twice as many scientists and engineers per year as we are. While our competition appears to be gaining mo-

mentum, we are losing ours, and this Nation's leadership in science and technology is truly threatened.

If the current situation is bad, the future could be even worse. There is evidence that the reduction in aerospace employment and in government research and development expenditures are, in large part, responsible for reduced enrollment in science and engineering in our universities. Our young people are not unaware of the depressed job market for technical school graduates, and many are reordering their career objectives as they watch career opportunities in aerospace disappear. It doesn't take a very good crystal ball to forecast the future: The Nation's scientific and technical capability just a few years hence is in genuine danger of being depleted because so many of our most talented youth may have entered other fields.

I noticed an article in the press recently to the effect that a former president of the American Chemical Society, Dr. Wallace Brode, has recommended a new Federal "WPA" for the present generation of American scientists and engineers. His suggestion was not put forth frivolously. Unless the country puts these specialists to work, he warned, many will be "lost" for they will be driven into other fields in order to make a living. Then, when we need these people three or four years from now, they won't be available.

How much would such a scientific and engineering "WPA" cost the country? Dr. Brode estimates that it would approximate the sum by which defense and space research and development funds have been cut.

Whether or not a "WPA" for scientists and engineers sounds realistic, the message is clear. The United States is a technological society, and our very survival may depend upon the full utilization, and continued development, of one of the nation's most important resources—scientific and technical manpower.

In closing, let me summarize the current situation as I see it. The space program finds itself competing for scarce resources at a time when the American people seem preoccupied with other pressing problems. While this may be understandable, it is important to recognize that a vigorous space program sets the pace for the nation's technological advancement. As such, it represents an investment in the future. More specifically, it is an investment in the training and development of the people on whom will depend the technological strength of the United States in the years ahead.

In the dangerous world in which we live, our country simply must retain its preeminent technological position. I believe a revitalized space program can provide at least a partial answer.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT GUARANTEEING THE RIGHT TO VOTE FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, last session the Congress passed the Voting Rights Act Amendment of 1970, which included a provision to extend the franchise to all citizens 18 years old and above. It was debated at length and approved by a majority of the peoples' representatives.

Subsequently the Supreme Court ruled that while Congress could grant the right to vote to 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds in Federal elections, it did not have the

power to change the minimum voting age for State and local elections. Thus we are now faced with the absurd result that in most States those citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 will be entitled to vote in presidential, senatorial, and congressional elections, but not to participate in State and local races.

In addition to the patent injustice of such a partial disenfranchisement, it will require a costly dual procedure for registration and balloting in most States. There will have to be separate registration rolls for voters above 21 and those between 18 and 21, and separate balloting for Federal and for State or local races. Several State legislatures, in immediate response to this spectre, have already passed laws extending the vote to 18-year-olds in State and local elections.

In the interest of uniformity and of a constitutionally proper reassertion of Congress original intent, I have today introduced along with Representatives RAILSBACK, HARRINGTON, RIEGLE, and more than 60 additional cosponsors, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment guaranteeing the vote to all citizens 18 years of age and above in all State and local as well as Federal elections. The list of cosponsors follows:

LIST OF COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. Railsback, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Begich, Mr. Burke, Mr. Cordova, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Gerald Ford, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Kemp, Mr. McCormack, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Nix, Mr. Podell, Mr. Steiger;

Mr. Whalen, Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Blaggi, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Clay, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Dow, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Morse, Mr. Rees, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Symington, Mr. Bergland, Mr. Conte, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Drinan, Mrs. Hansen;

Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hechler, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Nedzi, Mr. Obey, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Yates, Mr. Aspin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bolling;

Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Green, Mr. Horton, Mr. Koch, Mr. Leggett, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Reid, Mr. Robison, and Mr. Shriver.

SOUTH AFRICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in our Nation we have experts on every facet of life, including the internal affairs of many foreign nations. Some of these experts have never even been to the countries on which they consider themselves authorities. Taking their anti-apartheid changes in South Africa, for example, they only show that they have failed to heed the miserable record of their race reforms here in the United States.

South Africa continues as the target of the extremists of the left, the ultra liberals, and their do-gooder tag-alongs who react from myth and distorted facts and refuse to face reality.

Having been to South Africa myself, I can attest that their government and

customs differ from those of the United States. However, with the racial experiments in our country being proven daily as disastrous, I would not in good conscience even suggest to the South Africans that we in the United States have answers to their race problems when we have been unable to solve our own. In fact, our situation continues to deteriorate.

Mr. Bill Kennedy of the Donrey News Bureau, here in Washington, has been in Africa and has written numerous firsthand accounts of his experiences and findings which have appeared in many dailies throughout the United States.

So that our many colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Kennedy's assessment of South Africa, I insert several of his articles at this point:

SOUTH AFRICA—A BUSY COUNTRY

(By Bill Kennedy)

WASHINGTON.—For the next three weeks this column and other news stories will come to you from various points in the Republic of South Africa. I hope to give readers some insight into that country's political, economic and social life.

Since I have not been in South Africa, what I say now was gleaned from reading, acquaintances from there, and from friends who have spent time in the country.

The Afrikaners, as they are called, have a fierce national pride and are unreservedly anti-Communist. Yet, their manners, mode of life and even their meals are quite similar to those of the Dutch, German, English and French from which they sprang.

South Africa is a big country—bigger than the six major countries of Western Europe together. Or roughly the size of Texas, Oklahoma and New Mexico combined. Bringing it closer to home—larger than California, Arkansas, Hawaii, Nevada, Missouri and Washington combined.

South Africa is a land of sunshine, and it'll be like our June when I'm there. While along the eastern belt it is hot and humid in summer, but because most of the country averages 4,000 feet above sea level, summers are generally cool. Winter temperatures often drop below zero in the highlands, and frost is common. But snow is the exception.

The climate is well suited to many forms of outdoor recreation—from rugby to mountain-climbing, to hunting, to deep-sea fishing. South Africans are sporting people and have won international acclaim in many fields.

Returning visitors tell me that South Africa is the most tranquil country on the Dark Continent—that in some respects it resembles America of an earlier age. Yet, it is known as the "industrial giant" of Africa and has been enjoying an economic boom for some 10 years.

Johannesburg, the "Golden City," is the country's largest metropolitan center—population 1,294,800. It is followed by Durban on the East Coast which has 662,894 people, then by Cape Town with a population of 625,040. There are nine other cities with populations of more than 100,000.

South Africa produces more than 81 per cent of the Free World's gold, and has more gem diamonds than any other country. Other important ores and minerals produced in quantity include coal, copper, iron ore, platinum, manganese and chrome.

The country is often said to be a "pair" nation—that is, having two of most things. It has two national languages—English and Afrikaans, both compulsory in the schools. There are two national capitals—Pretoria, seat of the administrative government, and Cape Town, seat of the legislative (Parliament) government.

But what has brought more notice from other nations is the fact that South Africa has two separate societies—one for the whites and one for blacks. The word is "apartheid," meaning separate and parallel development of whites and blacks. Whites rule the country, but provinces within the country are being developed for and by the blacks where it is said they will eventually have independence.

Many countries, including the U.S. have condemned apartheid. America, along with Britain and other countries, has applied economic sanctions, political boycotts, and an embargo on the sale of arms to the country.

But while South Africa reaches out for the friendship of other nations, her leaders make it clear they will not tolerate interference in her domestic affairs. Her leaders say that South Africa is free of violence because of the policy of separate development—aimed at guaranteeing each group its own identity.

Visitors with whom I have talked say there is little friction between the races, that the whites are uplifting the blacks economically and culturally. It's a fact that the nearly 15 million blacks of South Africa own more automobiles than 200 million people in Russia, and there are more educated blacks there than in all the other countries of the continent.

South Africa's high standard of living for her people is the envy of most Western European countries. And this is attested to by the fact that more than 3,000 persons a month immigrate there—mostly from England, The Netherlands, West Germany, Belgium, Austria, Switzerland, Italy and Portugal.

SOUTH AFRICAN CITIES LOOK AMERICAN

(By Bill Kennedy)

PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA.—The visitor coming to this part of South Africa expecting to find any remnants of the "Me Tarzan, you Jane" cliché will be disappointed. For all in all, the two cities I have visited so far are not so different from American cities.

We put down at the Johannesburg airport about 1 p.m. Tuesday, after nearly 20 hours in the air from New York—with but a brief stop at Rio de Janeiro.

From the air, Johannesburg, the country's largest city, looked much like an American city. The countryside is green, it's spring or early summer here and the temperature is generally in the upper 50's.

The countryside around Johannesburg and this capital city of Pretoria 35 miles away is lush and green—many farms and we saw a lot of young corn. The terrain, vegetation and features of the land could pass for most any of the plains areas of the U.S.—say parts of Texas and western Oklahoma.

But what has impressed me most during my brief time here is the bustling industry—particularly the building going on. There's home-building, office-building, road-building, industrial-plant building.

There are several airport buildings going up, and a Holiday Inn nearing completion at the airport. Driving along the streets of Johannesburg, you can hear the bang of metal against metal, the fall of timbers, and see steel-helmeted men on the scaffolds.

The streets of both Johannesburg and Pretoria are alive with commuters and shoppers, and the stores are crowded. In most countries where my limited travels have taken me, the U.S. dollar has always been of higher value than the native equivalent.

In Mexico, for instance, the dollar is worth 12.5 pesos. But here, the dollar comes out second best. It's worth only 70 cents in South African money.

But even so, prices are more favorable here than in America. You can see that by comparing the prices of shoes, suits, other articles. And hotel and restaurant food is

considerably less than in the U.S., particularly around the Washington, D.C. area where inflation reigns supreme.

The Boulevard Hotel where I'm temporarily quartered is a good hotel, with a definite European atmosphere. A dinner here which you would pay six or seven dollars for in the U.S. costs little over two dollars. And a breakfast of ham and eggs, toast and coffee and cereal goes for one dollar.

The hotel help—waiters, bellboys, room maids—are Bantus, although of which tribe I have no idea. There are eight different tribes of Bantus in South Africa and they each speak a different language, have a different culture, and are often, I'm told, at odds with each other.

But the Bantus here at the hotel speak English, as well as Afrikaans and their own native language. They are generally smiling and cheerful, and move with a purpose.

These are merely first impressions of a stranger in a strange land. During the coming three weeks, I am to visit and talk with Bantu chiefs and administrative leaders, government officials, industrial leaders, our own Ambassador John Hurd with whom I was acquainted before he was nominated to this post, and others.

I hope to be reporting to you daily, or almost daily, as circumstances permit. These reports will come from various points around the country—including the Bantu homelands, Cape Town, East London and other areas.

BLACK ELECTORATE SPLIT ON SEPARATION

(By Bill Kennedy)

PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA.—For years now, controversy has swirled around the separate development policy of the South African government whereby the races are segregated.

During my 15 days here to date, I have tried to gather opinions not only from black and white leaders, but also from blacks who differ from other blacks and whites who oppose other whites regarding this development policy for the races.

Today, I interviewed two cabinet ministers, and one black South African who is an official in the government.

Henry Moleko is a Bantu (black South African) who is chief information assistant in charge of putting out regular publications in all the seven Bantu languages.

He told me that he personally likes the separate development policy of the government, and also that the vast majority of the black population subscribes to it.

"It is my opinion that the black South Africans want this policy because it is to their advantage," Moleko said. "It gives them opportunity to advance educationally and economically, something that was not always true in this country."

A number of foreign reporters have come to South Africa and branded such men as Moleko an "Uncle Tom." He shrugs this off with a smile and says, "Don't take my word. Go into the homelands, talk to the Bantu leaders from the various tribes and see what they say."

Dr. C. P. Mulder, 45, is minister of Information, Welfare and Pensions, and often spoken of as possibly the next prime minister to succeed John Voster.

He explained to me the basic tenets behind the government's separate development policy. It advocates no "superiority or inferiority" of any race, he said. It emphasizes differences, and desires of races for their own identity.

He outlined the program of development for the Bantu peoples which is costing the white taxpayer millions upon millions of dollars—a program to educate and uplift the black South African.

I asked him how the black African himself accepts separate development. Dr. Mulder pointed to the election in the Trans-

kei, a Bantu homeland, where the black electorate was split on separate development and integration.

"Mr. Kaiser Mantanzimo was the candidate advocating separate development, and his opponent was a man dedicated to the concept of integration," Dr. Mulder said.

"Mr. Mantanzimo won a substantial majority and today is the chief minister in the Transkei," he added. "This view of separate development vs. integration was the major point of difference. One might assume from this that the Bantu wants separate development."

I talked with the leader of the opposition, Knowledge Guzana, in the Transkei. He is for integration of sorts, but does oppose social mixing of the races.

"You must remember," he said, "that the Bantu is a proud people. They do not want mixing on the social level and marriage with the whites. In fact, they don't even want to mix with the various tribes within this country."

Mr. C. Botha is minister of Bantu Administration. He told me that in the past 25 years, the Bantu is making great gains in education, and being assimilated into the employment field—from the trades to the professions.

In the old days, he said, prior to 1948, the Bantu was segregated from the white society as he is today. But the difference is, today he has a progressive program, whereas in the past he was left to shift for himself and invariably wound up in the servant class.

NEITHER BLACKS NOR WHITES MAY CLAIM AFRICAN COUNTRY

(By Bill Kennedy)

CAPETOWN, SOUTH AFRICA.—Not long ago in Washington, a colleague of mine remarked of the whites of South Africa, "Why don't they just get out and give the country back to the blacks?"

Of course this colleague knew nothing about the country, for it never belonged to the blacks—at least not those here now—any more than it did to the whites.

The only indigenous people with whom the first whites came into contact were the Bushmen and Hottentots. The former were in the process of being ruthlessly exterminated by the less primitive Hottentots. The Bushmen were not entirely wiped out because of the intervention of the white man.

There are still small clans of both races living in remote areas, but over the years most have joined with other races to help create the Colored people of today—a distinctive community.

Western civilization came to South Africa in 1652, when the Dutch East India Co. established a station here at Cape Town to provide fresh food and vegetables for the fleets on voyages between the Netherlands and the East Indies.

Later, in 1688, the French came, followed by the British in 1820, and the German immigrants in 1859. Mainly from these four streams has grown the white South African nation of today—a nation in its own right, speaking two official languages—English and Afrikaans.

As the whites moved inland and northward, they met and fought with the Bantu tribes (forefathers of present blacks) who were migrating southward. This was in the latter part of the 17th century.

Both the whites and Bantu may, therefore, be said to be immigrants. Neither has a superior claim to be the first residents of what is now South Africa. After the British frontier wars of the late 18th and 19th century had ended, the whites and the Bantu each kept the territories in which they had settled, and which became their respective homelands.

The Indians came to Natal as indentured laborers on the sugar plantations. Today,

prosperous merchants, brokers, lawyers, doctors, builders and industrialists are numbered among the ranks of Indian South Africans.

For nearly a century, a state-aided plan has been in effect to repatriate Indian South Africans to the mother country, India. Few have taken the offer.

South Africa became a republic in May, 1961, after having been a Union under the British Empire since 1910. The country has the Parliamentary form of government.

Basic to South Africa's politics is the policy of apartheid, or separate development for the races. The plan is to have a number of Bantu nations within the country which will eventually have nearly complete independence.

Spokesmen for the government, and others, tell me that separate development recognizes the long established nationhood of the white people, and at the same time recognizes the right of self-determination of each of the separate Bantu peoples, and provides for full self-government.

The focal points of their political development are their homelands which they originally settled and which are still theirs today.

Separate development does, in fact, mean that the Bantu peoples will as far as possible provide their own politicians, administrators, doctors, teachers, civil servants, police and businessmen.

Implementation of the separate development policy reached a milestone in 1963 when 3.5 million Xhosa, whose homeland was the Transkei, were granted internal self-government. It now has its own parliament.

This same plan is in effect and in varying degrees of completion in some seven other homelands.

So that the Bantu peoples will not have to rely on a completely agricultural economy or leave their homes for long periods to work in the cities, the government has established a number of industrial complexes adjacent to the homelands, and is now in process of setting up industry within the homelands.

COLOURED, NOT BANTUS SEEM TO CAUSE MOST PRESSING PROBLEMS

(By Bill Kennedy)

STELLENBOSCH, SOUTH AFRICA.—Although the country has a number of colleges and universities, the University of Stellenbosch is considered THE university—the Oxford of England and the distinction that Harvard once claimed in a bygone era in America.

Situated just a few miles east of bustling Cape Town, Stellenbosch is nestled into a valley of lush vineyards and green sloping hillsides.

Stellenbosch is as different from Cape Town as Fort Smith, Ark., is from San Francisco. The city is quiet, with oak-lined streets—almost pastoral in appearance, dotted by low, thatched roofed, stucco-type buildings of Dutch architecture.

The university is right in the middle of town, and has students from all over the globe. It claims the distinction of having graduated all but one of South Africa's prime ministers.

Out of town to the east a few miles, an old winery has been converted into a hotel, called Lanzerac. And it was here that I lunched with Prof. J. P. Jansen, head of the Department of Africa Studies at the university.

Prof. Jansen is a warm, friendly man, about 50, who recently returned after teaching a year at Washington State University at Pullman. He probably knows as much about Africa as a whole as anyone—politically, socially and culturally—and is an expert on the evolution and development of his own country.

We talked about South Africa's relations with her African neighbors, her role in the

scheme of world affairs and her internal problems.

And as invariably happens in most every conversation, the subject turned to South Africa's race problems and the government policy of separate development.

"Problems of race are much more complicated here than in America," Prof. Jansen told me. "While you do have the Indian and the Spanish-speaking people, your problem is mostly one of white-black."

"Here in South Africa, we have the white-black problem as concerns the Bantu," he continued. "Also, the white-coloured, the black-coloured, and problems among the eight different tribes of the Bantu among themselves."

"What is the major difference between the black and coloured population of your country?" I asked.

"The coloured is more comparable to your situation in the United States where you have the Negro who is in the minority," he said. "The coloured here numbers less than the whites, and for that reason we haven't got separate development areas for the coloureds as we have for the Bantu who comprise the vast majority."

"We are educating the coloured as fast as possible," he went on. "Some of them have good educations and good positions, and I think we are moving in the direction of integration for the coloureds."

How are the coloureds and blacks treated differently in the South African society?

"The Bantu are a proud people, very proud of their heritage and regard themselves as a separate identity from both the coloureds and whites," Prof. Jansen said.

"The coloureds on the other hand have no such identity since they are of mixed blood," he added. "They live among the whites, especially here in the Western Cape Province, but within their own segregated living areas. They don't have their own home lands as do the Bantu."

I asked the professor what he thought would be the final solution to the coloured problem.

"We have only two possible solutions," he said. "One would be the development of separate homelands for the coloureds as the Bantu have, and the government has indicated it has no intention of doing this. The other solution is ultimate integration. This will take time, perhaps a generation or two, but I think this is the solution to which we ultimately will come."

After lunch we drove back into Stellenbosch, around the outskirts of the town and arrived at the university.

Prof. Jansen pointed out the coloured homes along the way, not too different from sections of numerous American cities. Closer in the homes became better and resembled middle-class American homes.

I pointed to one particularly attractive home and asked about it. Prof. Jansen said it probably belonged to a coloured doctor, teacher, or perhaps a lawyer.

I gathered from this conversation, as I had in others, that it is the coloured and not the Bantu that is presenting the most pressing problem to the South African government.

The Bantu seems to prefer to live in the homelands that have been set aside for them, to retain their pure blood, administer their own affairs, with economic and educational help from the white government.

In fact, I am told, the various Bantu tribes prefer not to even mingle with the other tribes, that they disdain the coloureds, and have no desire to mix socially with whites.

The coloureds, on the other hand, have little or nothing in common with the Bantu. Their experience has been and is with the white community.

In the Cape Province, for instance, where most of the country's 2 million coloured live, they are the backbone of the area's in-

dustrial and are quickly being assimilated into the professions.

While various programs—education housing, job training, welfare—are being pushed by the government, most with whom I have talked say the final solution to the coloured problem has not yet been devised by the government.

One government official told me that some within the ruling party want to integrate the coloured into the mainstream of South African life but "we have grave reservations because of the dire and devastating problems we observe in your America and in England."

TRANSKEI LEADERS DIFFER ON RACIAL ISSUE (By Bill Kennedy)

UMTATA, SOUTH AFRICA.—Today I interviewed two black South Africa leaders here in the Transkei who have opposing views on how this country should handle its racial problems.

They are George Matanzima, a cabinet member in the Transkei government, and K. Guzana, a member of the Transkei Parliament and leader of the opposition party.

Matanzima is minister of justice and brother of Kizer Matanzima, chief administrative officer of the Transkei, the large area set aside for the Xhosa-speaking peoples.

Matanzima told me the blacks and whites are living together in peace under the separate development policy for the races, that there is no oppression of the black man.

"The races have always been separated in South Africa," Matanzima said. "I accept this as a good policy that is helping us solve our racial problems."

This is why many Bantu leaders are surprised to hear the "hue and cry" made outside South Africa in regards to the separate development policy, he added.

Asked the reaction of Bantu leaders regarding criticisms of the South Africa policy coming out of the United Nations, Matanzima said:

"These outbursts from Afro-Asian nations are interesting because we don't believe they are concerned with the welfare of non-white South Africans. Instead, they have ulterior motives. With their large populations, especially in the east, they have designs on this rich and large country."

Matanzima said Ghana is becoming a "more sane country" in asking for dialogue with South Africa. Of Prime Minister Kounda of Zambia he said, "That man is power-drunk. They are now discriminating against the Indians in that country."

The Minister of Justice said that under the separate development policy there has been "more peace and tranquillity" than ever before.

"Formerly, the tribes lived in fear of each other," he said. "That is no longer true. Even the chiefs, of which I am one now visit each other."

Economically, the Transkei is progressing, but all agree the progress is too slow. Matanzima said, however, economic progress had been greater in the last seven years under the National Party's policy of separate development than during the previous 53 years.

The minister said the Transkei still is not ready for full independence. More help is needed in the areas of economy, civil service, and technology, he added.

But the independence the Transkei already enjoys is genuine, Matanzima said. He pointed to several acts the Transkei Parliament had passed contrary to the wishes of the white government "which in all instances nevertheless, were approved and put into effect."

Guzana, the opposition party leader, did not contradict any of these things—except to disagree on the separate development policy.

He would do away with the Transkei and other Bantu homelands as separate nations.

He does not advocate intermarriage or socialization between the races.

"These things will take care of themselves naturally," Guzana said. "People will segregate themselves by custom, or birds of a feather naturally flock together."

Guzana believes official separation will gradually end, that South Africa will become multi-racial country. It is, he added, an evolutionary process and will take a very long time.

SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT PLAYS ROLE IN AFRICAN SCHOOLS (By Bill Kennedy)

PETERBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—The last few days, my studies and travels have been concerned with education—particularly, education provided the black African by the white government.

A few miles from this city of some 30,000, there is the University of the North, a school exclusively for the Bantu. It started with 80 students 10 years ago and today, it has more than 800.

This area is known as the northern Transvaal, one of the four provinces in South Africa. It isn't too far from here to Rhodesia. The Bantu students at University of the North are made up of some 300 Sotho, over 200 Tswana, over 100 South Sotho, nearly 100 Tsonga, and more than 50 Venda. There are also some foreign students.

The teaching medium is, of course, English and Afrikaans, but these tribal languages are used to some extent also. Courses are offered in liberal arts, science, economics, education and theology. The bachelors degree, masters and doctorate are offered.

The physical facilities are modern and functional, and compare favorably with America's best in the smaller or junior college field. Academic standards were set and supervised by the University of South Africa, until this year, so that the quality of education was the same as offered elsewhere. Now the university has won its spurs, and sets its own standards.

I had a lengthy and private conversation with E. P. Lekhela, a professor in the History of Education who only this year received his doctor's degree. He is 57, a grandfather, and has been in education most of his adult life. He comes from the Tswana Tribe.

Dr. Lekhela's married daughter is a social welfare worker, his son is a school teacher, and his younger daughter is a university student here. After we had discussed his background, the university, and his four-month stay in America a few years back, I asked him:

"Dr. Lekhela, would you give me your personal opinion on the separate development policy of South Africa, particularly in the education field?"

He smiled and said, "I know you Americans find it difficult to understand, and I got many questions just like this when I was in America. But I agree with the policy, possibly from a selfish point of view because I see it is best for my own people."

"It is a fact," he continued, "that the African is not as highly developed as his European counterpart. In any work situation where there is competition, the black African always suffers."

"Separate development gives the African a sphere for his own development in competition he can cope with. He depends on himself, and doesn't have to have artificial concessions made to him. He has great vertical mobility under the system."

Dr. Lekhela said that outsiders had such a "misconception" of what the separate development policy meant.

"You all seem to see it in the narrow context of segregation," he said to me. "So many of you, and Europeans too, fail to take the time to know the very positive steps of

progress that are being taken by the government."

A few years ago (in the 1950's) the country had only one black university with an enrollment of about 300, he said. Today, there are three Bantu universities with an enrollment of some 3,000.

"The black man of South Africa is better able to judge the merits of separate development than are people from outside," Dr. Lekhela said. "We know what it was like before, and we don't want to go back. We also want to preserve our heritage, our languages and our cultures here in Africa."

Dr. Lekhela was born in the diamond capital of Kimberly, received his early education there in missionary schools. He has been teaching since 1933, and just this year received his PhD in History of Education.

Afterward, I talked to Dr. Johannes Voshoff, the rector of the university, equivalent to America's university president. He is of French descent, age about 60.

University of the North has 26 white lecturers and four Africans, he told me, adding, "But each year the number of white teachers gets less and the black teachers increase. Eventually, it will be an entirely black teaching staff."

Dr. Voshoff's views coincided with those of Dr. Lekhela.

"I'm quite positive the circumstances under which they study here, the Bantu gets more individual attention than he would at the white university," the rector said.

Dr. Voshoff said that previously when some blacks were enrolled at white universities "the records show that relatively few of them ever made the grade, for culturally they were out of their depth."

Dr. Voshoff placed much emphasis on "group identity." It's important, he said, not only in education but in almost every facet of life. "We can't achieve anything without recognizing this," he commented.

"This is a starting point, for you can't divorce the university from the community it serves," he added. "Here, we are giving the Bantu something that fits their community, their needs, yet we are not sacrificing quality in education. In fact, we are so aware of this that I sometimes think we are more rigid than the nation in education standards."

Dr. Voshoff said South Africa is experiencing an education explosion, adding, "The Bantu is eager for education." I, myself, found this to be true in the classes I visited.

One big problem, according to Dr. Voshoff, is that while the whites want the Bantu to serve his community and his people after graduation, he too often leaves for the big cities for more financial reward.

"Sometimes you outside journalists brand us a despotic regime here in South Africa," the rector said. "But our case is entirely different from despotic regimes. Here, we believe we can solve our problems best through an educated Bantu. It is to our own interest to educate the Bantu, and we can do that only with the help of the educated Bantu."

Dr. Voshoff said one of the greatest problems of education is to convince the educated Bantu that it is also his responsibility to help uplift and educate those less developed.

Dr. Voshoff said he had "no doubt whatever" that someday Europe and America would concede that South Africa has the best solution for peace and harmony between the races. At this moment, I have found nothing to contradict him.

SOUTH AFRICAN EMPHASIZES BANTU DEVELOPMENT

(By Bill Kennedy)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—Professor Mike Louw is head of the International Affairs Department at the University of Witwatersrand here and is considered one of the most politically knowledgeable men in South Africa.

He is a warm man with a mop of gray hair

and many of the attributes of the teacher. He delights when you ask him what he considers "good" questions, and his pleasure in answering them is easily read in his twinkling eyes.

We talked in his office for more than two hours—hitting on just two subjects—South Africa's political and economic role in world affairs, and his own feelings and interpretations of the country's separate development policy for the races.

In world politics, South Africa is not a great power, Professor Louw said.

"But from the economic point, the country is very important," he added. "It is the most industrialized and the most powerful country on the African continent."

The professor noted that South Africa has no military alliances, that the country is not committed to any other nation.

Is the role of South Africa being strengthened or weakened in international affairs?

"There is, of course, efforts to isolate South Africa from the rest of the western world," he said. "But they are not proving too successful."

He mentioned the enemies of the country are certain African nations and some countries in Europe.

"The reason these efforts are failing is because there is such a great internal movement in South Africa in the economic and technological field," Professor Louw said. "We have the gold and it is still a good financial leverage in the world."

He noted that South Africa has one of the best financial institutional credibilities in the world.

"Another reason these efforts are failing is because of the tenacity of the South African government not to be isolated," the professor said.

He noted that South Africa signed a loan agreement with Madagascar, has offered to sign a non-aggression pact with other African nations, and has good relations with a number of neighboring countries. He said all these efforts were beneficial and were apt to snowball.

What has brought much criticism to South Africa is the government's separate development policy. This consists mainly of developing eight homelands within the country for the black Bantu peoples.

When government officials defend the system, one might be apt to think they have an axe to grind. But Professor Louw has no connection with the government, except that he is often consulted on political and international matters.

"The separate development policy is not really an ideology, but an idea," the professor said. "It is an attempt by a white society which finds itself in a sea of non-white to resolve a great problem in terms of a humanist tradition of the west."

"The attempt is tinged with authoritarianism inherited from Europe," he added. "The government is authoritarian here, to both the black and the white."

He noted that the government was quite open and honest about the policy, and also humanist.

I asked Professor Louw what the alternatives were to the policy.

"One might say there are two—the idea of complete integration being tried in the United States, and the system followed by Brazil, of miscengenation or deliberate race-mixing," the professor commented.

"But because of South Africa's unique problem, neither of these can be considered a real alternative," he added. "With 15 million blacks and less than four million whites, one doesn't have to stretch his imagination far to see what would happen."

The professor said the US. attempts at solving its racial problems were "simplistic," the use of busing to achieve balance, etc., adding, "We don't see integration to be any solution."

The aim of the separate development

policy, he said, is to give the Bantu more justice than he has ever known in Africa, to give him the territory which he will have developed, and the right of self-determination.

Professor Louw said he criticizes some of the system, that he believes development of the homelands for the Bantu is not going fast enough, adding, "I criticize the territorial base of some of the homelands."

"Some of the homelands are not economically self-supporting but neither is Rumania, Costa Rica and many other countries," he commented.

"But by giving the Bantu the chance to develop on their own with outside aid, it will prevent social violence, the professor said. "I see no other way. You have not solved the problem in America, and neither has England."

He said the black people of South Africa were the best on the continent, adding, "They fled here from the north, and those that stayed behind became slaves of the Arabs."

The professor said the Bantu is much more enterprising, learns more easily and adapts more readily than others in Africa.

"The underdeveloped peoples today need paternal guidance," Professor Louw said, "I know this sounds old-fashioned, but there is no getting around the fact that some peoples are more developed than others. But this does not mean the underdeveloped should be left to the exploitation of others. We are, after all, our brothers' keepers."

From a humane standpoint, he added, more developed peoples have a responsibility for the less developed.

"Many other nations in Africa are being subjugated violently," he added. "Hundreds of thousands are systematically killed and the United Nations never raises a finger."

Professor Louw said the South African government recognizes and accepts the fact that self-determination for the Bantu might lead to secession from the nation by the homelands.

"Many black nations of Africa which recently gained independence are held together artificially by ruthless leaders," the professor said. "Our system has a higher moral position."

The professor said he personally opposes "petty apartheid," whereby people are segregated in restaurants, buses, etc., and that he believed it would die out in time.

He favors giving the Bantu, and also the colored, a voice in Parliament, but not on the "one man, one vote" idea. It would be, he said, on the idea of the U.S. Senate whereby area or territory is represented.

Any degree of integration would have to come from the upper level, Professor Louw said. Black and white leaders would lead the way.

But the professor said he did not believe there could be actual social mixing of the races—that there must be parallel development.

"Perhaps we might have the solution to the racial problem," he said. "At least it is an alternative to the solutions being tried and which are failing elsewhere."

DIAMONDS, GOLD NOT ONLY MINERALS SOUTH AFRICA HAS

(By Bill Kennedy)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—Most Americans probably think of diamonds and gold when they think of South Africa, but the country also has vast hordes of other precious minerals.

This morning I interviewed Dr. Thomas Muller, director of general mining, who told me South Africa is the leading mine country in the world and hopes to remain so for years to come.

The first mineral to attract the attention of early European settlers in the Cape Town

area was not gold or diamonds, but copper—discovered in 1685.

In the 1830's, white settlers in the Cape began their pioneering trek into the interior, which paved the way for the discovery of the vast mineral deposits which lie in the north regions of South Africa.

The first major discovery was made in 1866, when a young boy found a 21-carat diamond in the northern Cape Province. Three years later an African shepherd picked up an 83-carat diamond in the same region—and this stone became known as the "Star of South Africa." It launched the diamond rush, bringing people from all parts of the world to the new Kimberley diamond fields.

The second phase in the country's mineral development came in 1886 when a prospector by chance discovered the rich gold-bearing Main Reef of the Witwatersrand.

"For several decades, gold and diamonds continued to dominate the South African mining scene," Dr. Muller said. "The only other mineral mined extensively was coal, which was first sought to provide power needed to run the gold mines."

Today, South Africa supplies about 81 per cent of the free world's gold. It produces about 20 per cent of the diamonds in the world—second only to the Congo. However, about 40 per cent of South African production is of gem quality, and only 3 per cent has that quality in the Congo. The combined gemstone production of South Africa and South West Africa accounts for two-thirds of the world total.

There is still some gold production in the United States, mostly in the west—Nevada and California. Probably the only thing that remotely resembles the South African diamond mines is the small diamond field in Pike County, Ark.

"Copper is second only to gold in production value here. Copper production value has risen by more than 500 per cent over the past 10 years," Dr. Muller commented.

He added that in 1969, exports of copper totaled more than 72 per cent of the production. No great increase is expected during the next few years, he added.

Copper-mining in South Africa is carried on by quite different methods than in the U.S.—those in the vast copper pits of Ely, Nev., for instance.

Dr. Muller said that copper here is found much deeper than in the U.S. and consequently there is no open-pit mining.

South Africa is known throughout the world for its gold production. Not many realize however, that the country's platinum reserves—the largest in the world—are valued at 60 per cent more than the gold reserves.

"The Rustenburg platinum mines alone supplied two-thirds of the free world's demands in 1969," Dr. Muller said. "Chrome production is becoming ever important here, too, and 85 per cent is exported."

Uranium production began in South Africa in 1952 and reached a peak in 1959 with an output of about 5,800 tons a year. Uranium deposits are found mainly with gold, and it is produced as a byproduct of gold.

"South Africa may have the west's largest manganese deposits and is the world's second biggest producer," Dr. Muller noted.

Most coal production is consumed within the country, and is produced cheaply. Iron ore is another important mineral here.

"Over many years the country has won recognition as a world leader in the field of mining," Dr. Muller said. "This has led a number of countries to call in South African experts on problems ranging from shaft-sinking to tunnelling."

South Africa is becoming increasingly independent as far as foreign capital is concerned. It still welcomes foreign investment, but majority control remains with South Africans.

BANTU HANDICAPPED RECEIVE ASSISTANCE

(By Bill Kennedy)

LETUBA, SOUTH AFRICA.—Not too many years ago the black South Africans, in their tribal societies, would refuse to care for and would abandon their ill, their lame and those born with mental and physical handicaps.

It was, in sense, much like the custom of some Eskimos and some American Indians in years past of abandoning their elderly, leaving them to die alone when they could no longer pull their own weight—one of the tenets of the law of the jungle and survival of the fittest.

This is no longer true in South Africa. Credit for the breaking of this tradition must first go to the white missionaries, and now to the white government which is carrying on.

I visited the Letuba school which has 212 inmates—ranging from the very young to middle-aged adults. All are afflicted with some type of mental, physical or emotional handicap.

No one, not even the director of the school, Max H. Lemmer, cantender, contends that this school and a similar one are nearly enough. But in my own opinion, what is being done—compared to what was done a few years ago—is highly commendable.

I was touched by a class of nine young Bantu, ages from about eight to 12, that I visited. Unashamed of their physical deformities and proud of the progress they are making, they lined up and sang for me.

It was a religious song, sung in their native language. It, no doubt, had come down from the missionaries, for the song told of "the light" that came into their lives since discovering the Savior.

One little chap, not more than seven, had no hands—only what appeared to be loose masses of flesh where hands should be.

Yet, he held a pencil with both, and proceeded to write some English words, and the figures 1 through 10.

I visited the handicrafts section and saw youngsters and adults busy weaving baskets, bags, and other items, and also some quite beautiful ceramic work. There are a number of barracks and dormitories, all clean and designed especially to fit the various handicaps.

You have only to talk to Director Lemmer a few minutes until you can see his genuine dedication and know he is a man devoted to his work.

He is rightly proud of the work he is doing and hopeful that he and others here can do more.

Lemmer pointed out to me the various handicaps—cerebral palsy victims, a lad who had had both legs severed in a train accident, polio victims, meningitis victims, hydrocephalic and microcephalic cases.

He has, of course, those who have only physical handicaps and are capable of being educated and becoming somewhere near self-supporting.

Then there are, the uneducable, and the best that can be hoped for them is that some will be able—some day—to care for their personal needs, such as dressing, going to the bathroom, and feeding themselves.

In addition to this school, South Africa has one other in the west Transval in operation, a third being readied for opening in the Province of Natal, and a fourth on the planning boards at East London.

This school has a waiting list of 33, and within a year, plans call for extending the capacity for a total of 280.

It is quite easy to criticize South Africans from a distance of eight or 10,000 miles. But this criticism does not come so quickly once one has had opportunity to see first hand what is being done in the humane category, and what is planned for the future.

No, South Africa no longer abandons its sick and lame and the less fortunate. The

burden is heavy indeed, but progress is being made.

CASE MADE FOR PROGRESS IN SOUTH AFRICA—MOST BANTU PREFER SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT

(By Bill Kennedy)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—For three weeks now I have knocked around this country talking to government officials, school leaders, black leaders, visiting factories, farms, auto plants and numerous other places.

Now, I'm sitting alone in my hotel room trying to sum up my impressions of this country, trying to clarify my own thoughts about the many problems. This is my last day in the country.

Of course, the big problem—at least as far as the outside world goes—is the official government policy of separate development for the races.

In this land of 14.9 million Bantu, 3.8 million whites, 2 million coloureds (mixed) and more than a half-million Asians, there is only one thing I'm sure of at the moment: there are no easy solutions.

When one considers these problems, he must not make the mistake of comparing the incomparable—the Bantu and the American Negro, nor must he even compare them with the white settler vs. the Indian in early-day America.

One must remember that neither the white nor Bantu have any prior territorial claims in South Africa—for both arrived at about the same time.

It was not a case as found in America—where the white settlers found the Indians already there, and proceeded to encroach upon their land and drive them out.

It must be further remembered that the nine Bantu tribes in South Africa are vastly different, still hostile to each other and in most instances can't even speak the other's language.

Although there are now many educated Bantu and the rate of education is accelerating quickly, these are a people who less than 100 years ago had not even discovered the wheel—perhaps because they had no use for the wheel, or thought they hadn't.

I am convinced after even a short time here that the whites must of necessity look after the welfare of the Bantu. It is to their own advantage to make life better for the Bantu. And as one college professor recently told me, "We believe it is wiser to deal with the educated Bantu than with the ignorant."

Even though it is a big financial burden on white wage earners and salaried persons, the whites are breaking their backs to uplift the Bantu—in education, housing, hospitalization. They did not ask for this burden, but are doing quite well considering the enormity of the problem.

What also must be remembered about South Africa is too often the "separateness" of the races, with little or no emphasis on the "development" phase of the entire program.

What also must be remembered is the fact that the great majority of the Bantu prefer separate development, that they want to preserve their heritage and culture and language. This has been proven in elections where the candidate standing for separate development has swamped the candidate advocating integration.

Being realistic, one could not argue that the Black South African has the standard of living comparable to the white. But again, the comparison is unfair.

A much fairer comparison would be the Bantu and the black man in other African countries—Kenya, Tanzania, Nigeria, the Congo.

I talked about this to a Bantu, a lawyer, and he said he would not like to live in any other African country, adding, "In fact, I

would not like to be a black in America today."

So what the Bantu has is a job, improving education, land in certain areas—something most other black Africans cannot claim. What he lacks are certain civil and political rights, and even these are encompassed in the long-range program.

Western democracy, of course, emphasizes the humane and tries to de-emphasize group, racial and even individual differences.

Noble, perhaps, but it does not solve or even explain current problems. Practicality is emphasized here in South Africa—what is practical for the white AND black community.

As one man aptly put it, himself a black African, "If you do not have a practical political system, all the humaneness you can muster will not begin to solve your problems."

It must be remembered, too, that when the whites and the blacks came into this country in the 1600's, it was the whites who settled the communities, built the cities, developed the industries.

It is a foregone conclusion that the "one man, one vote" principle is no solution to South Africa's problem. It would mean giving over the country to a people to whom it never belonged. It would mean chaos and disintegration, and the end of western civilization in South Africa.

The educated Bantu tell you this, frankly admitting they are not yet ready to govern themselves even in their own homelands, much less a multi-tribal society.

I have become convinced that this is the reason that outside agitators and terrorists have met with such little success in attempts to rouse the Bantu to rebellion.

Separate development is not synonymous with denied privilege and opportunity. On the contrary, it is the working toward identical rights and privileges—only they are separate for the races, each enjoying same in his own racial community.

Naturally, there is not perfection in South Africa. In numerous instances, I have had government officials admit shortcomings. As one minister said to me, "We are experimenting toward solution to a grave problem. If some other country has an answer to the racial problem, I wish they would tell us and perhaps we would try it."

In fact it gives pleasure to some government officials here, both black and white, to ask about race problems in America. "Ah, ha," they say. "Neither do you have the answer."

U.S. ENVOY SAYS RELATIONS WITH SOUTH AFRICA "GOOD"

(By Bill Kennedy)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the 20th of a series of articles by Bill Kennedy of The Tribune-Herald's Washington Bureau on his trip to South Africa.)

PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA.—American Ambassador John Hurd said the United States and South Africa have "very good" diplomatic relations and that both countries were desirous of continuing them.

This reporter interviewed Hurd, of Laredo, Tex., at the American Embassy here, Hurd took up his post here only in September.

The ambassador said South Africa, like other countries, has "points of diversion" within its policy, both internal and external from those of the U.S. government.

Hurd said there are numerous visits of officials between the two countries which all "make for better understanding" in regard to "points of difference."

Scrupulously avoiding discussion on South Africa's policy of separate development for the races, Hurd commented:

"I wouldn't pinpoint any particular point (of disagreement), I think these are as well known in the press and by the people in our country as they are in South Africa."

Hurd said he found South Africa "an exceedingly interesting assignment." He first went to Cape Town where the Parliament was in session. He said there were some cold and dreary days, matched only by "the hot debate" within Parliament.

In October, Hurd and his family moved to the American Embassy home in Pretoria, seat of the administrative government of South Africa.

"This is an extremely viable economy with strong economic processes in the throes of evolution in many cases," Hurd said. "The country is rich in mineral ores and in people in the possibilities of the future."

The ambassador said that basically, his job was to carry out the policies of the U.S. government, to help formulate some policies and to let South Africa know what American policies are.

Hurd said one definite policy of the U.S. that applies to South Africa as well as other countries is to keep "hands off" regarding internal problems.

"We don't interfere, or even wish to appear to interfere with internal policies of a country," he remarked.

Hurd said he has not been embarrassed by any U.S. government official coming to this country and "sounding off." He intimated, however, this had occurred with non-official persons, but did not elaborate.

While South Africans are relatively unaware of the American holiday, Thanksgiving, Hurd said he and his family, and staff observed the holiday with a turkey dinner "just like at home," and also attended Congregational Church services.

Speaking of staff, the ambassador said about 75 Americans are employed by the embassy. They have some 150 dependents, and in addition there are a number of South Africans working there.

Ambassador and Mrs. Hurd are the parents of three daughters and a son, only one—the youngest daughter, Victoria, is living with them. She is 18, and will enter University of Cape Town in February.

The son is a lawyer in Houston, one daughter lives in Mineral Wells, Tex., and one in Delaware. All three are married.

Hurd won Senate confirmation for the ambassadorship last summer, having been rejected for the same post to Venezuela because of his American oil interests.

POW NATIONAL WEEK

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join today with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), the gentlemen from Indiana (Mr. MYERS and Mr. ZION), and 153 other Members of the House in introducing a House joint resolution designating the week of March 21–27 as a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

It is certainly appropriate that we should demonstrate our support and concern for the 1,500 Americans now listed as prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia. I hope that all Americans will join us in setting aside the week of March 21 to register our protest over the treatment these men are receiving at the hands of the North Vietnamese, and that the American people will observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

However, we must not set aside 1 week to express concern over the fate of our prisoners of war and forget about them the other 51 weeks of the year. Rather, we must take advantage of every opportunity to focus world attention on the plight of the POW's—the refusal of the North Vietnamese to release a complete list of the Americans being held captive, their refusal to release the seriously sick and injured, their refusal to permit the impartial inspections of all POW facilities, and their failure to permit the free exchange of mail.

American servicemen who are now being held prisoner or are missing in action in Southeast Asia have paid a high price for our involvement in that part of the world. While it is appropriate to devote 1 week to concentrated activities in support of their release, this action must not lead to suspension of efforts in their behalf during the rest of the year.

As I have said on a number of previous occasions, we must work for immediate withdrawal of all our servicemen—including our prisoners of war—from Southeast Asia.

U.S. PUBLIC UTILITIES MUST STOP BUYING FOREIGN HEAVY POWER TRANSFORMERS BEING DUMPED ON U.S. MARKETS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during the past session on two occasions I called attention to the serious problem of unlawful price discrimination in the sale of heavy power transformers—RECORD, September 28, 1970, at page 33908; and RECORD, December 30, 1970, at page 44198. On the latter occasion, I pointed out that 95 percent of the purchases of these products by Government-owned utilities such as TVA have in the last 3 years been made abroad.

I and 18 of my House colleagues have called for an immediate moratorium on such buying in order to preserve thousands of jobs and the health of an industry vital to our national security. We ask this not to protest against honest competition, but to prevent great harm being caused by what is known as dumping, the unlawful selling in this country of foreign products at prices far below those charged in their country of origin.

While I have expressed confidence that the pending antidumping case will ultimately succeed in ending this practice this complex case is months away from completion, despite an intensive effort on the part of the administration to expedite it.

For this reason we have called for a number of immediate alternative steps including the moratorium I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I include at the close of these remarks a copy of a recent legal memorandum which makes it clear that there is ample authority for such a moratorium.

atorium. It was prepared by an able attorney who has had extensive experience in this subject, Theodore F. T. Crollius. I commend it to your attention.

In the near future I and many of my colleagues will be seeking broader support within this Chamber to urge decisive action on this matter. For, regardless of our views on the need to restrain imports of one kind or another, there can be no question that we must put an end to what is clearly unlawful price discrimination.

The memorandum referred to follows:

JANUARY 6, 1971.

To: Representative Silvio O. Conte.

From: Theodore F. T. Crollius.

Re Government-owned Electric Utilities: Authority to Cease or Limit Procurement of Power Transmission Equipment from Foreign Suppliers.

On October 14, 1970, Mr. Conte and 18 other House members wrote President Nixon to urge his support of a moratorium by U.S. government-owned electric utilities on purchase of foreign-made heavy power transmission equipment until fair international trade in such equipment can be established. The letter stated, in part:

"We believe our government-owned utilities, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation, which in the last three years purchased 95 percent of their power transformers from foreign sources, should cease such buying at once, pending elimination of the inequities of foreign trade in these products. We understand that the agencies have authority for such action either in the exercise of discretion under their respective enabling legislation or under the Buy American Act."

This memorandum is submitted in support of the above statement that there is statutory and Executive authority for the three cited government power agencies to adopt a moratorium on procurement of power transmission equipment from foreign suppliers.

1. *Tennessee Valley Authority*: Section 9(b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C. 831h(b)) provides, in part:

"Subject only to the provisions of this chapter, the Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements, upon such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem necessary, including the final settlement of all claims and litigation by or against the Corporation; and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the Treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said chapter."

Such statutory language confers on the Corporation broad authority to determine that it is "necessary," i.e., that it is in the best interests of the Corporation, to cease or otherwise limit procurement of certain classes of electrical equipment, such as extra-high voltage (EHV) transmission equipment, to U.S.-made equipment. The grounds for such determination would be either or both (a) the Corporation's direct and immediate interest that the U.S. technology base in this equipment should be sustained and encouraged, and (b) the Corporation's interest that unfair and discriminatory foreign competition in electrical equipment should be eliminated or otherwise deterred.

In addition to the foregoing authority under TVA's enabling legislation, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Corpo-

ration can invoke the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10d) to fix the margin of preference for goods of domestic origin at a differential sufficiently high to eliminate or deter sourcing from foreign suppliers. Executive Order No. 10582, as amended by Executive Order No. 11051 (17 F.R. 9683), provides that generally the margin of domestic preference shall be six percent (Sec. 2(c)(1)). But Section 3(a) of the Order provides:

"Sec. 3. Nothing in this order shall affect the authority or responsibility of an executive agency:

(a) To reject any bid or offer for reasons of the national interest not described or referred to in this order;"

And Section 5 of the Order provides, in part:

"Sec. 5. This order shall apply only to contracts entered into after the date hereof. In any case in which the head of an executive agency proposing to purchase domestic materials determines that a greater differential than that provided in this order between the cost of such materials of domestic origin and materials of foreign origin is not unreasonable or that the purchase of materials of domestic origin is not inconsistent with the public interest, this order shall not apply."

The Chairman of the Board of the Corporation, therefore, has the authority to determine that it is either in the "national interest" (Sec. 3) or "not inconsistent with the public interest" (Sec. 5) to fix the margin of domestic preference for power transmission equipment at a rate which will ensure sufficient procurement from U.S. suppliers to sustain and encourage the domestic technology base and/or eliminate or otherwise deter unfair and discriminatory foreign competition.

2. *Bonneville Power Administration*: Section 2(c) of the Bonneville Project Act of 1937, as amended (16 U.S.C. 832a(c)), provides:

"(c) The Administrator is authorized, in the name of the United States, to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation, such real and personal property, or any interest therein, including lands, easements, rights-of-way, franchises, electric transmission lines, substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto, as the administrator finds necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Title to all property and property rights acquired by the administrator shall be taken in the name of the United States."

Section 2(c) has been construed by the Administrator of BPA, the Department of the Interior, and the Comptroller General to confer broad discretionary authority on the Administrator in the statutory exercise of his responsibilities for "program operations" procurement, i.e., purchases for non-administrative and non-housekeeping purposes.

Standing by itself Section 2(c) is probably sufficient authority for the Administrator of BPA to cease or otherwise limit procurement of power transmission equipment from foreign suppliers. But there is no need to test this proposition because, in previous opinions of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior and the Comptroller General, Section 2(c) has been read in the light of and joined with other provisions of law which, in their entirety, conclusively establish the Administrator's discretionary procurement authority.

There is a 1966 decision of the Comptroller General, involving EHV transmission equipment, which is so squarely in point and which so precisely defines and disposes of the procedural issues involved herein that it is excerpted below in considerable detail:

"The subject invitation, issued May 24, 1966, solicited bids for furnishing thirteen 500-kv. circuit breakers. By letters dated May 26, 1966, the Chief of Supply, BPA, advised Cogenel, Inc., and Merlin & Gerin

[French manufacturers] that BPA has 39 500-kv. circuit breakers on order and one in service and that of the 39, Cogenel has contracted to furnish 18 and Merlin & Gerin 21. The letters stated further that, under the authority of 16 U.S.C. 832a(c) of the Bonneville Project Act, it was decided that award of a contract at this time to either firm or its licensees for additional 500-kv. breakers was not appropriate for the best interests of the BPA system and its customers. The letters also stated the basis for the conclusion. They explained that the 500-kv. breakers constitute a critical part of the power network and that their reliability is essential to BPA's power commitments; that BPA does not consider that the 500-kv. breakers of any manufacturer have been in service for a sufficient period of time to assure that a particular design is free from defects; and that, therefore, sound engineering judgment dictates spreading the 500-kv. breaker purchases among a number of manufacturers so that if a particular design has some serious defects, the whole system will not be faced with what could amount to catastrophic consequences.

"The question, as we see it, is whether the Administrator is authorized by the Bonneville Project Act, 16 U.S.C. 832, *et seq.*, to preclude, for the reasons stated, certain manufacturers from offering equipment which would otherwise meet the BPA performance specifications.

"Subsection (b) of section 832a of the act provides:

In order to encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated and marketed and to provide reasonable outlets therefor, and to prevent the monopolization thereof by limited groups, the administrator is authorized and directed to provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such electric transmission lines and substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto, as he finds necessary, desirable, or appropriate for the purpose of transmitting electric energy, available for sale, from the Bonneville project to existing and potential markets, and, for the purpose of interchange of electric energy, to interconnect the Bonneville project with other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems constructed on or after August 20, 1937.

"Subsection (c) of section 832a provides in pertinent part as follows:

The administrator is authorized, in the name of the United States, to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation, such real and personal property, or any interest therein, including lands, easements, rights-of-way, franchises, electric transmission lines, substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto, as the administrator finds necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

"Subsection (f) of section 832a provides:

Subject only to the provisions of this chapter, the Administrator is authorized to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements, including the amendment, modification, adjustment, or cancellation thereof and the compromise or final settlement of any claim arising thereunder, and to make such expenditures, upon such terms and conditions and in such manner as he may deem necessary.

"Section 832g provides as follows with respect to purchases of supplies and services:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all purchases and contracts made by the administrator or the Secretary of the Army for supplies or for services except for personal services, shall be made after advertising, in such manner and at such times sufficiently in advance of opening bids, as the administrator or Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, shall determine to be adequate to insure notice and opportunity for competition. Such advertisement shall not be required, however, when (1) an emergency requires immediate delivery of the

supplies or performance of the services; or (2) repair parts, accessories, supplemental equipment, or services are required for supplies or services previously furnished or contracted for; or (3) the aggregate amount involved in any purchase of supplies or procurement of services does not exceed \$500; in which cases such purchases of supplies or procurement of services may be made in the open market in the manner common among businessmen. In comparing bids and in making awards, the administrator or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, may consider such factors as relative quality and adaptability of supplies or services, the bidder's financial responsibility, skill, experience, record of integrity in dealing, and ability to furnish repairs and maintenance services, the time of delivery or performance offered, and whether the bidder has complied with the specifications.

"We observe first that section 832a (b) of the act authorizes and directs the Administrator, among other things, to do what he finds is 'necessary, desirable, or appropriate' to 'improve' the power transmitting facilities. From what has been reported above, we believe it is self-evident that the BPA considers that diversification is desirable because it results in an improved system since the risk of failure is not concentrated, but spread out over the products of several manufacturers. Subsection (b) indicates the purpose of the act and what the Administrator is to accomplish. Therefore, the modes of accomplishment provided by the act should be read preclude, for the reasons against that background. Since the Administrator is authorized to do what he believes is desirable to improve the power system, section 832g of the act which provides the manner in which supplies are to be purchased should be construed with that authority in mind. In that connection, it should be observed that section 832g was not intended to be limited by any other advertising statute in that at the outset it indicates that it is not controlled by any other provision of law. The section does provide for an 'opportunity for competition,' but such competition, obviously in view of the authority in section 832a(b), can be limited by what the Administrator seeks to accomplish. In this case, since there were three bidders other than Cogen who could and did bid upon the procurement, the 'opportunity for competition' was met.

"We observe further that section 832a(c), which authorizes the Administrator to acquire property, is also tied into the 'purposes of this chapter,' which as previously noted can be found in section 832a(b).

"We observe too that in a report from the Department of the Interior on H.R. 2690 and H.R. 2693, duplicate bills to amend the Bonneville Project Act, contained at page 13 of S. Rept. No. 469, 79th Cong., 1st sess., the Secretary made the following comments:

Furthermore, the Bonneville Power Administration is not engaged in a governmental regulatory program. It operates a business enterprise from which the Government derives a return of no small proportions. Government procedure was not designed for such an agency, and in many instances it has hindered the operations of the Administrator to an unwarranted extent. The bills under consideration recognize these characteristics of the Bonneville Power Administration and will facilitate its operations as a regional and business agency.

"The purpose of the bill which amended section 832a(f) of the Bonneville Project Act, as stated on page 4 of S. Rept. No. 469 is—

*** to permit the Bonneville Power Administration to use better methods of administration in carrying out his present functions. It would not extend his authority in the power field and is concerned chiefly with the relationships of the Administrator with his employees and with other Federal agencies. They would enable the Administra-

tor to employ business principles and methods in the operation of a business enterprise and would eliminate some hampering procedures designed primarily for agencies conducting governmental regulatory programs.

"Moreover, our Office in B-105397, September 21, 1951, made the following observation concerning the impact of section 832a(f):

The legislative history of the foregoing provision of law indicates that its purpose was to free the Administration from the requirements and restrictions ordinarily applicable to the conduct of Government business and to enable the Administrator to conduct the business of the project with a freedom similar to that which has been conferred on public corporations carrying on similar or comparable activities. * * *

"The Bonneville Project Act contains powers broader than those customarily vested in Government agencies, and these powers were preserved when Congress enacted Public Law 89-343 (act of November 8, 1965, 79 Stat. 1303, 41 U.S.C. 252) extending the mandatory character of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. The public law specifically preserved from impairment the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to procurement for program operations under the Bonneville Project Act. This recent amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act recognizes the special and exceptional procurement authority over these matters which has hitherto been conferred by law. In that regard, comments found in H. Rept. No. 1166, 89th Cong., 1st sess., state that the amendment will provide the Administrator "sufficient authority to enable the agency to operate in business matters as a public utility with powers and effectiveness similar to those of a corporate entity." It is understood that administrative and housekeeping items are excluded from the term "program operations" and that, to the extent that these procurement programs would not be impaired by compliance with the Administrator's regulations, such regulations will be observed, as heretofore contemplated by the Congress and the President. (H. Rept. No. 670, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 28; Presidential Directive of July 1, 1949, 14 F.R. 3699).

"Our consideration of the Bonneville Project Act as a whole leads us to the conclusion that the Administrator was authorized in the circumstances of the case to preclude Cogen and Merlin & Gerin equipment from the immediate procurement. While reliance on the act is sufficient to arrive at this conclusion, the legislative history, discussed above, supports this view." . . .

Comptroller General Opinion B-159458, October 21, 1966.

In addition to the foregoing procurement authority vested in the Administrator under the Bonneville enabling legislation, the Buy American Act is applicable to BPA procurement. Pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3174) the Secretary of the Interior, acting on behalf of BPA, may invoke the provisions of Executive Order No. 10582 which implements the Buy American statute (discussed above in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority). Accordingly, the Secretary of the Interior (either himself or by delegation to the Administrator) has the same authority as the Chairman of the Board of Directors of TVA to determine that it is either in the "national interest" (Sec. 3 of the Executive Order) or "not inconsistent with the public interest" (Sec. 5) to fix the margin of domestic preference for power transmission equipment at a rate which will ensure sufficient procurement from U.S. suppliers to sustain and encourage the domestic technology base and/or eliminate or otherwise deter unfair and discriminatory foreign competition.

3. *Bureau of Reclamation:* The Bureau of Reclamation does not have the broad pro-

urement discretion that TVA and BPA possess by virtue of their enabling legislation. As an organic part of the Department of the Interior the Bureau is subject to the general, and less discretionary, procurement regulations of the Department.

Nevertheless, the Secretary of the Interior can resort to the Buy-American Act and invoke Section 3 or Section 5 of Executive Order No. 10582 on behalf of Bureau of Reclamation procurement, thereby effectively preventing foreign sources for EHV power transmission equipment.

In fact, there is Bureau precedent for such action. In 1967 the Bureau of Reclamation had a requirement for hydro-turbines and generators for the third power plant at Grand Coulee Dam. The equipment required was the largest and most technologically advanced of its kind ever designed for installation in the U.S. The Department of the Interior, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, determined that national security considerations and public policy generally were so clearly involved in this procurement that it should be limited to domestic suppliers.

The same reasoning, it is submitted, can and should be applied to Bureau procurement of high technology EHV power transmission equipment.

THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to return to this distinguished body for a second time as Representative of the people of the Fifth District of North Carolina. They have given me a mandate to serve in this Chamber as a voice of reason and pragmatism, and as the present instrument of their will. I pledge myself and my best efforts to the fulfillment of that mandate.

It is appropriate for me, at this time, to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your ascension to the high office to which you have recently been elected. At the outset of your tenure, I am confident that you will distinguish yourself as a man of fairness, ingenuity, and vision.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the new majority leader, Mr. Boggs, whose long service in this Chamber has been a credit to the people he represents, and to the Nation at large.

And I wish, of course, to again offer congratulations to our distinguished minority leader, Mr. Ford, whose dedication and wise counsel have been constant sources of inspiration for me. I am sure he will continue to serve in the best interests of our party and the Nation. I pledge to him my strong support and my assistance in whatever area it may be needed or desired.

As we begin a new Congress today, I believe we should all dedicate ourselves to those same high principles which characterize our present leadership. I hope that we shall conduct the business of this House in a new spirit of unity, welcoming the expression of divergent opinions, but realizing that if our work is to be truly successful, we must be of one accord in our efforts to strengthen the Union and improve the quality of our national life.

The people of my district have made it clear that their major concern at this time is the restoration of reason in formulating policies that affect our local educational systems.

In my campaign for reelection last fall, I stressed the need and the importance of developing fair, enforceable, and understandable guidelines to help implement the desegregation of our schools.

Much of my effort in the 91st Congress was directed toward finding a solution to the chaos that characterizes school districts across the country.

In the last Congress, I introduced legislation to establish nondiscriminatory school systems and to preserve the rights of elementary and secondary students to attend schools in their own neighborhoods.

No action was taken on this legislation during the course of the 91st Congress, and no improvement in our local school situation has been made.

The Supreme Court has taken under advisement the case of Swann against Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, which deals specifically with the issue of forced busing to overcome racial imbalance.

The High Court has not as yet made a ruling on this case, and their decision may not be forthcoming for many months. But still the matter persists, and the people of my district have asked for action from this House.

In accordance with that mandate, I am today reintroducing my nondiscriminatory education bill, in the hope that the measure will be actively considered in this Congress, and swiftly approved.

The vaguely drawn forced busing edicts issued by our courts have proven, in almost every instance, to be accompanied by incredibly complex administrative burdens and exceedingly high costs.

The remedying of this condition will receive my highest priority in this Congress, and I call upon my colleagues, old and new, to join with me in arriving at an equitable solution to this problem.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to establish nondiscriminatory school systems and to preserve the rights of elementary and secondary students to attend their neighborhood schools, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Nondiscriminatory Education Act".

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. The right of elementary and secondary education students to attend their neighborhood schools shall not be abridged by any Federal authority based upon the race, creed, color, religion, or national origin of the students.

Sec. 102. Each local nondiscriminatory system shall have the right to determine their own attendance zones without interference from Federal authority as long as they are reasonably drawn as to serve the needs of the community and no effort is made by drawing such attendance zones to force a student to attend a particular school because of his race, color, creed, religion, or national origin.

Sec. 103. Each local nondiscriminatory system shall have the right to determine the

placement of any new school or school facility without interference from Federal authority so long as the new school or facility is placed so as to reasonably serve the needs of the community and no effort is made through its placement to discriminate against any student or group of students based upon race, creed, color, religion, or national origin.

Sec. 104. Each local nondiscriminatory system shall have the right to determine the placement of faculty and administrative personnel without interference from Federal authority as long as such placement reasonably serves the needs of the school system and no effort is made through its placement to discriminate against any faculty or administrative member on the basis of race, creed, color, religion, or national origin.

TITLE II—DEFINITIONS

Sec. 201. The term "nondiscriminatory system" whenever applied to any school system receiving public support means a school system wherein all schools comprising the system function as a part of an overall single administrative unit and in which there is no force or discrimination present, based on race, creed, color, religion, or national origin, in establishing the makeup of the student body, faculty or in the allocation of funds, books and facilities to the respective schools.

Sec. 202. The term "pairing" whenever applied to any school or school system receiving public support means any act required by any Federal authority or person or board acting pursuant to such authority to cause the merger of schools or the alteration of the grade structure for the purpose of altering the race or ethnic makeup of the student body.

TITLE III—ILLEGAL ACTS

Sec. 301. (a) The operation of any school system receiving public support other than non-discriminatory-school system shall be illegal.

(b) The forced closing of any school for the purpose of forcing any student or group of students into a different school for the purpose of altering the racial or ethnic makeup of the student body shall be illegal.

(c) The pairing of schools shall be illegal.

(d) Forcing a child to leave his neighborhood school to attend another more distant because of his race, color, creed, religion, or national origin shall be illegal.

RESOLUTION ON PRISONERS OF WAR BY THE VILLAGE OF VICTORIA, ILL.

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, a resolution was passed in early December 1970, by the Village Board of Victoria, Ill., in Knox County. The resolution is the unanimous product of the mayor, the clerk, and the six trustees. It expresses the sincere concern of the Board of Trustees and of the citizens of Victoria over the treatment of prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese. In order that my colleagues might take note of the request by the Village of Victoria, I am including the resolution as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE VILLAGE OF VICTORIA, BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Whereas the government of North Vietnam refuses to abide by the rules of Geneva Convention concerning the treatment of the prisoners of war;

Whereas it has repeatedly refused the inspection of their prisoners of war camps by International Red Cross representatives, as required by Geneva Convention;

Whereas North Vietnam government has reportedly mishandled and tortured the prisoners of war at their mercy; and

Whereas it has therewith committed the same crimes for which war criminals have been tried immediately following World War II, found guilty and executed;

Therefore it be resolved by the Victoria Village Trustees, acting in behalf of the citizens of Victoria Village, that we demand that such inhuman treatment of the prisoners of war by North Vietnamese government would be stopped and, if North Vietnamese government shall refuse to abide by the provisions of Geneva Convention, it's members shall be branded as the criminals against the humanity;

Furthermore it be resolved that we ask the President of the United States, the United States Congress, and all officials at all levels of government, domestic and foreign, as well as all the citizens of all the civilized nations, to demand from the North Vietnamese government strict observance of the Geneva Convention rules concerning treatment of the prisoners of war.

Unanimously passed by Victoria Village Trustees, this 7th day of December, the year 1970.

FEDERAL PRIVACY ACT

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there have been several reports of Army surveillance over political figures and the public at large. What is perhaps most alarming about these revelations is that most probably only the tip of the iceberg is being exposed. Hidden is the growing accumulation of information on individuals that is being stored in thousands of interconnecting Government computers for quick retrieval and cross-referencing.

This collection of data cannot help but pose a threat to personal privacy and individual liberty. It is time that the Congress act decisively in developing some safeguards to countervail the intrusion of computer technology into our private lives.

It is in this regard that I am reintroducing my Federal privacy bill with 20 cosponsors. This bill would require all Federal agencies to notify persons of any personal files maintained on them. Furthermore, the agencies would have to provide a person with the opportunity to inspect his files and add, at his own expense, statements pointing out errors, if any, or providing explanations where necessary. Exception to this disclosure rule would be made for records whose secrecy is required in the interest of national security and for records being retained for cases involving criminal prosecutions.

I believe it is imperative that the Congress immediately investigate the dimensions of the Army's surveillance activities, as well as the entire Government's policies for collecting information on individuals. Today, the average citizen has no recourse and the reputations of count-

less numbers of decent citizens are being threatened or destroyed by malicious and false information appearing in the millions of dossiers held by Government agencies. The individual must be given some means for protecting himself against misinformation. The bill I am introducing today would provide this protection.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Chairman of the Government Operations Committee, Mr. HOLIFIELD, should be commended for the initiative he has taken in instructing his staff to assemble background materials by way of a preliminary investigation into the allegations of military surveillance of political activities. Chairman HOLIFIELD has informed me that he also is working on this matter with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN). Next month the Senator's judiciary subcommittee will be holding hearings on the subject of "computers, data banks, and the Bill of Rights;" the military's intelligence activities will be included in the committee's consideration.

The following Members of this body have joined in cosponsoring the Federal Privacy Act with me:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

James Abourezk, Bella S. Abzug, Les Aspin, Nick Begich, Mario Biaggi, Jonathan Bingham, Shirley Chisholm, Don Edwards, Seymour Halpern, Michael Harrington.

Robert L. Leggett, Norman F. Lent, Stewart B. McKinney, Parren J. Mitchell, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Bertram L. Podell, Ogden Reid, William F. Ryan, Fred Schwengel, Olin E. Teague.

PRISONERS' FAMILIES APPROVE
RESCUE EFFORTS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, early last month, by a vote of 347 to 15, this body agreed to House Resolution 1282, in support for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war incarcerated in North Vietnam. The overwhelming majority ignored the bleats of the surrender cult and served notice to North Vietnam that the American people, speaking through their chosen representatives, approve of the recent attempt to free the prisoners.

What made the lopsided vote even more impressive is the fact that seven of the 15 "nay" votes were cast by Members from Greater New York. Two of the seven from that metropolis who opposed the resolution were emitting the dying squawks of lame ducks.

That the vote was an accurate barometer of public opinion has been eloquently verified by a survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J. This poll showed that 81 percent of the next-of-kin of the prisoners of war approve of the attempt to rescue American prisoners from Son Tay prison. Only 10 percent had unfavorable reactions. Another rescue attempt would have the approval of 84 percent of the next-of-kin, according to the survey.

Mr. Speaker, let us quit paying serious

attention to such humbug as world opinion and listen for a change to what our fellow Americans have to say. After all, they are the ones who chose us to represent them in this, the popular branch of the Congress of the United States.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified during the last Congress to see a large number of the bills I had either sponsored or cosponsored enacted into law, or incorporated into more comprehensive legislation. Among them were bills to make Monomoy Island, in my district, a wilderness area. Another increased the authorization for land purchases at the Cape Cod National Seashore. Additionally, the 91st Congress saw enactment of bills I cosponsored which created the Council on Environmental Quality, a Commission on Population Growth, and a Commission on Marihuana. Perhaps most importantly, I was proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation to establish a Securities Investor Protection Corporation, a new semipublic agency which should promote investor confidence in our securities markets for the years ahead.

Regrettably, a number of bills which I consider particularly worthy and which I had sponsored, were not passed in the 91st Congress. Today, then, I am reintroducing these and hope that full consideration will be given them in both committee and on the floor of Congress. Of course, these do not include all of the legislative initiative I intend to undertake in this Congress. For example, I expect in the next few days to file several bills for consideration by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. At this point, however, I would like simply to outline the provisions of the bills I am now introducing.

Mr. Speaker, Vietnam remains one of the most pressing and perplexing problems facing our Nation. Its rapid conclusion can only expedite reconciliation and help in the restoration of prosperity at home. To this end, I am reintroducing a resolution calling for United Nations involvement in the pursuit of peace in Indochina. Specifically this measure proposes the establishment of a U.N. peace-keeping force to police a cease fire, phased withdrawal of all foreign troops during that cease fire and a final settlement of outstanding political questions at an international conference.

On the domestic scene, I believe that one of our top priorities in the 92d Congress should be the enactment of a campaign reform act aimed at regulating the size and nature of campaign expenditures. Accordingly, I am refiling such legislation today. This bill, whose principal author is our distinguished colleague, JOHN ANDERSON of Illinois, should serve as an admirable basis for comprehensive campaign reform in the 92d Congress.

Last year the House made history in passing the amendment to the Constitution providing equal rights for men and women under the law. Regrettably this commendable measure died in the other body. Thus, to lend my support to early hearings and action in the House this year, I am refiling the women's equal rights amendment.

When the House passed the Social Security Amendments of 1970, it also adopted a motion to recommit with instructions to add on a feature guaranteeing automatic cost of living increases, a proposal I had filed earlier in the form of a separate bill. This legislation, as we know, also died in the closing days of the 91st Congress. The cost of living feature, I believe, is of vital importance to those on social security and so today I am introducing legislation containing such a Means Committee, as it proceeds to consideration of the Social Security Amendments of 1971 will adopt this legislation.

Another bill in the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee which I am refiling is the administration's revenue-sharing proposal. Interest in this legislation is rapidly growing at the state and local level. I hope that the widespread sponsorship of revenue sharing in the House will expedite Ways and Means consideration of this legislation.

With a view toward promoting international cooperation and conciliation, I am also refiling resolutions calling for a joint space exploration venture with technologically advanced nations and for an Atlantic Union Delegation to explore the possibility of establishing a transatlantic federal union.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am refiling several other pieces of legislation under the principal sponsorship of other Members. I am joining Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts in reintroducing a bill to establish an Economic Conversion Commission whose chief mission would be to facilitate an orderly transformation of our economy from wartime to peacetime production. The proposed Economic Conversion Commission could be especially useful in an area like Massachusetts where technological expertise and manpower left idle as a result of decreased space and defense spending might be channeled into combatting pollution and other critical problems of modern American society.

And, in concert with our distinguished colleague JOHN McFALL, I am again cosponsoring the Public Works Acceleration Act. If this legislation is enacted, such economically hard-hit areas as New Bedford in my district will be eligible for large Federal grants-in-aid to decrease unemployment and build needed community facilities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, together with the able member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. MICHEL, I am cosponsoring legislation to base the Government's finances on the calendar, rather than fiscal, year. Since Congress generally does not complete appropriations for most agencies until well after the fiscal year has commenced, this legislation should bring the fiscal year into line with the realities of the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, as I have noted, I believe that each of these bills is particularly meritorious. It is my strong hope that the

appropriate committees will give full consideration to these measures as quickly as possible.

\$100 FOR EACH SCHOOLCHILD

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am again introducing my tuition voucher proposal, known as the Schoolchildren's Assistance Act, and often called the GI bill for junior.

This measure authorizes an annual financial grant to each child attending school—whether public or nonpublic. It prohibits Federal interference in the operation or administration of any school system. It returns to parents a share of their own tax money to assist them in directly controlling the education of their children in the schools of their choice.

We can no longer continue to ignore the consequences of declining enrollment in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. This system educates close to 6 million children. However, in the last 3 years some 1,000 of these institutions have closed.

In the last 2 years, according to an article in the New York Daily News on January 18, nearly 500,000 pupils from Catholic schools across the Nation have been forced to enroll in public schools, because of high costs and advancing tuitions at these nonpublic schools. This situation has forced a massive increase in school taxes in a number of States.

In New York State, an estimated 872,000 children are enrolled in independent schools. If these children were forced into the public school system—at today's costs—it would put an estimated additional burden of \$1.139 billion annually on the taxpayers of New York, based on a cost of \$1,306 per pupil.

If all nonpublic elementary and secondary schools in the Nation closed tomorrow, it would force upon the American taxpayers an additional \$4.7 billion annually to absorb these children into public schools, based on estimates by the U.S. Office of Education.

My bill would encourage these schools to continue operation, and result in a substantial saving to the taxpayers of the Nation.

I want to emphasize that this bill is not limited to children in religious oriented schools. It offers a real opportunity for diversity in educational opportunity for all school children—regardless of race, religion, color, or geographical location.

Nine years have passed since I first introduced this legislation. When first proposed, a grant of \$20 per child was recommended on the basis of the Federal involvement in education at that time. Since then the cost of education has soared, and I am now recommending an expenditure of \$100 for every child enrolled in elementary and secondary schools in the Nation.

After this approach was first advanced, considerable dialog and discourse have taken place. The public has now become more vitally aware of the need to protect one of the most fundamental rights of man in a free society—the paramount right of the parent to control the education of his children, without being penalized.

This concept has been endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, as well as many distinguished educational authorities. It is being considered as the basis for a pilot project by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity as an innovation to improve the educational opportunities of the disadvantaged. Earlier this week, a special panel appointed by Governor Mandel of Maryland endorsed this approach to educational equity.

Today there is a crisis of confidence in our educational system. Old solutions are not the answer to new problems.

Taxpayers are revolting against constantly increasing school costs. They do not like being forced to support a monolithic State school system, to the detriment of competing educational institutions.

Time after time, the American people have expressed their strong opposition to the high cost of taxes by voting down requests for school funds.

My bill would give the hard-working taxpayers an opportunity to choose exactly how their educational tax money will be spent. At the same time it offers the best opportunity to provide equality in the exercise of the civil rights for all school children.

It offers an appropriate response to the challenge of the times.

LEAA AND THE NATIONAL POLICE FORCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I voted against H.R. 17825 to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act by providing Federal funds for State and local police. At that time, I explained that my objection was based on the fear that Federal funds would again be used to destroy local control and bring about Federal supervision of State and local police departments.

Not even a year has passed and already we are advised that a branch of the Justice Department is requiring State police, that have accepted Federal funds, to comply with Federal regulations and standards under the threat of a cutoff of funds or court action.

Since the announced intent of the spending of tax payer's money by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—was to upgrade local and State police forces, one can but conclude that integration of police forces has a greater priority than controlling crime or making the streets safe.

I include a newspaper clipping and a copy of the Dan Smoot Report of January 27, 1970, which follows:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 12, 1971]

UNITED STATES ACTS TO INTEGRATE STATE HIGHWAY PATROLS

(By Fred Barnes)

A new effort by a branch of the Justice Department to eliminate job discrimination in law enforcement agencies across the country may force state highway patrols, particularly in such Southern border states as Virginia and Maryland to recruit black patrolmen actively.

A set of regulations issued Dec. 31 attaches a proviso to the hundreds of millions of dollars passed out annually to state and local police, prisons and courts by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Recipients of LEAA funds now must submit reports showing that they comply with federal regulations against job bias. If the reports indicate they don't meet federal standards, the agencies will face a cutoff of LEAA funds or court action against their discriminatory practices.

LIKE SCHOOLS RULES

The regulations are similar to guidelines set by the U.S. Office of Education, which has threatened to cut off federal funds—and in some cases has actually stopped aid—to school districts which failed to integrate sufficiently.

A spokesman for LEAA said most state highway patrols receive grants from LEAA, either through bloc grants, according to population, or "discretionary grants" for specific anti-crime projects.

A recent survey by the Race Relations Information Center in Nashville, Tenn., showed that 98 or 99 percent of state highway patrolmen are white. In Virginia only one member of the 912-man force is black and in Maryland there are 13 blacks among 1,150 patrolmen.

By itself, however, the small percentage of black patrolmen in the two states would not impel LEAA to cut off any grant. That would occur only if LEAA felt that the small percentage of blacks was the result of discrimination.

The state patrols, which in the South were often used in the early 1960s to rout civil rights demonstrators, could evade the new federal guidelines by simply not accepting LEAA funds.

LEAA has the power to seek court action against job bias in law enforcement agencies only if they are recipients of grants.

In its survey, the Race Relations Information Center obtained racial breakdowns for 42 of the 49 state highway patrols. Ten states, two of them in the South, reported that none of their patrolmen is black.

CALIFORNIA HAS MOST

These states are Alabama, Idaho, Iowa, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont and Wyoming. Ten other states said they have one black patrolman: Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Minnesota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

The state with the most blacks on its highway patrol is California, with 80. It has 174 other non whites on the force. New York has eight blacks among 3,275 state patrolmen and Illinois has 23 of 1,698.

In some Southern and border states, blacks have complained that they are systematically denied an opportunity to join state patrols. The complaint also has been made, less frequently, in other states.

Under the new LEAA rules, bias in employment along racial, religious or ethnic lines is prohibited in areas such as recruiting, transfer and promotion. States are ordered to file reports giving racial breakdowns in their law enforcement agencies.

"As soon as proper staffing of a civil rights investigative team is completed—probably within six months—LEAA plans to begin making on-site inspections of agencies receiving funds to review their employment

practices and policies," a Justice Department press release stated.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Dallas, Tex., July 27, 1970]

NATIONAL POLICE FORCE

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 established the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in the Justice Department, to channel tax money from the federal government to states for state and local law enforcement. Congress appropriated \$63 million for LEAA in 1969, \$268 million in 1970. The Nixon administration requested \$480 million for fiscal 1971.

Congressman William M. McCulloch (Ohio Republican) introduced a bill to authorize \$650 million for LEAA in fiscal 1971. Congressman Emanuel Celler (New York Democrat) introduced a bill to authorize \$750 million. Congressman Claude Pepper (Florida Democrat) proposed \$1 billion for LEAA in 1971.

On June 30, 1970, the House, by a roll-call vote of 342-2, passed HR 17825, authorizing \$650 million for LEAA in fiscal 1971, \$1 billion for fiscal 1972, \$1.5 billion for fiscal 1973. The two Congressmen who voted against it were Maston O'Neal (Georgia Democrat) and John R. Rarick (Louisiana Democrat). Rarick was the only Member of the House who voiced opposition. He said:

"The crime situation in the United States has reached such crisis proportions that the members of Congress are hearing from the folks at home with demands that something be done. The political impulse seems to be to do something, even if it is wrong.

"We are being asked to ignore the cause of the problem—the many crime-favoring Supreme Court laws. We are being urged to hoodwink our people into thinking that by massive expenditures of Federal money, by so-called upgrading our local and state police officers, and modernizing our correctional facilities, we can deter the criminal threat.

"The crime problem in the United States is not the fault of Congress—nor the police officers, nor the taxpayers. Congress is hiding its head in the sand if it thinks it can fool the people into believing that by giving away more of their money, they will be any safer from the criminal element which roams our streets and highways like some sacred cow.

"We already have enough laws on the books.

"The . . . problem is that as we continue to talk about reducing crime, our law enforcement agencies are denied the freedom to enforce the laws. This bill offers no solution. It but provides for \$3.2 billion to be doled out over 3 years for grants to local and State police who agree to comply with various edicts and guidelines laid down by the Attorney General of the United States and enforced by the administrator of . . . LEAA. Except for this purported financial assistance, the measure offers only false promises of help to the police of America in their efforts to stop crime.

"Those of us who live in the South are familiar with Federal funding programs based upon compliance. The funded State or local organization loses all semblance of representing its local people and becomes completely subservient to the funding agency. In this instance, any law enforcement agency accepting Federal funds, which does not toe the line of compliance, can expect to be threatened with loss of funds and if not whipped into line, have its funds cut off.

"We of the South have witnessed firsthand what has happened to our State and local governmental agencies that accepted Federal funds. We need only point to the wholesale destruction of our public schools and public education system which are in many areas either abandoned by a large segment of our people or made wholly inadequate to educate the youth.

"With Federal funds necessarily comes Federal control. It is utterly ridiculous for any rationally informed person to believe that we can buy personal safety or freedom from crime. It is equally ridiculous to believe that we can hand out Federal money and not end up with Federal control and domination over our local police.

"Up to now, the sociological pseudointellectuals have sought to justify throwing away billions of tax dollars with their theories that we can buy off criminals with massive Federal programs and funds. While they still refuse to acknowledge the utter futility of their upside-down thinking, some of the same spokesmen, that is, Ramsey Clark, the National Governors' Conference, the League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, and representatives of do-gooder organizations now support this bill and ask Congress to buy the police away from the people and put them under the control of an appointed Fed.

"The police power under the Constitution of the United States, with rare exception caused by judicial fiat, has historically been reserved to the States. Now, after 190 years of constitutional government with the police being under the State and local control, we are told that the Constitution must be warped if it says what it does not say.

"If it is a national police force that the Federal bureaucrats want, they have the Army, Navy, and Marines. I, for one, oppose every effort to destroy local police forces, or to even chance the 'foot-in-the-door' power building which is constantly sought by the socialist bureaucrats in their craze for domination of every facet of local and State government.

"This is bad legislation—spurred on by emotion and frustration—more laws by the democracy phobia of the mob—demands without regard or consideration for the further erosion and destruction of constitutional government.

"I intend to abide by my oath of office by casting my peoples' vote against this bill. I will continue to support my local police in upholding their responsibilities to maintain law and order to their people, unbridled by additional unnecessary Federal controls and redtape."

Of course, Congressman Rarick is correct. Federal aid to local law enforcement is unconstitutional. It will lead to federal domination of police (just as federal aid to education has led to federal domination of schools). At first, federal influence will be felt (is already being felt in some areas) in the quality of men recruited for police work and selected for promotion to key positions. Under pressure and guidance of federal bureaucrats who dispense tax money from Washington, local and state law enforcement agencies will emphasize the hiring and promoting of college graduates trained in sociology. A college degree, instead of experience in the field, will become the stepping stone to advancement in police work.

But the kind of indoctrination imparted by departments of sociology in many universities will unsuit, rather than improve, a man for effective police work. The thin blue line of police officers who correctly look upon themselves as defenders of society—and who presently constitute the only real defense of our civilization against barbarism and anarchy—will gradually vanish. Law enforcement leadership will begin to reflect the permissive attitude generally prevalent in the federal courts and federal bureaucracy: the attitude that "society" and not the criminal is responsible for crime—that it is not society but the criminal who needs protection.

This permissive attitude of the federal courts is one cause of the breakdown in law enforcement. As federal influence brings the attitude into local law enforcement, enforce-

ment will become less effective. Indeed, I anticipate that law enforcement effectiveness will decrease as federal aid to local law enforcement increases.

Something must be done will become a universal cry; and the chief criers will be the people responsible for the deteriorating situation: those who led the drive for federal aid to local law enforcement. They will not acknowledge that they have erred. They will not recommend a change in direction. They will fight the fire by throwing more fuel on it. That is, they will demand more federal aid.

As federal aid increases, federal influence on local law enforcement will evolve into federal control. At the end of that road is the instrument for total control that all dictatorships require: a national police force.

Then, the character of American law enforcement will undergo another, and this time a rather abrupt, change. When a national police force becomes a recognized, accepted, operating reality, it will no longer be ineffective and permissive. It will be ruthlessly efficient and repressive. Its mission, however, will not be to protect the public, but to protect entrenched political power against the public.

Then, Congressman John Rarick's June 30, 1970, speech in the House (if not purged from the record) will be an important historical document; it will reveal the identity of the one man out of 535 Members of the federal Congress who had the acumen to perceive the truth, the political courage to tell it, and the integrity to act upon it.

One of Mr. Rarick's points should be particularly re-emphasized and remembered: the argument for expenditure of federal tax money to curb crime by improving local law enforcement, insinuates that crime is the fault of law enforcement, which is inferior and needs improving; that Congress is responsible, because it has not heretofore appropriated enough money to improve local law enforcement; and that the taxpayers are responsible, because they have discouraged the spending of tax money for law enforcement. This puts no blame on criminals for committing crimes; on courts for helping criminals and hampering law enforcement; or on liberal politicians and bureaucrats who, by supporting governmental programs that violate the fundamental law of the land (the Constitution) set an example of lawlessness.

In reference to the argument that federal aid will improve local law enforcement, we should note that the trend I anticipate—the effectiveness of law enforcement will decline as federal aid rises—has already begun to set in. The first appropriation to curb crime by giving comprehensive federal aid to local law enforcement was for 1969; and the crime rate in 1969 was higher than the crime rate in 1968. The second appropriation for federal aid to law enforcement was for 1970; and the crime rate in 1970 is higher than the crime rate in 1969.

The Crime Control and Safe Streets Act is presently awaiting action in the Senate, where it will doubtless pass. The only opposition is from those who want the federal aid given directly to cities, instead of being given to state governments for reallocation to law agencies in the state.

This bill is only one of several of President Nixon's crime-control proposals. Other major bills awaiting final action by Congress:

The Preventive Detention Act, aimed at the problem of indicted hard-core criminals being given pre-trial release and allowed to remain free to commit other crimes while awaiting trial;

The Drug Control Act, whose most controversial feature is the "no-knock" provision authorizing search warrants which would permit law officers to enter a premise without first knocking or announcing their intention;

The Organized Crime Control Act, aimed at underworld criminal syndicates.

The primary thrust of these three crime-control bills is toward giving law enforcement a little more leeway than it now has in handling the worst kinds of criminals: hardcore habitual criminals to whom release-on-bail is encouragement to commit more crimes; the traffickers in dangerous drugs; the denizens of the powerful, organized criminal underworld. And the tenor of these three bills is to put the blame for crime on criminals.

It is interesting to note that Members of Congress who are most aggressive in supporting the federal-aid-to-law-enforcement bill (which insinuates that poor law enforcement is the cause of crime) are most aggressive in opposing these crime-control bills which rest on the assumption that it is the criminal who is responsible for crime. They find nothing unconstitutional in a bill that provides federal aid for local law enforcement, although the Constitution does not authorize the federal government to subsidize local police. These same Members of Congress, however, consider as unconstitutional legislation which would, in some degree, restore to police certain powers that were traditionally and constitutionally theirs until taken away by act of Congress and court decisions in recent years.

HORTON URGES JUSTICE FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last month two Soviet Jews were sentenced to death for allegedly plotting to hijack a Soviet airliner. Nine other persons, seven of them Jews, received heavy prison terms.

These sentences were handed down not for hijacking, nor attempted hijacking, but for the crime of plotting to hijack a Soviet airliner, and many news accounts have suggested the possible entrapment by the Soviets of the Leningrad Eleven.

The Soviet Union has said the defendants were sentenced to death in order to uphold "the spirit" of a new international convention against airline piracy.

The real purpose of the trial and the subsequent sentencing, however, was to terrorize the thousands of Jews who wish to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. It is known that most of the Leningrad Eleven had asked as long as 3 years ago for this permission.

Such unjust and inhumane treatment of Soviet citizens cannot be allowed to continue. First, we must do all that is possible to insure that future Soviet trials are open to the light of international observation. The Eleven were sentenced in closed trials. No foreign observers or newsmen were permitted to attend. Such trial procedure can only arouse suspicion.

In our country, trials are not conducted in secret. We do not feel that our system of jurisprudence is so harmful that it should be hidden from the eyes of mankind. Only in an open system of justice are the constitutional rights of citizens protected and an accused presumed innocent until found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt by a jury of his peers.

To offer some hope to future Soviet

Jews who may be tried, I asked the Secretary of State to seek permission for a small delegation of Americans to attend and observe future trials of Soviet Jews and to make arrangements to allow interested Soviet citizens the opportunity to attend trials of their choice in the United States.

In response to my suggestion and that of others, Secretary Rogers has extended an invitation to the Soviet Union to send a delegation of observers to the trial of Angela Davis in Marin County, Calif.

Hopefully, this will lead to an exchange of Soviet-American trial observers and to an assurance that any future judicial proceedings against Jews in the Soviet Union will be more just.

Secondly, I urge the Soviet Union to grant the free migration of all its citizens, Jewish, and non-Jewish. Soviet Jews who want to emigrate to Israel should be allowed to do so—without the specter of a political trial before them. I urge the Soviet Union to abide by article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights which grants the right of everyone to emigrate freely to other countries.

As much as I abhor the recent trials and their results and the cruel treatment to which Soviet Jews are subjected, I also abhor the protest against them in the United States that has surprised legitimate bounds. It should be evident to those of us in the United States concerned about the fate of Soviet Jews that violent protest against Soviet diplomats is pointless.

It should be remembered that the peaceful protest which followed the sentencing of the Leningrad Eleven helped win the commutation of the two death sentences.

Acts of violence such as the recent bombing of the Soviet cultural center and residence in Washington, D.C. and Soviet facilities in New York and elsewhere are deplorable and only serve to hurt the 3.5 million Jews in the Soviet Union, and to diminish the effectiveness of our efforts in their behalf.

Also it is imperative that the Soviet Union recognize that nothing can be gained by terrorism and intimidation, but rather that freedom of worship, of movement and of life itself should be the inalienable rights of everyone.

GREEK "ALLY" DISCUSSED

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a pair of articles from the Christian Science Monitor of January 8 and 14, 1971, discussing internal developments in Greece.

The articles follow:

GREECE: U.S. PLEA FOR REFORM SCORNE
(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—In announcing its plans for 1971, the Greek military regime has again rejected the plea of the United States to end martial law and return promptly toward democratic government.

It also appears to have violated, or disavowed, an understanding which the American Ambassador in Athens thought he had negotiated at the highest level. The understanding called for significant steps toward political freedom for the Greek people in late 1970 or 1971.

The sequel, according to reports reaching Washington from reliable sources, was a "stormy confrontation" in which U.S. Ambassador Henry Tasca and Vice-Premier Stylianos Pattakos reached an impasse on this question.

SECRET MEETINGS

Mr. Tasca is said to have asked why Premier George Papadopoulos, in a year-end speech took such a hard line against constitutional advance—and what the Ambassador could report to Washington which believed that commitments had been made to advance democracy in 1971.

In reply, Mr. Pattakos is reported to have asked whether anyone in the governing junta had made such promises.

Ambassador Tasca, who had held a series of secret dinner meetings with Premier Papadopoulos last summer, during which U.S. Greek policy was largely formulated, said he had gained this impression. But now he realized it was wrong, he added.

The Vice-Premier is said to have answered: If you feel you were wrong, perhaps you ought to apply for transfer to a new post.

PORTS, BASES OFFERED

By the time the two men met, the Greek regime already had gained what it most wanted from the United States Government: the resumption of full-scale military aid. This had been announced Sept. 22, and included heavy weapons which had been banned by Washington for political reasons since the Greek military junta seized power in a coup d'état.

The United States had also achieved at least part of what it wanted: Just before the Jordanian crisis last fall—although the Papadopoulos regime had earlier said in public that it would not aid any big power intervening in the Mediterranean—the junta secretly offered the use of Greek ports and air bases to U.S. forces in case they undertook an operation in Jordan. The offer was made while U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary C. Warren Nutter was visiting Greece.

The American decision to resume shipment of heavy weapons was given political as well as military importance in Greece and elsewhere. It was interpreted and publicized by the Greek military leaders as a belated political endorsement of their regime by the United States.

During the summer's secret dinner meetings, which dealt with both political and military relations between the two countries, Ambassador Tasca had put three requests to Premier Papadopoulos and his government. On behalf of the United States he had asked for:

1. An end to martial law soon.
2. The return of King Constantine, who is in exile but remains the legal head of the Greek state.
3. Elections to be held in 1971.

Mr. Tasca asked that at least one of these be implemented before arms aid was resumed.

Premier Papadopoulos is reported to have given Mr. Tasca to understand that these measures would be carried out soon, except that elections would probably be held in 1972 rather than 1971.

A State Department spokesman in Washington said, when announcing the resumption of full-scale military aid last September, "In Greece the trend toward a constitutional order is established. . . ."

WARNINGS TO GREEKS

Three months later, announcing plans for the coming year, Premier Papadopoulos indicated that there would not be any significant constitutional advance in 1971. He also said, "I will not permit any return to normal political life until I consider this possible."

In New Year's speeches, Mr. Papadopoulos also repeated severe warnings to Greeks not to take advice from outside Greece. These were interpreted as being directed against Western, including American, interference.

Thereupon, Regent General George Zoi-takis made an indirect criticism of the new situation. He publicly praised the Greek revolution of 1821 against the Turks by saying that it put into effect, in Greece, the principles of the French Revolution which still, he said, "apply today in Greece," especially the declaration of human rights of August, 1798.

The conservative newspaper *Vradiani*, which is presently the only newspaper criticizing the junta in this manner, commented ironically on Jan. 3 that the regent's speech meant that from now on, Greeks need no longer worry about arbitrary arrest or other violations of human rights since they are protected by the principles of the French Revolution.

ANTI-AMERICAN ACTIONS

Reports from Athens say that anti-American feeling is rising rapidly there; that most acts by resistance groups now are directed against American presence.

Politicians and journalists in Greece are quoted as blaming the United States for continuing arrests and political repressions following the well-publicized Christmas release of some political prisoners. They blame the "gullibility of Tasca" and "the Pentagon's obsessive concern for using Greece as a base to counter the Soviet presence in Egypt and the Mediterranean."

Some of these critics argue that the Americans could use the Greek bases without giving the political support which they feel is going increasingly to the person of Premier Papadopoulos, rather than to the junta or revolutionary council as a whole.

In Washington, the State Department has repeatedly said that its view on the "trend toward a constitutional order" was not a determining reason for resuming full-scale military aid to Greece last September.

In a letter to a Greek newspaperman and resistance leader in Washington, Elias P. Demetracopoulos (who sent to President Nixon a letter of protest against the resumed shipment of heavy arms to Greece, signed by himself and 24 Greek publishers and journalists living outside Greece), a State Department spokesman said the decision "was based entirely on considerations which concern the security of the United States."

"COMPELLING CONSIDERATIONS"

In a letter to Sen. Frank E. Moss (D) of Utah, another department spokesman, referring to the department's statement that "a trend toward a constitutional order is established," said:

"That is our judgment. It was not, however, the reason given for the decision. . . . The announcement clearly identified compelling security considerations as the sole rationale for the resumption of full military aid shipments."

Meanwhile, Ambassador Tasca has come under criticism in Washington on another account. Members of the Senate who had sought a safe passage on humanitarian grounds for Mr. Demetracopoulos to visit his ailing father in Athens—which was not granted under circumstances that are under dispute between the senators and the White House—have criticized Mr. Tasca for his handling of the matter. There now may be a demand for a congressional investigation of the Demetracopoulos affair.

A State Department source in Washington made the following comment on the above material in this dispatch:

"Much of the information in the article is highly speculative and bears little resemblance to the facts as we know them."

POLITICAL UNDERTAKINGS

In addition to the understanding that Ambassador Tasca thought he had with

Premier Papadopoulos, there are other specific political undertakings, in writing, which the Greek regime has broken.

One of these is a note from the late Greek Foreign Minister, Panayotis Pipinellis, to the Council of Europe, dated Aug. 25, 1969. This document was recently published in an official Greek Government white book. It stated that Articles 10, 111, and 112 of the junta's 1968 Constitution would be in force by September of 1970. These articles would provide protection against arbitrary trial and would suppress military courts except for cases involving actual security of the armed forces.

Article 10 of that Constitution, which was to have been strictly observed since April, 1970, provides protection against arrest without warrant. Such arrests, however, are continuing up to the present time.

Also 14 laws governing miscellaneous matters such as prohibition of mail censorship and the status of magistrates and associations were to have been implemented and in effect by December, 1970.

These promises were repeated by Mr. Pipinellis in a letter to Jean Rey, president of the European Economic Community. At the end of 1969, the Foreign Minister said the 14 laws would be published in the official gazette at the rate of three each month. The Undersecretary for Information repeated three months ago that all of these laws would be published and in force by the beginning of 1971.

News dispatches from Athens report that the law governing mail censorship, one of the 14 laws, was put into effect this week.

Another of these laws, on the right of public assembly, now in force.

There is no indication whether any other of the 14 laws has yet been implemented.

First of two articles. Next: Greek criticism of growing one-man rule by Premier Papadopoulos.

GREEK ONE-MAN RULE CRACKS JUNTA

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The assertion of one-man, personal leadership of the Greek Government by Prime Minister George Papadopoulos, in his year-end political statements, has intensified a division within the ruling military junta.

There now is an open debate in Athens between several right-wing newspapers expressing the viewpoints of the different factions.

The main issue is one-man rule vs. the so-called collective leadership originally espoused by the small group of colonels who seized power in a military coup nearly four years ago.

This information has reached Washington from Athens by many different channels since Dec. 19, when Mr. Papadopoulos first said that he alone, under the junta's partially applied "constitution," would decide when martial law in Greece was to be modified.

One well-informed source reports that "many Greeks, after watching the Papadopoulos Christmas and New Year speeches on television, have concluded that he is a highly intelligent but conspiratorial fanatic with strong egocentric tendencies; that he is now determined to exercise the type of personal rule that he earlier specifically rejected; and that collective leadership has now been thrown to the winds."

The issue has important implications for American foreign policy. The decision of the Nixon administration to resume heavy-arms aid to the Greek Government, announced last September, was explicitly based on "considerations of national security"—the need to firm up the Mediterranean flank of the NATO alliance in Greece and Turkey in view of the incursion of Soviet naval and air strength into the Middle East and the Mediterranean.

But when the military-aid decision was announced, carrying the implication of

American political support for the junta, the Nixon administration had been seeking to reassure both the public and some critical senators that this did not mean support for a repressive dictatorship.

An example of this reassurance is a statement by the Department of Defense read in a Senate speech last June by Sen. Strom Thurmond (R) of South Carolina:

"The Greek Government announced that in accordance with a specific timetable, to which it has thus far adhered, the institutional structure of a democracy prerequisite to elections will be in place by the end of this year [1970].

"This timetable is a public commitment on the part of the Greek Government. It seems to be a reasonable time element, i.e., the end of this year. A yardstick has now been established to measure the Greek regime's performance. . . ."

A State Department spokesman took a similar line.

The lifting of martial law has since been postponed to the indefinite future by the year-end statements of Mr. Papadopoulos.

Among the objections raised by various Greek groups—including, it is understood, disaffected members of the ruling junta—is what is described as repeated personal and political favoritism on the part of Mr. Papadopoulos for shipping magnate Aristotle Onassis.

This criticism is applied both to a \$600 million contract between the government and Mr. Onassis, and to what are called "lavish expenditures" for mutual hospitality, for an expensive wardrobe for Mr. Papadopoulos' present wife Despina, and for the latter's social activities in the Onassis "jet set."

The Onassis part of the story is told as follows in a report available here, from normally dependable sources:

"Hard-line officers in the junta, led by military-police commander Dimitrios Iohannides, are indignant over Mr. Papadopoulos' favoritism toward Mr. Onassis in the matter of a contract signed last March for a \$600 million investment in a new oil refinery, an aluminum plant, power stations, and petrochemical projects.

"This was signed by Assistant Minister of Coordination Emmanouil Fthenakis, who was appointed by Mr. Papadopoulos when his predecessor, John Rodinos-Oriandos, showed disinclination to favor Onassis over Stavros Niarchos and other competitors.

LEGAL MOVE MADE

"Later, when Mr. Onassis saw he was going to have difficulty getting a bank guarantee to cover the \$600 million, he made a legal move which would have delayed the posting of a \$7 million sum required by the contract on Dec. 12.

"He applied to the Greek Council of State, Greece's highest judicial institution, for cancellation of the contract, and sought a contract renewal to take account of the rise of the Mideast oil price since the contract was signed. He reportedly also made overtures to the Soviet Government, which is now increasingly involved in Mediterranean oil deals, for help in financing.

"At a Cabinet meeting last Nov. 10, Premier Papadopoulos demanded that the Greek Government find some way to arrange the \$600 million bank guarantee for Mr. Onassis. Coordination Minister Nikolas Makarezos objected, pointing out that a commission of economists named by Mr. Papadopoulos himself had rejected the idea as unsound and dangerous. Mr. Makarezos said that Greece's entire foreign-currency reserves amounted to only a little over \$400 million.

"Premier Papadopoulos replied, 'We must find a way somehow because the government must meet its promises to foreign investors.'

"Mr. Makarezos reminded the Premier that the junta's 'revolution,' as it is officially called, had come to power in order to clean

up the country and give it a new economic deal. He said that Mr. Papadopoulos might be the head of the government but that he had no right to 'monopolize the revolution.'

"Later the matter was apparently adjusted. Mr. Fthenakis warned Mr. Onassis shortly before the December deadline that if he did not post the required \$7 million, the contract would be given to others. Mr. Onassis thereupon posted the money."

A broadly confirming story about the difficulties over the contract has been published by the German newspaper Der Spiegel.

REPORT CONTINUES

The report on the question of "personal favoritism" continues:

"Meanwhile, during last summer the Premier and his wife Despina used a summer villa presented to Jacqueline Onassis by her husband. At that time Mrs. Papadopoulos made shopping trips to Paris and London during which she was entertained by friends and associates of Mr. Onassis.

"It also is reported that in the Premier's desire to make his wife Despina, formerly a hairdresser and wife of a policeman, socially acceptable in the Onassis jet set, he ordered some 40 outfits averaging \$1,000 each from a leading Athenian dressmaker, whom Mr. Papadopoulos later rebuked for failing to live up to top standard.

"This added to the disaffection of dissenters in the junta who had formerly assumed that Mr. Papadopoulos believed his own slogans about austerity, cleaning up corruption, and simple Spartan living.

"It is rumored in Athens but not confirmed that Colonel Iohanides assailed the brother of the Premier and director of his office for accepting favors for whatever purpose from Mr. Onassis. It is likewise reported that Col. Michael Roufoglalis, deputy director of the Greek Central Intelligence Agency, KYP, conducted a search of the files of the Papadopoulos office, presumably seeking documentary information of any dealings between people in Mr. Papadopoulos' office and Mr. Onassis."

VIEWPOINTS DISCUSSED

This report cannot be documented in full by independent sources. But it comes through competent channels, deals with matters which in fact are being discussed in Athens and therefore have political significance, and deals with the question of democracy vs. dictatorship in Greece which is a matter of importance to American foreign policy.

The divisions within the governing junta are reflected publicly in sometimes guarded, sometimes quite open discussion in newspaper expressing the various viewpoints.

The Athens newspaper Vradyni, on Jan. 4, reported at length on the move away from collective leadership in the government toward one-man rule. It listed a number of official documents and statements from the government on the constitutional question, then continued:

"From these announcements, it appears that the government has not kept its promises to the people, first with respect to applying all the institutional laws by January, 1971, second with respect to implementing Articles 111 and 112 of the Constitution [of September, 1968] which would have had as a direct consequence . . . the lifting of martial law. . . .

"Instead of this," Vradyni continued, "very suddenly was heard the Premier's speech of 19 December with respect to no [constitutional] change in 1971."

CONCLUSION OF ARTICLE

Vradyni concluded its article as follows: "We have proved without our own comments, and only from official documents and announcements, that the Premier had designated the '70-71 period for action toward constitutional evolution, which today he prohibits as premature."

This statement was explicitly answered on Jan. 5 in the Athens newspaper Acropolis by a former director general of the Papadopoulos press office, Byron Stamatopoulos. He wrote:

" . . . Even the right of the Premier to decide . . . on the implementation of the Constitution in its entirety, even on the conduct of elections, on the regulation of the position of the King, belongs to the Premier as one of his constitutional rights. Those responsible along with him in the government of the land, who possibly may be in opposition to the occasional decisions of the Premier on basic issues, should either resign, if this is their attitude, or be dismissed, according to the circumstances."

Meanwhile, information received here from Athens confirms that at least five former ministers in earlier Greek governments have been called in by the police since full-scale American weapons aid was resumed last September, and have been given stern warnings of possible measures against them.

Letters from two of these indicate that when the American Embassy inquired into the subject, at the request of the State Department, it did not contact the men involved and apparently got its information from the Greek Government. The State Department then played the matter down by saying merely that there had been "contacts between officials of the Greek military police and a number of former politicians."

Most such political figures now are shadowed by the police.

AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY SPEAKS ON ENVIRONMENT

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure yesterday to hear an address by AFL-CIO President George Meany at a luncheon reception of the National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry. In his address Mr. Meany spoke of the problem of solid waste disposal and its effect not only on the beverage industry but also on our entire Nation.

The problem of disposing of our solid waste materials—bottles, cans, combustible and noncombustible trash—is one which looms as a major challenge to the preservation of our environment. As Mr. Meany pointed out, 30 billion nonreturnable glass bottles, 60 billion cans, 4.3 billion tons of solid waste and 250 million tons of waste from homes, commercial enterprises, and institutions cannot be easily put aside or overlooked. The dimension of this problem is so vast that its solution can only be reached by the sacrifice and the cooperative effort of industry, labor, Government, and the individual. And because the consequences of inaction are so dangerous to the environment—and thus to you and me—the initiative must start now.

Recycling, rechanneling, reuse, research, and experimentation are beginnings in the right direction. Stricter laws, and personal commitment to abide by them, are other essential steps on the road toward solution. Again, as Mr. Meany noted, "Littering is not only un-

sightly, it is illegal. And it should be treated as such."

Mr. Speaker, I feel Mr. Meany's address was enlightening and I therefore wish to share it with my colleagues in the House:

AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY SPEAKS ON ENVIRONMENT

It is a pleasure to meet here today with the National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

You set a fine example for all of industry. Your efforts—both of labor and management—to work together to solve mutual problems is sound, constructive and for the benefit of all.

The coordinating committee recognizes that a collective bargaining relationship does not stop when a contract is signed. It is an expression of concern by labor and management—concern about the welfare of the industry and a commitment to do more than to insure its continued prosperity.

You are to be commended. This is the American way—pulling together to solve mutual problems.

And there are problems—problems which may affect the jobs of many workers and the welfare of your industry.

We in the trade union movement are very concerned about the problem of disposing of waste, trash, litter, or whatever you want to call it.

We are concerned because it affects the land in which we all live.

We are concerned because quick, easy solutions may not be solutions at all.

It is easy to point the finger . . . to call for banning returnable bottles. It is easy to point to a beer can cast thoughtlessly beside the road by a lawbreaker and say: "If we ban that can, there'll be no more litter."

It is easy, but not right.

It is not right, because that's a program for banning jobs, not eliminating litter.

We must not be deceived into confusing attention with action. The hard work lies ahead.

The dimensions of the problem are fantastic:

—4.3 billion tons of solid waste is produced in a year.

—250 million tons from homes, commercial enterprises and institutions.

—30 billion glass bottles and 60 billion cans, many of which are of the nonreturnable variety.

What do we do with all this?

We in labor answer: Why not use it to the best advantage of society.

That is one of the reasons Congress passed the Resource Recovery Act of 1970. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is authorized to spend more than \$440 million to study new ways of using what formerly has been thrown away.

This is a positive step. It is vital that all authorized funds be appropriated and put to good use.

Several approaches hold promise.

Recycling glass bottles and cans to other uses is a new and growing field. Bottles can be crushed and made into paving materials. Cans may be melted down and reused, thus conserving vital natural resources.

Some experiments are underway using compacted refuse as a source of electrical power. Burning refuse in this manner contributes little to air pollution since low amounts of sulfur dioxide are produced.

But these are largely experimental ideas. More research must be undertaken.

Bottles and cans are only a small part of the entire waste problem.

But the beverage industry is not ducking the questions by denying that a problem exists. It is working to help find solutions.

Collection of reusable items and delivery to recycling plants are problems that must be faced. We cannot always rely on civic-

mind groups to collect nonreturnable bottles and cans. And the cost of delivering the bottles and cans must not make reuse impractical.

While necessary research is being undertaken, there is one thing we must do. Strict laws, enforced to the highest degree possible, do have an effect on litter. They stop it.

Littering is not only unsightly, it is illegal. And it should be treated as such.

For everyone in America, it will require a willingness to pay the price of extra care not to defile the countryside. It will also require tax dollars to correct present pollution. These tax dollars will, in the long run, pay a handsome return if the squandering of natural resources is truly stopped.

America must be committed to solving the entire problem of waste disposal.

As part of labor's commitment, I have established a special committee of international union presidents to present their recommendations on this problem to the AFL-CIO Executive Council meeting next month.

In addition, we will continue all our little efforts—such as the Union Label Department's program to distribute litter bags. Keeping litter in cars and off highways seems like a small effort. But small efforts, individual actions, labor and management cooperation, expanded government enforcement—the sum of all these will mark the success of our efforts to preserve the environment.

And I don't think there is anything more important to this nation than preserving the environment.

THE TAB FOR CONSULATE PROTECTION AND LOSS IN REVENUE SHOULD BE BORNE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 the Secret Service sent an estimated 75 to 100 members of its Executive Protection Service to New York City to provide foreign missions and consulates with police protection during the wildcat strike of the city's policemen.

Today, I am reintroducing my bill to give the Executive Protection Service permanent responsibility for guarding foreign missions throughout the country, thus relieving local police of this duty. The Executive Protection Service was established last year as an adjunct to the White House Secret Service to protect foreign missions in the District of Columbia.

New York City has been particularly hard hit by the demands on its police department for the protection of foreign missions. The drain on the city is felt both in the police manpower not available to patrol the streets and in the nearly \$2 million a year the city pays for this guard service. Crime in the 19th Precinct, where most of the consulates are located, has spiraled so that the area is now first in Manhattan in auto theft and second in burglary. Stores keep their doors locked and many businesses and residents have had to hire their own private security guards.

Mr. Speaker, I am also reintroducing my bill providing for Federal reimbursement to cities for the real estate reve-

nues lost because of the United Nations and consulates' tax exempt status and for expenses incurred in providing special police protection for visiting foreign dignitaries. New York alone loses about \$5 million a year in real estate tax revenue, while spending an estimated \$2 million to \$3 million in protecting visiting officials.

New York City is not the only city that will receive relief from both of these bills. They also will assist other major metropolitan areas such as Boston, Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, San Francisco, St. Louis, Richmond, New Orleans, Denver, and Kansas City. Each of these cities has a number of consulates located within it.

Mr. Speaker, is it simply not fair that we place this burden of revenue loss and the protection of foreign missions on the cities which already are facing enormous financial crises? The United Nations and foreign consulates do not serve just the particular city they are located in, but the entire country. It is only appropriate that the Federal Government provide the consulates with the guard service they require and absorb the full loss of the tax revenues and the cost of special police protection.

I hope that my bills will receive the favorable consideration of the Congress.

ACCURACY IN MEDIA

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of my colleagues to an organization in my congressional district, known as "Accuracy in Media" which is performing a needed service for the American viewing public in pointing out inaccuracies in many documentary television programs being presented by major networks today. As I am particularly impressed with this organization's charges of inaccuracy with regard to a CBS television program on Cuba aired on September 25, 1970, and agree with their contention that CBS in responding to their charges failed to answer satisfactorily nine of their 10 original criticisms, I insert the text of AIM's memorandum of January 4, 1971, where the original charges are listed, the CBS responses are likewise listed, and the AIM final conclusions are reached:

ACCURACY IN MEDIA

JANUARY 4, 1971.

To: Congressman JOEL T. BROYHILL.
From: Benjamin Ginzburg, Executive Secretary.

Subject: AIM charge of inaccuracies in CBS Television program on Cuba of September 29, 1970.

On October 25, 1970, AIM wrote to Mr. Richard S. Salant, President of CBS News, calling his attention to what we believed were ten serious inaccuracies in a CBS program on Castro's Cuba that was broadcast on September 29, 1970. The statements AIM criticized are listed and discussed below.

1. CBS: "Here's what we found: The

Cuban poor man doesn't want to leave. For Cuba's poor, things are a good deal better than they used to be."

AIM cited the cases of specific refugees from the lower economic classes in Cuba who had risked their lives to get out of the country. Statements made by these refugees were cited as evidence that living conditions for these people had seriously deteriorated. For example, a negro bricklayer who was one of a group of 150 working-class people who attempted a dramatic escape to the Guantanamo Base on January 1, 1969, was quoted in the New York Times as saying: "Not only is there not enough to eat, but they make you spend extra hours in the fields after a 54-hour work week."

2. CBS: "The peasant in Cuba is better off than the peasant in most Latin American countries. No one is in rags. No one starves. The children go to school, and a little thing like an electric light bulb, free electric light bulb, free electricity, has made the Cuban peasant a warm supporter of Fidel."

AIM cited the testimony of Rene Dumont, a French agricultural expert who has made several trips to Cuba to advise Castro on agricultural matters, to show that this statement is dubious. In his recent book, "Cuba: Est-Il Socialiste?" Dumont states that in Cuba today one sees children dressed in odds and ends of old sacks and "young girls are ashamed of their rags." He points out that food is very scarce, that rations are meager and the ration tickets are often not honored. He points out that farm workers are moved about constantly, live in barracks and "cannot organize any kind of family life." Farm work, he says, is "too little esteemed and too badly paid." AIM also pointed out that in pre-Castro Havana, the average family spent about 46.5 per cent of its income on food and drink, but that evidence suggests that Cuban families today must devote a far higher percentage of their income to the basic necessity of food. Rice, for example, cost \$2 a lb. on the blackmarket in 1968. Paul Bethel, an expert on Cuba, states that the farmers in Cuba now provide the core of the anti-Castro rebels.

3. CBS: "It is for this man, (the poor), his family and millions like them, black and white, that the Cuban revolution was undertaken. Under Batista they were either exploited or ignored. Under Fidel Castro, they are convinced their government cares about them."

AIM pointed out that Castro had based his criticism of Batista on political, not economic grounds, saying that economic goals should not prevail at the expense of political goals. "Otherwise," he said, before he came to power, "we should be satisfied with Batista." Castro's emphasis was on the restoration of civil liberties, but actually he has taken away even more of these liberties than did Batista. AIM said that it was an absurdity to suggest that you could greatly reduce overall economic productivity, as has been done in Cuba under Castro, and at the same time raise the standard of living of the mass of the population.

4. CBS: "Nurses make regular rounds of the Bohios of the rural Cubans who had virtually no medical care at all before Castro."

AIM pointed out that every Cuban was entitled to free medical care at the 69 state hospitals that dotted the island before Castro. There were also 168 private cooperative clinics that provided a wide range of medical services for a modest monthly fee. As a result, Cuba had the lowest infant mortality rate in Latin America in 1958. It had one of the highest ratios of doctors to population.

AIM cited letters from Cuba that complained of the deterioration in the quality of medical care because of the inexperience of the doctors and the shortage of medicine and adequate nutrition. There has been a heavy exodus of doctors from Castro's Cuba,

and AIM asked about the impact that this had had on the quality of medical care.

5. CBS: "Castro hopes to create a complete moneyless society, and everyone would get not just the necessities of life, but the extras too."

AIM agreed that Castro might have such hopes, but he himself has had to admit that the Cuban economy is in a terrible mess. It would appear that little progress has been made toward the society in which everyone gets the necessities and the extras without money.

6. CBS: "Many Cubans have a new sense of pride, of identity with their country's revolutionary effort. These are volunteers harvesting coffee on a summer weekend, after the sugar harvest was over. Their only reward, volunteer work certificates."

AIM quoted Rene Dumont as follows: "Today, in their majority, the Cuban people are no longer convinced, as they were in 1959 and 1960. They are disenchanted, and they have many reasons for being so. In October 1969, for the first time Fidel was booed in a working-class neighborhood." It also quoted John Clytus, an American negro who had spent some time in Cuba as a defector, on the subject of the compulsion involved in the so-called "voluntary" labor. Clytus said that those who did not volunteer would be looked upon as unfriendly to the revolution and might lose their jobs.

7. CBS: "There is a quiet equality of the races now in Cuba. They told us that in their country, black is not beautiful, it's just not a matter of concern any more."

AIM quoted Erneido Oliva, an Afro-Cuban who was one of the first men appointed to a high government post by Fidel Castro, as follows: "Even under Dictator Batista, whom we rejoiced to see go, Negroes were judges, senators and high officials. In Cuba today, there is only one black man in an important office—Juan Almeida. Almeida is Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Cuban Army, but he is right under Fidel's brother, Raul, and is nothing but Castro's black showpiece. He has never had and never will have any real power at all. No other black man has or ever will have under Castro." John Clytus found the climate in Cuba racially oppressive, and another American negro who defected to Cuba for five years, William Nelson, returned in 1968 saying that he would rather live in an American jail than remain in Cuba.

8. CBS: "But schools are free; every child must go."

AIM pointed out that on January 5, 1969, Castro had admitted that 400,000 school-age children were not attending school. He also noted that out of 1.4 million elementary school students, 621,000 failed to pass to the next grade, and more than half of the secondary school students failed to pass.

9. CBS: "The Cuban revolution has not failed."

AIM pointed out that Castro had promised to give the Cubans liberty, but he had made the island into a prison. Castro himself admits to his massive economic failures. Rene Dumont says that so far success can be measured in the satisfaction of the appetite for power of Castro and his henchmen.

10. CBS: "(Children) get what their elders cannot, unrationed clothing, milk, eggs and meat."

AIM pointed out that it was false to say that these items were not rationed for children. The ration for some articles, such as milk, is slightly larger for children than for adults.

CBS REPLIES TO AIM

Mr. Richard S. Salant replied to the AIM criticisms of the Cuba program in a letter dated December 15, 1970. Mr. Salant said: "I find nothing to alter my opinion that the broadcast was accurate in all essential respects." The following is a summary of his reply to our specific criticisms.

1. "There is no doubt that some poor have left Cuba. This does not dispute what we determined from our trip—that the Cuban poor man, in a generic sense, doesn't want to leave. The State Department reports that the smallest percentage of refugees—less than two percent—are categorized as farmers or fishermen." Mr. Salant quotes from Congressional testimony on the occupational breakdown of the Cuban refugees by Mr. Howard H. Palmatier, Director of the Cuban Refugee Program of HEW (who he incorrectly identifies as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs). Mr. Salant did not comment on statements of refugees cited by AIM attesting to the sharp decline in real income, the shortages of food and the forced unpaid work, which, together with the deprivation of freedom made poor people willing to recklessly risk their lives to flee from Cuba. Nor did he comment on the testimony of Rene Dumont about the shortage of food and the growing unpopularity of Castro among the working people. He stated that the CBS News team had spent more than a month in Cuba, talking to all kinds of people, but he did not cite or quote any interviews that would support the contention that the team was able to divine the fact that the poor man, in the generic sense, was contented and did not want to leave.

2. Mr. Salant does not comment on Rene Dumont's statements about the serious shortage of food in Cuba and the inadequacy of clothing. Nor does he comment on the evidence that the percentage of family income that has to be spent on food is sharply up. He has nothing to say about the significance of rice being priced in the black-market at \$2 per lb.

3. Mr. Salant says: "We did not report that Castro justified his revolution on economic grounds. We did say . . . the Cuban Revolution was undertaken by Castro on behalf of Cuba's 'small' man. However, Castro did say on October 10, 1958: "The problems concerning land, the problem of industrialization, the problem of education, the problem of the health of the people: these are the six problems we would take immediate steps to resolve, together with the restoration of public liberties and political democracy." (Source not indicated.)

4. While CBS had originally suggested that rural Cubans "had virtually no medical care at all before Castro," Mr. Salant does not provide any documentation to support this assertion. He does quote from *Twentieth Century Cuba* by Wyatt Macgaffey and Clifford R. Barnett which states that "educational and welfare services and the general health of the population during the first half of the century compared favorably with those of other Caribbean countries" but that the statistical averages were deceptive because urban and rural conditions "differed considerably and a still wider gap was apparent between the standards applying to the upper and lower classes."

AIM had pointed out that Cuba had the lowest infant mortality rate in Latin America before Castro and that the rate had risen under Castro. CBS did not comment on this. Nor did it comment on the sharp increase in the incidence of gastroenteritis, which we had cited. This is an indicator of deterioration in public health measures. Nor did CBS comment on complaints from Cubans of deterioration in the quality of medical care and the scarcity of medicines. CBS did quote from an article in the Congressional Quarterly which cited reported increases in hospitals, hospital beds, clinics and dispensaries. It also cited declines in the incidence of malaria from 1962 and 1966 and a decline in mortality from gastritis and related diseases in the same period.

5. In response to AIM's criticism of the statement that Castro hopes to create a moneyless society where everyone will get an ample supply of both necessities and luxuries, CBS quoted Rene Dumont to the effect that

money was becoming less important because housing, water, schooling and health services are free. CBS also cited the Congressional Quarterly as saying that Cubans now received free meals on the job, a "banquet" for wedding guests, local telephone service, day nursery care, tickets to sporting events and a funeral free.

6. CBS did not comment on the evidence cited by AIM to indicate that the "voluntary" labor that had been given as evidence of Cuban enthusiasm for the revolution was inspired more by fear of retribution for not volunteering than by enthusiasm. Similarly, Dumont's statement that the Cubans are now disenchanted with Castro and with good reason was ignored. CBS cited only a single statement from a book by Oscar Lewis published in 1968, in which he describes the new spirit noted in a Cuban slum that he visited "after the Castro revolution." This clearly does not describe the mood of the Cuban people in 1969, the year of Dumont's last visit.

7. On the issue of racial discrimination, CBS does not try to defend its statement that there is equality of races in Castro's Cuba and that race is not a matter of concern any more. Rather, it quotes from *Twentieth Century Cuba* to show that there was attitudinal discrimination against negroes in pre-Castro Cuba.

8. CBS does not comment on the Castro admission that 400,000 school-age children do not go to school, a fact cited by AIM to refute the CBS statement that every Cuban child must go to school. Nor did CBS comment on the significance of the high rate of failure in the schools. Instead, CBS cited statistics from articles published in the *Saturday Review* which showed dramatic increases in the number of students and teachers at all levels of education under the Castro regime. No comment was made on the quality of the education being provided.

9. CBS makes no comment on AIM's criticism of the statement that the Cuban Revolution has not failed.

10. CBS points out that AIM did not quote in full the statement on children receiving unrationed food and clothing. The full statement is "Day care or fulltime child care centers take charge while their mothers work and they get what their elders cannot, unrationed clothing, milk, eggs and meat. They also receive large doses of political indoctrination." CBS does not explain this statement, but we infer that what was meant was that children at day-care centers are fed these foods without deductions being made from their rations. However, the statement remains misleading, since meals served to adults at their places of work are also outside the ration system. This would not seem to be a significant difference between the treatment of children and adults.

Mr. Salant, in concluding his letter to AIM, noted that both the Council of the Americas and the Department of State had commended the CBS report on Cuba as "balanced and accurate."

AIM'S COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. AIM does not believe that CBS has succeeded in substantiating the statement that the Cuban poor man does not want to leave and that for Cuba's poor things are a great deal better than they used to be.

Ultimately the test of whether or not anyone wants to leave Cuba is to permit those who want to leave to do so freely. Given the very strong barriers that Castro has erected to make exit difficult, the presumption is that a great many people who want to leave Cuba are being prevented from doing so. It is highly presumptuous of CBS or anyone else to predict how the Cuban people would behave if all barriers to exist were eliminated. No one can take a public opinion poll in Cuba today to make this determination. A CBS news team visiting Cuba for one month could hardly be expected to arrive at any valid estimate, if for no other reason than

that Cubans still under Castro's heel would hardly be likely to speak freely to CBS newsmen. Those who know the temper of the people and who are most likely to speak frankly on this subject are those Cubans who have managed to get out in recent years. They, of course, are the disaffected, but their explanations of the causes of their disaffection deserve to be heard and weighed. If food shortages, forced labor and the denial of freedom have made life in Cuba intolerable for them, one may presume that many others like them share their discontent. The fact that the others cannot escape does not prove that they are not discontented. There is no evidence that CBS has collected or evaluated the testimony of poor refugees from Cuba in arriving at its judgment that the poor man, in a generic sense, does not want to leave.

CBS is, of course, aware of this evidence. In addition to the cases cited by AIM in its letter to Mr. Salant, we know that CBS examined the Hearings on Cuba and the Caribbean before the Sub-committee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, released August 20, 1970. CBS cited testimony from these hearings in its reply to AIM. Included in these hearings was testimony by Manolo Reyes, Director of Latin American news at Station WTVJ in Miami. Congressman Fascell asked Mr. Reyes if he believed the Cuban people were better off or happier under Castro. His reply was: "Never. They are worse than ever." I interviewed one farmer recently, and I asked him, a farmer from inside the island, if the Cuban people were with the Castro regime. . . . He said: "Mr. Reyes, if they put a bridge between Havana and Key West, Cuba would be empty. Don't put the bridge, just the water to our neck and we will come to the United States walking."

The use CBS makes of the HEW statistics on the occupational background of the Cuban refugees is completely unjustified. CBS would have us believe that because less than 2 per cent of the refugees who have come via the airlift are farmers and fishermen this is proof that poor people do not want to leave Cuba. There are three important points to make with respect to these figures.

1. CBS is wrong in implying that Cuban poor are limited to farmers and fishermen. Other low income groups included in the HEW occupational breakdown are service occupations, semi-skilled and unskilled labor and clerical and sales personnel.

2. The occupational table of HEW includes a category, "Children, students and housewives," which accounts for 64 per cent of the refugees. This means that if a poor fisherman escapes with his wife and five children, the HEW table will show this as one fisherman and 5 children, students and housewives. If we want to get a proper idea of the economic status of the refugees, we must assume that the wives and children are not a separate economic category. In the absence of a breakdown of their economic status, the best we can do is distribute them proportionally among the occupational categories in the HEW table. When we do this, we find that the percentage distribution of refugees by occupational grouping during the first 11 months of 1970 was as follows:

Professional, semi-professional and managerial	Per cent
Professional, semi-professional and managerial	12.2
Clerical and sales	30.2
Skilled workers	25.4
Semi-skilled and unskilled workers	15.8
Service occupations	9.5
Farm-fishing	6.9

In 1970, about one-third of the refugees have been in the farm-fishing, service occupations and semi-skilled and unskilled worker categories. No doubt a high percentage of the clerical and sales personnel and even the skilled workers are in the low income categories. No doubt a high percentage of the

clerical and sales personnel and even the skilled workers are in the low income category. It would not be unreasonable to say that two-thirds of the refugees in 1970 were from low income groups.

3. The airlift refugees are for the most part those who registered to leave Cuba between December 1965 and May 1966. No one has been able to get on the list since Castro shut off registration. Those who did not make up their minds in the brief period that the books were open and who have since found life intolerable in Cuba have had to find other more dangerous means of escape. Moreover, registration involved terrible hardship and it was not open to all. Because of this, the distribution of the registrants is unlikely to be an accurate indicator of what Cubans would choose to flee the island if all barriers to exit were now removed.

AIM concludes that the statistical evidence, imperfect as it is, clearly shows that a high percentage of refugees from Cuba are low income families, demonstrating that CBS has not accurately interpreted the attitude of the poor man toward the Castro regime.

2. The silence on AIM's criticism No. 2 is interpreted as meaning that CBS is unable to substantiate its claim that the peasant in Cuba is better off than his counterpart in most Latin American countries and that no one is in rags.

3. AIM does not believe that CBS has substantiated its statement that Castro's revolution was originally presented as a class matter. Castro was supported by all economic classes at the beginning, and his main appeal was based on the claims that he would re-establish constitutional government and complete civil liberty, which he has, of course, not done.

4. CBS does not try to defend the statement that there was virtually no medical care for rural citizens of Cuba before Castro.

5. In response to the AIM criticism of the statement that Cuba is heading for a moneyless economy in abundance, CBS has shown that a number of services are now provided free in Cuba, indicating progress toward a reduction in the role of money. AIM's criticism, however, was aimed mainly at the notion that Cuba is making progress toward providing the kind of material abundance for all that monetary accounting will be unnecessary. CBS does not try to show that material abundance is increasing in the face of Castro's own admissions that they have suffered monumental economic failures.

6. AIM does not consider that the observations of Oscar Lewis on an early visit to Castro's Cuba constitute any answer to the observations of Rene Dumont in 1969 that Cubans were disenchanted with Castro and his revolution. Dumont's observations confirm the testimony of many recent refugees from Cuba, as well as statements by returning American defectors such as John Glytus.

7. CBS does not try to dispute the testimony of Erneido Oliva, John Glytus and other blacks that racial discrimination exists in Castro's Cuba. It apparently would not defend the statement that race is not a matter of concern anymore in Cuba.

8. CBS does not defend the earlier statement that every child must attend school in the face of Castro's admission that some 400,000 do not attend. CBS cites figures on the dramatic increase in the quantity of education, but it does not discuss the question of quality, even though it cites in another connection an article in U.S. News and World Report of Sept. 21, 1970, which points out that the quality of education has dropped, with many teachers as young as 15 or 16.

9. CBS does not defend its statement that the Cuban Revolution has not failed. Since it has patently failed to restore freedom to the Cuban people, as Castro promised, this would seem to be a major failure. Now that

Castro has admitted economic failure as well, the CBS judgment of non-failure seems clearly wrong.

10. AIM concedes that the statement on unrationed food for children at day-care centers is correct if it is understood to mean that the food is provided at the center and not that children in general are exempt from ration restrictions.

IN CONCLUSION, AIM believes that nine of the ten original criticisms of inaccuracy in the CBS report on Cuba of September 29, 1970 are valid and have not been satisfactorily answered by CBS. We cannot accept Mr. Salant's judgment that the broadcast was accurate in all essential respects. We believe that CBS has an obligation to its viewers to present a program on Cuba that corrects the misleading impression created by the serious inaccuracies in the earlier broadcast.

BIRTHDAY OF GEN. STONEWALL JACKSON

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, 147 years ago today, General Stonewall Jackson was born at Clarksburg in what is now the State of West Virginia.

In remembering the birthday of Thomas Jonathan Jackson, we celebrate one of the great chapters of heroism in American life and history. The legend and the reality of Stonewall Jackson have become a part of the heritage shared by all our people and a source of continuing inspiration in these troubled times.

Of him, a distinguished historian has written "The most striking figure of the Civil War on the Southern side—whose career—has the fascination of the character of romance." That fascination is as alive today as ever, as witness the continuing appearance of books, of tribute, and of studies concerned with various aspects of his public and private life. Elected to the Hall of Fame in 1955, two of his sayings adorn his bust in bronze, sayings which epitomize his dauntless spirit: "You may be whatever you resolve to be," and "Never take counsel of your fears."

One may doubt if in all history there can be found a more impressive and moving death than Jackson's, thoroughly in keeping with the classical spirit which he seemed to embody: his dying words are enshrined in the folklore of this country: "Let us cross over the river, and rest under the shade of the trees," words placed on the beautiful Jackson Memorial window in Washington's National Cathedral. In death as in life he manifested that profound religious faith which represents his most enduring legacy to our day, even as it reveals the secret source of his strength and purpose. He has sustained in all things by a deep sense of the presence of God in human affairs.

Significantly, one of the finest and most perceptive appreciations of Stonewall Jackson comes to us from Robert E. Lee, who wrote, "He is true, honest, and brave; has a single eye to the good of the service, and spares no exertion to accomplish his object." An eminent British

historian has written discerningly of Jackson's stature:

Nor has that story a message for America alone. The hero who lies buried at Lexington, in the Valley of Virginia, belongs to a race that is not confined to a single continent; and to those who speak the same tongue, and in whose veins the same blood flows, his words come home like an echo of all that is noblest in this history: What is life without honor? Degradation is worse than death. We must think of the living and of those who are to come after us, and see that by God's blessing we transmit to them the freedom we have ourselves inherited.

Another authority, appraising Jackson as a commander—his brilliant strategy, his bold tactics, his personal bravery, speaks of "his rock-life confidence—which impelled—him to convert and discipline his men in a manner other than military, and thus to create a noble fighting corps led by a southern Cromwell. Yet Jackson was more than a Cromwell. It would be fairer to call him an American Napoleon." Certainly such mastery use of cavalry had not been seen since the days of Napoleon—and yet the comparison is misleading. For, unlike Napoleon, Jackson was moved by a faith which, then as now, set him apart—a faith in God and in the authority of conscience, the voice of God in the soul. It is this which speaks most powerfully to us today over a century after his death at Chancellorsville in 1863. In his own words, we, too, "must see that by God's blessing we transmit" to the living and to the generations yet unborn "the freedom we ourselves have inherited."

POLAROID—SOUTH AFRICA AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, apparently the Polaroid Corp., in its efforts to achieve good employee relations, has now embarked as a full participant in the international revolutionary movement.

In December of 1970, the Polaroid Corp., was blackmailed into a \$20,000 contribution supposedly earmarked for Boston's United Black Appeal for assistance to low-income and unemployed blacks. The \$20,000 booty did not reach the poor blacks, but rather ended up in Cairo, Ill., subsidizing a group of black revolutionaries and to South Africa, bankrolling an aggressive militant black front warring against the responsible governments in that area.

The diversion of funds by the United Front was purportedly in support of a small group of Polaroid employees demanding that Polaroid cease its trade with South Africa—which most assuredly any corporation has the right to do at any time.

However, following the December incident, the Polaroid people while not cutting off trade, ran full-page ads attack-

ing the Government of South Africa, the South African people, and their way of life. It was further announced that they would use the small income from their operation in that nation to bring about internal changes which are blatantly in violation of the law of that nation. This the Polaroid people announced as an experimental program.

I have written to the president of the Polaroid Corp., but I have received no answer. Is the U.S. State Department now using private industry to condition the American people to accept unpalatable foreign policy?

The announced program by Polaroid not only serves to smooth its employee relations, it serves the double purpose of achieving the aforementioned foreign policy objectives.

Polaroid is getting a distorted picture—its camera must be out of focus.

I include several newspaper clippings and a copy of my letter to Polaroid in the RECORD:

[From the Evening Star, December 1970]

POLAROID SHOCKED

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Polaroid Corp. expressed shock that its \$20,000 contribution to Boston's United Black Appeal had been divided between a black group in Cairo, Ill., and organizations working for black liberation in South Africa, instead of for blacks in Boston.

The United Front Foundation, which disburses the funds, announced last Thursday it had decided not to give the money to any organizations in Boston's black community, for whom the appeal was organized this fall.

The United Front said the decision was based on a vote at a general community meeting and was intended to demonstrate support for demands by a group of Polaroid employees that the firm cease all trade with South Africa.

[From The Washington Post, Jan. 13, 1971]

AN EXPERIMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Polaroid sells its products in South Africa as do several hundred other American companies. Our sales there are small, less than one half of one percent of our worldwide business.

Recently a group has begun to demand that American business stop selling in South Africa. They say that by its presence it is supporting the government of the country and its policies of racial separation and subjugation of the Blacks. Polaroid, in spite of its small stake in the country, has received the first attention of this group.

We did not respond to their demands. But we did react to the question. We asked ourselves, "Is it right or wrong to do business in South Africa?" We have been studying the question for about ten weeks.

The committee of Polaroid employees who undertook this study included fourteen members—both black and white—from all over the company. The first conclusion was arrived at quickly and unanimously. We abhor *apartheid*, the national policy of South Africa.

The *apartheid* laws separate the races and restrict the rights, the opportunities and the movement of non-white Africans. This policy is contrary to the principles on which Polaroid was built and run. We believe in individuals. Not in "labor units" as Blacks are sometimes referred to in South Africa. We decided whatever our course should be it should oppose the course of *apartheid*.

The committee talked to more than fifty prominent South Africans both black and

white, as well as many South African experts. They heard from officials in Washington. They read books, papers, testimony, documents, opinion, interpretation, statistics. They heard tapes and saw films.

They addressed themselves to a single question. What should Polaroid do in South Africa? Should we register our disapproval of *apartheid* by cutting off all contact with the country? Should we try to influence the system from within? We rejected the suggestion that we ignore the whole question and maintain the status quo.

Some of the black members of the study group expressed themselves strongly at the outset. They did not want to impose on the black people of another country a course of action merely because we might feel it was correct. They felt this paternalistic attitude had prevailed too often in America when things are done "for" black people without consulting black people.

It was decided to send four of the committee members to South Africa. Since this group was to include two black and two white members, it was widely assumed they would not be granted visas. They were.

It was assumed if they ever got to South Africa they would be given a government tour. They were not.

It was assumed they would not be allowed to see the actual conditions under which many Blacks live and would be prevented from talking to any of them in private. They did see those conditions in Soweto and elsewhere. And with or without permission they met and talked to and listened to more than a hundred black people of South Africa. Factory workers, office workers, domestic servants, teachers, political leaders, people in many walks of life. They also talked to a broad spectrum of whites including members of all the major parties.

Their prime purpose in going to South Africa was to ask Africans what they thought American business should do in their country. We decided that answer that is best for the black people of South Africa would be the best answer for us.

Can you learn about a country in ten days? No. Nor in ten weeks. But our group learned one thing. What we had read and heard about *apartheid* was not exaggerated. It is every bit as repugnant as we had been led to believe.

The group returned with a unanimous recommendation.

In response to this recommendation and to the reports of the larger study committee, Polaroid will undertake an experimental program in relation to its business activities in South Africa.

For the time being we will continue our business relationships there (except for sales to the South African government, which our distributor is discontinuing), but on a new basis which Blacks there with whom we talked see as supportive to their hopes and plans for the future. In a year we will look closely to see if our experiment has had any effects.

First, we will take a number of steps with our distributor, as well as his suppliers, to improve dramatically the salaries and other benefits of their non-white employees. We have had indications that these companies will be willing to cooperate in this plan.

Our business associates in South Africa will also be obliged (as a condition of maintaining their relationship with Polaroid) to initiate a well-defined program to train non-white employees for important jobs within their companies.

We believe education for the Blacks, in combination with the opportunities now being afforded by the expanding economy, is a key to change in South Africa. We will commit a portion of our profits earned there

to encourage black education. One avenue will be to provide funds for the permanent staff and office of the black-run Association for Education and Cultural Advancement (ASECA). A second method will be to make a gift to a foundation to underwrite educational expenses for about 600 black students at various levels of study from elementary school through university. Grants to assist teachers will also be made from this gift. In addition we will support two exchange fellowships for Blacks under the U.S.—South African Leader Exchange Program.

Polaroid has no investments in South Africa and we do not intend to change this policy at present. We are, however, investigating the possibilities of creating a black-managed company in one or more of the free black African nations.

Why have we undertaken this program? To satisfy a revolutionary group? No. They will find it far from satisfactory. They feel we should close the door on South Africa, not to try to push it further open.

What can we hope to accomplish there without a factory, without a company of our own, without the economic leverage of large sales? Aren't we wasting time and money trying to have an effect on a massive problem 10,000 miles from home? The answer, our answer, is that since we are doing business in South Africa and since we have looked closely at that troubled country, we feel we can continue only by opposing the *apartheid* system. Black people there have advised us to do this by providing an opportunity for increased use of black talent, increased recognition of black dignity. Polaroid is a small economic force in South Africa, but we are well known and, because of our committee's visit there, highly visible. We hope other American companies will join us in this program. Even a small beginning of cooperative effort among American businesses can have a large effect in South Africa.

How can we presume to concern ourselves with the problems of another country? Whatever the practices elsewhere, South Africa alone articulates a policy exactly contrary to everything we feel our company stands for. We cannot participate passively in such a political system. Nor can we ignore it. That is why we have undertaken this experimental program.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1971.

Mr. EDWIN H. LAND,
President, Polaroid Corp.,
Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR MR. LAND: Having shared your newspaper advertisement from today's *Washington Post*, "An Experiment in South Africa," with my morning coffee, I felt that I should drop you a line to express my disgust, or rather sympathy, at your naivete.

South Africa is a long way from Cambridge, Massachusetts, and from the United States. So it must be easy to make peace with your blackmailers by joining in their guerrilla warfare against another peaceful ally of the free world.

If it is to now be the policy of the Polaroid Corporation to embarrass the American people further in our international relations for your self-serving employee relations, when are you going to run ads expressing your company's abhorrence for the national policies and customs of other nations?

Is Polaroid going to employ some Arabs to investigate apartheid in Israel so you can denounce that country?

What about India with its caste system, where the untouchables are not to be seen in public even in the street by the higher

caste. Of course, under your researchers' type racist examination, you must hire the lower caste to help formulate your policies.

Then we have the many African nations such as Liberia, Congo, Ethiopia, which still practice slavery. Most certainly you will want to alienate these nations as well as Zambia, which persecutes Jehovah's Witnesses, Indians, and all Moslems.

Finally, I notice nothing in your public relations propaganda which indicated that your company is cutting camera trade with Russia or its Communist satellites, which practice apartheid not only against the Zionist Jew, but other religious and ethnic minorities as well.

If you think life is so bad in South Africa, why is it that there are no lines of refugees or escapees fleeing that country? On the other hand, people fleeing from Communist countries at the risk of losing their lives and all of their belongings is a daily occurrence. I dare suggest, that for a successful industrial organization, you people have been taken.

Yes, South Africa is a far piece from the United States, and as your article confesses, you have little if any business there anyway so what do you have to lose in South Africa? Perhaps you are unaware that there are many Americans who are sick and tired of the Black Panthers and these revolutionaries being pampered and bank rolled by organizations such as yours.

It has hardly been a month since your \$20,000 contribution to Boston's black appeal was sent to Cairo, Illinois to help destroy race relations in that community—the remainder was sent to Communist affiliated revolutionary troops in Africa, dedicated to kill white people and overthrow responsible governments.

I think that you will find that the people of South Africa have far more friends in the U.S. than your colored advisors have led you to believe. As for me, neither myself nor any member of my family will ever consider buying a Polaroid product, or using same. Until the day when South Africa manufactures her own camera, I will confine my photography to the Zeiss of Germany, and Yashica. These companies are still interested in increasing sales and friendships—not alienating them.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—Incidentally, I am writing the Internal Revenue Service to inquire for an opinion as to whether corporations which are forbidden by law from making political donations can write off full page newspaper advertisements such as this as operating expenses.

REFORMING THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) and his colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee's Special Subcommittee on Education in sponsoring legislation establishing the Student Loan Marketing Association. The gentleman is to be commended for

the most significant role he has played in the creation of this proposal.

Establishing Sally Mae, as the Student Loan Marketing Association is called, would provide a firm underpinning to the guaranteed student loan program established 5 years ago as part of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Since that time, the guaranteed loan program has enabled tens of thousands of college students, and individuals enrolled in postsecondary vocational, technical, and business schools to continue their education in fields of their choosing. In so doing, it has focused on middle-grade students from middle-income families.

At the present time, however, this guaranteed loan program is in grave danger of drying up. Private lenders, such as banks, are reluctant to participate due to current economic conditions, despite the fact that defaults on student loans amount to less than 1 percent of the outstanding obligations. In addition, the costs of advanced studies are mounting rapidly. As a result, students are caught between rapidly dwindling sources of loan funds on the one hand, and rapidly increasing costs of education on the other.

On the basis of the facts the guaranteed student loan program cannot, as it is presently constituted, bridge this widening gap. Sally Mae can, though; that is its very reason for existence.

Sally Mae establishes a student loan program which would operate in much the same fashion as Fannie Mae, the Federal National Mortgage Association, does in the home mortgage field. This means that Federal tax dollars would not be used to maintain its operations. Sally Mae would function as a Government corporation having the authority to hold pools of student loans and to issue its own securities. The loans could be acquired from primary lenders, such as banks, or subsequent holders of student loan paper. By this process, although the original lender would continue to process the loans as he presently does, student loan accounts would be divested of administrative burdens, at least as far as the private money lender is concerned. This would make them far more attractive loans than they currently are. Moreover, with Federal backing, Sally Mae loans would also present more attractive investment opportunities for institutional investors, and the like.

Mr. Speaker, in sum, Sally Mae would establish a sound foundation for the guaranteed student loan program. It would provide a new method of financing student loans, a method geared to the economic realities of today's money markets. As such, it would insure the continued success of what is virtually the only federally aided assistance available to the children of middle-class families, the families that bear most of the tax burdens for the public education system of the Nation. And, in addition, it would constitute a most appropriate means of providing interested Americans with increased educational and vocational training opportunities.