

By Mr. SANDMAN (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. LENNON, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON):

H.R. 8061. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to provide for the regulation of the broadcasting of certain major sporting events in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. McCCLURE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. McKEVITT, and Mr. CORDOVA):

H.R. 8062. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. McCCLURE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 8063. A bill to provide for financing the economic development of Indians and Indian organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 8064. A bill to amend certain laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 8065. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 8066. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to

insure the procurement and use by the Federal Government of products manufactured from recycled materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 8067. A bill to bring the tax reductions for individuals provided by the Tax Reform Act of 1969 into immediate effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.J. Res. 606. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.J. Res. 607. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure the right of parents and local school authorities to determine which school the children in that locality will attend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.J. Res. 608. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 609. Joint resolution to authorize the interment of an unknown soldier from Vietnam in the Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SISK, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution to instruct the President of the United States to release

certain appropriated funds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 289. Concurrent resolution relative to citizens radio service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution relative to asset depreciation range; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 421. Resolution urging that import controls be placed on men's wearing apparel, textile goods, and shoes manufactured in foreign countries employing cheap labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 8069. A bill for the relief of Joyce Ann Farrior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 8070. A bill for the relief of Angelo Battista Noll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 8071. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cipoletta and his wife, Rita Cipoletta, and their children, Gaetano Cipoletta, Patrizia Cipoletta, Sabrina Cipoletta, and Antonia Cipoletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 8072. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eva Odisho, John K. Otis, William C. Otis, and Joseph J. Otis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

70. The SPEAKER presented petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to the exchange of prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. GEORGE L. "SHORTY" COLLINS RECEIVES EDWIN T. DAHLBERG PEACE AWARD

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to advise my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate that Dr. George L. "Shorty" Collins, Baptist College chaplain at Grace Baptist Church in San Jose, Calif., will on May 13, 1971, be awarded the Edwin T. Dahlberg Peace Award at ceremonies to be held at this year's American Baptist Convention being held in Minneapolis, Minn.

I am particularly pleased that "Shorty" Collins is receiving this high honor, because he has been a personal friend and associate of mine for many years. His humanity and leadership have been an inspiration to all of us who have been working for peace and justice in California and elsewhere.

The peace award statement to be presented to Dr. Collins reads as follows:

For the testimony of his life as a persistent, gentle, courageous advocate of peace and justice; for his quiet, personal influence which has led students, faculty, friends and co-workers to dedicate their lives to the cause of peace; for the spirit of reconciliation which permeates his life and builds bridges of respect and affection even to those who oppose him, the American Baptist Convention awards to Dr. George L. Collins the Edwin T. Dahlberg Peace Award, May 13, 1971.

The name of George L. "Shorty" Collins is synonymous with reconciliation. His witness is quiet, persistent, and enduring. He has a personal manner that embraces both gentleness and great courage. He is a loyal disciple of Christ, a prophet in the truest sense of the word, a constant witness to the reconciling power of the gospel.

Both in his vocation as a campus pastor and in his service with the Fellowship of Reconciliation, he has worked for international, racial, and community peace, and economic justice. In the face of critical opposition he has stood for the principles which make for human

well-being within the family of nations, within the State, and within the community. He has singlemindedly kept before himself and his coworkers the evils of war and militarism. He has given sledge hammer blows at cited injustices in American society while at the same time in a most creative way, he has employed his keen wit and his human kindness both to empower the blows and to disarm the agents of the injustices.

"Shorty" Collins is a most gentle and persistent advocate of peace. Even in the tension which inevitably swirls about his advocacy he is a walking testimony that man can know peace in the midst of strife. He has refused to hate those who disagree with his political and economic convictions and is loved by almost all who know him.

Probably his greatest contribution has been the personal influence he has had on faculty, friends, and coworkers which has led many of them to recognize and accept their individual responsibility to work for peace. Some of those who have taken light from Shorty's torch are working in the Mekong Delta project, some in the State Department, others in

the United Nations. Some are in the ministry working for peace in their own way. But all these and many others carry a more diligent and vigorous activity in the various ministries of reconciliation, because they saw Shorty at work and learned from him.

Shorty Collins has served in the campus ministry at the Colorado School of Mines, the University of Wisconsin, and San Jose State College. Currently he is serving part time as Baptist College chaplain at Grace Baptist Church, San Jose, Calif., and part time as the bay area representative of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

The Edwin T. Dahlberg Peace Award was founded in 1964 to give recognition to American Baptists who have worked constructively for peace with justice and freedom. The award is granted annually by the General Council of the American Baptist Convention to the person or church who has done an outstanding work for peace, with evidence of activity and solid accomplishment within the last 3 years.

Peace, under the terms of the award, includes international peace, racial peace, community peace, peace between labor and management and other types of peace that bring reconciliation between persons, groups, and nations. Peace does not mean just the lack of hostility but positive efforts to build solid foundations for peace and the conditions that make for peace.

The founders of the award are Mr. and Mrs. Victor H. Gavel, active members of the Delmar Avenue Baptist Church, St. Louis, Mo., where Dr. Dahlberg served as pastor 1950 to 1962. Mr. and Mrs. Gavel have long been interested in supporting positive efforts toward peace.

Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg is recognized as one of the great Christian leaders of our day and an outstanding advocate "of the things that make for peace." In addition to the many responsibilities he has carried through the years at the local, association, and State levels of American Baptist and ecumenical work, he has served as president of the National Council of Churches and the American Baptist Convention.

List of award recipients follows:

AWARD RECIPIENTS

Martin Luther King, Jr., 1964.
L. Kijungluba Ao, 1965.
W. Alvin Pitcher, 1966.
No award given, 1967.
Leon H. Sullivan, 1968.
Kyle Haselden, 1968.
Zelma George, 1969.
Frank M. Coffin, 1970.

PREDATOR CONTROL PROGRAM

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on March 8, 1971, Sports Illustrated published an article written by Jack Olsen dealing with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Predator Control program. The program was originally intended to

aid ranchers and sheepmen by poisoning animals that prey upon cattle and sheep.

However, as the article points out, the program has gotten out of hand. Arsenic, cyanide, thallium, strychnine, and 1080 are in widespread use throughout the West. Serious ecological damage has been encountered as a result of this indiscriminate poisoning.

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

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

THE POISONING OF THE WEST—PART I

(By Jack Olsen)

It was just after dawn on a chilly November morning, and the three surveyors were scratching about the barren earth southwest of Fort Stockton, Texas looking for the old cedar stakes that would give them their bearings. The men were members of a seismic team, jolting and bullying the earth out of its geologic secrets on behalf of a major petroleum company. One of them, 49-year-old Raymond Medford, reached down to tug at a gray pipe protruding from the chalky soil; as he did, there was a sharp report and something tore upward into the fleshy part of his hand. "What happened?" one of the other men shouted. Medford, confused and shocked, was running in circles. Then he calmed and said, "That thing went off! It had an explosion, whatever it was." A doctor in Fort Stockton looked at the bloody hand, administered first aid and sent the surveyor off to bed. An hour later Medford was dead.

Investigation showed that the pipe in the earth was a so-called "coyote getter," a deadly device loaded and cocked and set to shoot a cyanide charge into the mouth of any animal that pulled at its aromatic wick. If the local doctor had known that cyanide had penetrated deep into Raymond Medford's hand, he could have saved his patient. But the coyote getter had been unmarked, and the doctor had proceeded without the crucial knowledge that he was dealing with a notorious poison. The local sheriff acknowledged that the device should have been clearly marked but no charges were pressed following the inquest. As one of his deputies observed later, "Who wants to prosecute somebody for killing coyotes?"

A Colorado hunting guide and jack-of-all-trades named Bill Miles discovered several dozen sheep carcasses lying in an open corral east of Craig, Colo. He asked around and found that the sheep had been slaughtered and laced with sodium fluoroacetate, "1080," one of the most subtly dangerous poisons known to man. The carcasses were to be used by Government trappers to kill predators in the surrounding sheep country. Not far from the carnage ran a stream that fed Craig's public reservoir, but Miles was told not to worry; the carcasses would be positioned at strategic locations out on the sheep range long before their toxic contents could leach into the watershed supplying the town of 4,000.

But Bill Miles had had previous experience with the poisoning Establishment around Craig; he was on intimate terms both with the sheepmen of the area and their surrogates, the men of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and he had learned to distrust the one group as much as he distrusted the other. Miles mounted a daily watch on the pile of poisoned meat, and twice within two weeks he saw snow cover the carcasses and then melt into the watershed. He began making a photographic record of what was going on, and local sheepmen began to harass him. Not long afterward, Miles was told to mind his own business or suffer the consequences. When he continued to take daily

photographs of the scene, three of his hunting dogs died on his doorstep. In the front yard of his house were tire tracks and leftover evidence of meat poisoned with thallium. Miles kept up his investigations of the poisoning practices and more than once nearly came to blows with fellow townsmen and the federal poisoners. His business fell off, and soon he moved away.

Dinosaur National Monument, straddling the border of Colorado and Utah, is one of the most environmentally sacrosanct portions of the U.S. Like all national parks, it is administered strictly in accordance with nature, and the intentional poisoning of animals within its borders is considered the ultimate offense against park law and order. In the spring of 1970 cowhands who worked for a rancher named Tim Mantle were searching for strays inside the park borders when one of Mantle's valuable Australian sheep dogs suddenly stiffened and died. A few minutes later another dog went into convulsions, and when the shocked cowmen dismounted to see what was wrong they found that the second dog had stopped breathing. By the time their vital organs were transported to a laboratory, diagnosis was difficult, but the best guess was 1080—the favorite chemical of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's death squads.

The incident happened four miles inside the park borders, but Dinosaur officials were not surprised. "I've found any number of live coyote getters inside the park," said one of them, a wildlife ranger, "and we've had plenty of other evidence that the poisoners come right across our borders." Just outside the park on a lonely access road, another park ranger had found the skinned remains of foxes, badgers and coyotes, and when he stopped to investigate a strange-looking pipe jutting from the earth, he set off a coyote getter and barely escaped with his life.

These three incidents, multiplied ad nauseam, characterize the programs of extermination and revenge that are in full swing throughout the Western half of the U.S. The programs already have brought whole species of animals to the edge of extinction and threaten still others. They also threaten *Homo sapiens*, that poor creature who lately has begun driving six miles out of his way to buy phosphate-free laundry soap, all the while turning his back on poisoning programs that are directly and specifically contaminating millions of acres of his country.

The coyote getters that explode every summer in the hands of unsuspecting people may be the least of the problem. To be sure, the very idea that the ugly devices lie in wait for both coyote and nature lover is annoying. *The Denver Post* suggested that the deadly gadgets be renamed "little boy getters," but that name would not have been completely descriptive. The cyanide-loaded cartridges are also old man getters, dog getters, Girl Scout getters, cow getters, fox and marten and wolverine and magpie and hawk getters. They are getters, in fact, of anything that has the natural curiosity to reach down and pull lightly on the carrion-scented wick that protrudes above the ground and wafts a smell of decay and musk to the winds.

But coyote getters—fascinatingly newsworthy as they may be—seem to be a negligible hazard, a minor earth pollutant compared to certain other poisons that are saturating the countryside. Dr. Alfred Etter, student of the conservationist Aldo Leopold and himself a former professor of conservation and ecology, told a congressional committee: "The fact is that poisons are being distributed all over the Western states year after year by federal, state, county and private interests, and are often left in the environment to poison any animal that happens to have a taste for meat, tallow, oats, honey or rice, or even a curiosity about foul-smelling attractants."

Etter was not talking about the DDT and

parathion and mercury compounds and other pesticides and fungicides and herbicides with which overzealous industrialists and agriculturists and exterminators and ordinary citizens are inadvertently poisoning the earth. He was talking about poisons used specifically and purposely to kill animals. These include the cyanide that is found in coyote getters, the arsenic that is put out in honey buckets, the thallium that is impregnated into bait carcasses, the strychnine that is encased in sugar-pill coatings, and 1080, a pinch of which is toxic enough to send several dozen adult humans into writhing, convulsive death.

To add to the efficiency of miracle poisons like 1080, there is a new sophistication in poisoning techniques. At one time the West was protected by its very limitlessness; a pioneer might strap on snowshoes and trek 10 miles across a mountain, shoot a grizzly, lace its body with strychnine and call this activity a day's work. But nowadays the poisoner works from airplanes, trail bikes and tough pickup trucks that carry him and his thallium bait bucket and his coyote getters to every corner of the range in a few easy hours.

"The whole sheep range out there, why, that whole country's plastered with poison," says crusty Paul Maxwell, former trapper and bulldozer operator and now president of the National Council of Public Land Users. "As soon as it gets cold enough so the poison baits will keep, they've got traps and 1080 stations and getters and strychnine and arsenic and everything else all over this country, and hardly any of it marked. The people who could crack down on this—the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management and the different state fish and game commissions—why, they're advocating poisoning, too! The people we're entrusting with taking care of our public land are out contaminating it. I assume they must be padding their pockets from the stockmen."

Says an equally perturbed Wyoming trapper, "Up here they're killing wild animals faster'n they can be born. Many sheepmen who use the national forest for grazing go in with sacks and sacks of strychnine pellets, some in peanut butter, some in honey, and throw 'em around like seed, and they kill everything in the area before they bring their sheep in." To supplement this frenzied poisoning by private ranchers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service annually distributes tons of 1080-baited meat, bangs coyote getters into the earth by the tens of thousands, throws strychnine pellets across the countryside by the hundreds of thousands and utilizes several dozen other killing techniques, including aerial hunting and the gassing of dens.

In response to these pressures, the number of wild animal species is dropping, but the Fish and Wildlife Service's annual budget for killing and poisoning rises inversely in magnificent adherence to Parkinson's Law. (The budget for the Wildlife Services program in 1971 was \$8,092,300. In 1960 it was \$4,370,935.) The money, of course, comes ultimately from the very taxpayers and consumers who stand to lose the most from this systematic annihilation of the nation's fauna. Says Glen Sutton, who spent over four decades working as a predator trapper for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, embracing some of its methods but disdaining others, "I'm afraid a lot of these animals are going to be extinct soon. The bear and mountain lion are next. There's too much pressure from sheepmen; they want 'em all killed. Nowadays you don't see one bear track where you used to see dozens. The poisons are getting them."

Says another retired Government trapper, Charles Orlosky, who lives high in a remote area of the Rocky Mountains: "Around here the poisoners have wiped out weasel, marten, mink, fox, badger, and they've got to be

able to make a fair living trapping for pelts up here, but now I do it just for a hobby, for something to do. There aren't enough fur-bearing animals left in these mountains to support a trapper, and I don't care how hard he works at it. Mostly, I blame the 1080 poison. They say it's only dangerous to canine species, but that's just not true. I've found all kinds of birds feeding on 1080 stations—eagles, magpies, Canada jays, Clarke's nutcrackers, woodpeckers—and those that don't get killed pack away the poisoned meat in places where the martens and the weasels can find it and get poisoned themselves.

Last winter was the first time in years that we didn't have a pair of eagles feeding up here. They just disappeared. And where there used to be magpies all over the place, we didn't see one all winter. These are major changes, crucial changes. My God, if they can wipe out whole species way back here in this part of the Rockies, they can wipe them out anywhere."

There is ample evidence that the combination of stockmen and federal poisoners has already succeeded in eliminating certain animal populations and endangering others. As Michigan's conservation-minded Congressman John Dingell said at a House hearing in 1969:

"They are poisoning them off in a fashion that is disgraceful to behold. They are doing it without shame or mercy." There are broad acres of California where coyotes once were common and now are completely eliminated. A trapper in southwest Texas was asked when he saw his last wild badger, and his reply was to shrug his shoulders and say, "It's been so long I can't even remember." The kit fox, full grown at five or six pounds and a master controller of rodents, has vanished from thousands of square miles of the prairie. Like all canines, the tiny fox is particularly vulnerable to 1080. The black-footed ferret, never common, is about to flicker out and die as a species, victim of the poisons that are also wiping out the prairie dogs on which the ferret dines.

An outdoorsman in Idaho says sadly, "Every year for the last five or six years I've seen this pair of fishers in a little spring hole where I hunt. This year they were gone. Nearby, I found a poison bait." Hikers came across two dead golden eagles in the sheep country of northwest Colorado, a region where eagle populations have diminished sharply, and a Denver laboratory provided the diagnosis: strychnine poisoning. Two of the last surviving California condors fell to 1080-treated grain, and a Government report noted, "It is unthinkable that this sort of mistake can be permitted to recur." But it will recur again and again, with condors and other species, simply because there is so much poison scattered on the land that it cannot be avoided by wildlife.

The poison is being distributed and utilized with typical American enterprise. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and private manufacturers of poisons have even managed to export some of their deadly expertise. A well-publicized "victory" over Canadian wolves was accomplished by aerial distribution of 1080 supplied by an American manufacturer. Dozens of nations have begun to send in orders and repeat orders for American-made predacides, and recently the Japanese paid U.S. chemical technology the ultimate compliment: they began manufacturing a 1080-like product of their own. The Fish and Wildlife Service, in a generous hands-across-the-border gesture, helped Mexican authorities put out 83 poison stations from Tijuana to the mouth of the Colorado River along the international border, with predictable results. Within three months coyotes were "no more to be seen" (to quote an exuberant Fish and Wildlife report), and "in Rumerosa a considerable portion of the dog population was poisoned. Only two dogs survived in the village." When

this same Government agency and the Pan American Sanitary Bureau distributed 1080 in Chihuahua, they managed to kill several grizzly bears, some of the last grizzlies that exist below the northern reaches of the American continent.

After the bears were poisoned, stockmen displayed a predictable attitude: What good is a grizzly? The question recalled a remark by Wisconsin's Senator Gaylord Nelson to a committee of Congress: "I have a lawyer friend who had a scientist friend who spent all of his time studying the spider, and one day the lawyer asked him, 'What good are spiders?' and the scientist said, 'They are interesting, and may I ask, what good are you?'"

Large numbers of concerned Americans have been taking cram courses in ecology, but there are still millions who ask questions like what good is the spider and what good is the grizzly. The answer, of course, lies in nature's delicate adjustments, worked out over millions of years of massive trial and error, of survival experiments and adaptation and compromise. These processes are mysterious, inscrutable, so much so that the more one learns about them, the more one becomes reluctant to step on an ant or swat a fly for fear that some dire ecological catastrophe will ensue. As Charles Darwin warned, we are ignorant "of the mutual relations of all organic beings, a conviction as necessary as it is difficult to acquire." But as Darwin might not have anticipated, we are beginning to learn. And the more a person learns about the balance of nature, the less he is likely to ask questions like the ones that a sheepman recently bellowed across a room: "Which is worth more, livestock or predators?" and, "How much taxes do coyotes pay?" As ecological knowledge grows, we no longer consider which is "worth more," which is "good" and which is "bad," which is "destructive" and which is "useful," but how do they relate to each other and to us, and how do we all relate to the land that sustains us?

"Harmony with land is like harmony with a friend," Aldo Leopold wrote. "You cannot cherish his right hand and chop off his left. That is to say, you cannot love game and hate predators; you cannot conserve the waters and waste the ranges; you cannot build the forest and mine the farm. The land is one organism."

If Leopold and other scientists are correct, if the land is indeed one organism and there is a total and critical interdependence among all living things, then the deliberate poisoning of vast areas of the U.S. will have been a long stride toward the end of life as it is known on the North American continent. Dr. Lee Talbot of the President's Council on Environmental Quality said that "during the past 150 years the rate of extermination of mammal species has increased 55-fold. If it continues to increase at the same rate (hopefully it's unlikely), virtually all the remaining species of mammals will be gone in about 30 years." No one need feel that the U.S., officially and unofficially, has failed to do its part.

Warnings of the dangers of wholesale poisoning have been issued loud and clear for many years. One of them came nearly a quarter of a century ago from the late J. Frank Dobie, dean of Southwestern naturalists, in his classic work *The Voice of the Coyote*.

"Sheep are the arch-predators upon the soil of arid and semi-arid ranges. Wherever they are concentrated on ranges without sufficient moisture to maintain a turf under their deep-biting teeth and cutting hoofs, they destroy the plant life. . . . Unless long-term public good wins over short-term private gain and ignorance, vast ranges, already greatly depleted, will at no distant date be as barren as the sheep-created deserts of Spain. Metaphorically, the sheep of the West

eat up not only all animals that prey upon them—coyotes, wildcats and eagles especially—but badgers, skunks, foxes, ringtails and others. On sheep ranges, wholesale poisoning and trapping have destroyed nearly all of them."

The effect of Dobie's anguished broadside was precisely nil. Similar impassioned attacks on Western poisoning and grazing practices have been equally futile, and nowadays certain sheepmen (and sometimes certain cattlemen) go about spreading poisons, all the while humming *Home on the Range* and totting up imaginary economic benefits of the slaughter. Not long ago a weekly Colorado newspaper printed a story about a rancher and his wife and children who spent a delightful winter weekend cruising their property on snowmobiles, throwing out strychnine "drop baits" to kill coyotes. The item ran as a social note, The Western stockman who does not engage in such popular practices is branded an eccentric, sometimes an outright traitor, and those who protest against this drenching of the American landscape with poison are called "little old ladies in tennis shoes." In sheep country, there is no harsher epithet.

The irrational hatred of animals that kill other animals (a hatred that was good enough for Dad and is good enough for most ranchers) is deep-grained, going back to the hard times when the loss of a few lambs or a calf might cause a serious shortage in the winter larder. But while modern scientists have learned that predators are sorely needed ecologically, and while stock operations have long since passed out of the shoestring category of the old West, sheepmen have continued their anachronistic war on predators as though their very existences depended on poisoning the last one off. Dozens of naturalists have issued public warnings against the resulting toxification of the American range, but there is hardly a legislative body that has paid the slightest attention. This includes the Congress of the United States, where a session is not complete without the introduction of antipoisoning legislation, a few chuckles and a prompt pigeonholing of the matter. The sheepmen seem to possess a mysterious power. Arnold Rieder, a former Montana state senator and one of a handful of Western politicians who have spoken out against the sheep industry's practices, tells why:

"The woolgrowers are the best organized livestock group of all. To a great degree they control the stockgrowers' associations, and that means control of the state capitals of the West and the delegations that are sent to Washington. Invariably, sheepmen get their way. They're always the ones who make the most noise about coyote loss, the ones who demand the most poison."

Sometimes the hatred of sheepmen for coyotes, bears and mountain lions seems to go so far beyond the dimensions of reality as to be almost pathological in origin. Frank Dovie wrote about a sheepman on the Frio River in Texas who liked to saw off the lower jaws of trapped coyotes and "turn the mutilated animals loose for his dogs to tear to pieces." Stories of skinning coyotes alive are common, as are stories of setting them afire. "I had one sheepman tell me, 'Bring me a live coyote, will you?'" says trapper Acel Rowley of Vernal, Utah. "I said, 'What're you gonna do with it?' He said, 'I'm gonna take him and tie his jaws shut and soak him with kerosene and touch a match to the end of his tail and turn him loose.'"

Only an imbecile would conclude from such Western horror stories that sheepmen have a monopoly on cruelty to animals or that all sheepmen share the same lack of compassion or rapport with nature. Most woolgrowers abhor the violence that some of their fellows commit. There are many sheep ranchers who oppose the wholesale poisoning and killing that goes on around them, and specifically

forbid it on their own properties. But too many other private poisoners carry on their work by land and by air, and with gusto.

In Wyoming the personal pilot for a rich stockman learned that he could glide down on coyotes in the wintertime and drop them with heavy patterns from his shotgun. From this it was a short step to gunning eagles from the air. After the pilot had perfected his techniques and increased his efficiency by taking along a rancher to serve as aerial gunner from the copilot's seat, he began to warm to the idea of eliminating predators in the mass. He learned that coyotes and other animals were getting wise to the poison stations scattered about the state; often trappers would see tracks where predators had made wide detours around the deadly baits. An established predator-control technique by ranchers in Wyoming had become the baiting of game carcasses, and if no road kills or natural kills were available, antelope or deer were shot and laced with poison. All of this was illegal, of course.

Growing more certain of his improving techniques, the pilot began flying to remote areas of the range and gunning down antelope and deer instead of predators. Then he would make a short landing, doctor the carcass with poison and fly away. The aerial poisoning became so widespread—and the pilot so fearless of prosecution—that it was soon the talk of the state. Before long the pilot was being called upon by ranchers around the state for advice and guidance on his advanced poisoning techniques.

One day a tip came in from a U.S. Fish and Wildlife trapper who had deep contempt for the pilot's practices. He told game wardens that the pilot was going to fly some poisoning missions in a few days, and he named the sheep spread where the operation would take place. The Wyoming Game and Fish Commission provided a plane, and when the pilot took off, wardens followed in their own aircraft at a discreet distance. They followed—and followed. The poisoner's plane led them all over the state, climbing and diving and snaking through canyons and over mountain passes and under power lines, and at last, with a contemptuous waggle of wings, turned homeward and landed without a semblance of a threat to any wildlife.

The wardens gave up. The Wyoming Game and Fish Commission was poorly funded for such expensive operations as aerial surveillance, and anyway it was plain that someone was tipping the pilot off. One of the wardens felt that the leak was coming from the airport; others were convinced that the tip came from inside the Game and Fish Commission itself. Such leaks are common in Western states; they are another reason that antipoisoning laws are largely unenforced.

For a while the pilot's activities seemed to slow, but after a discreet period of watching and waiting he resumed his poisoning full-scale. "We'd find all these carcasses on the ranches," recalls one of the frustrated wardens. "Most of them were deer, but some were antelope, and they were all loaded with poison. I can't imagine a worse offense in the outdoors than killing game animals and then filling them with poison to kill more animals."

"We were furious about it." But neither fury nor frustration was enough to solve the case and bring the pilot and his imitators to justice. Nor would there have been much likelihood of a conviction—or a meaningful penalty—if the pilot had been caught. To be sure, he had refined and perfected an effective (and illegal) poisoning technique, but that only made him different in degree from so many of the sheepmen of the region. As one local woolgrower put it, "Sure, poisoning game is illegal. So's crossing the double yellow. If everybody's doing it, can it be much of a crime?" Indeed no. Nowadays the pilot's operations are more extensive than ever. His price has risen from \$75 to \$150 an hour, and even the most dedicated game

wardens of Wyoming have given up on the case.

Anyone who remains dubious about the power of the sheepmen or the impossibility of serious prosecution of illegal poisoners in sheep country has only to study the so-called Arambel Case, a landmark in the annals of frustrating Western jurisprudence. The case began when a trapper named Jim King was putting out bobcat sets two miles north of the Big Sandy Creek in western Wyoming. At the tip of a narrow point of rocks, where he usually installed a trap, King saw what appeared to be a jellified blob of meat. He took a closer look and recognized an antelope quarter, fresh and showing signs of having been doctored. King finished putting out his string and then telephoned a game warden named Darwin Creek, 40 miles away in Pine-dale, Wyo. Creek brought in an enforcement-minded colleague, Max Long, and the two wardens drove to the scene. They found tire tracks and boot prints fanning out in several directions from the original bait, and by the time the long afternoon was over they had picked up seven quarters of antelope and deer. Five of these had been in remote areas, but one had been alongside a trickle of water that joined a fishing stream below, and one was close to another stream that was popular with campers.

It was December, the air was cold and no one was around, but Creek and Long knew that unseasonal warm weekends might bring dozens of visitors to the camping area. They made plaster of paris prints of the tracks, interviewed the closest inhabitants and rushed the seven quarters to the Game and Fish Commission Research Laboratory at Laramie. Chemists took one look at the meat and quickly put on gloves. After preliminary tests they advised Creek and Long to remove their clothes and burn them. The final analyses showed that the slabs of meat were carrying a heavy load of 1080, which is supposed to be used in predator control only by U.S. Government trappers but, in fact, sifts into the hands of private poisoners all over the West. According to Creek, "One of the doctors at the game and fish lab said there was enough poison in any one of the quarters to kill people for a mile down that stream. It was the highest concentration of 1080 they'd ever seen."

Creek and Long now face the classic dilemma of the Western conservation officer. The baits had been found in sheep country, on public land, and all signs pointed to one person, an influential Basque-American stockman named John Arambel, member of a prominent ranching family. To investigate, or not? Neither Creek nor Long paused to consider the consequences; they made an investigation, picked up a few tidbits of information around the area and sent for Arambel to meet them at the sheriff's office. Creek tells what happened: "After we gave him his rights, he denied everything. We told him we could place him at the scene. We told him witnesses had spotted his pickup, and the tire tracks matched. After a while he broke down and admitted that his hired help had shot the deer out of season, but he said he had gotten the antelope after the animal had been killed by a car. He also admitted that his men had laced the carcasses with 1080 and had distributed the poisoned quarters on public land. But when we asked him where he got the 1080, he refused to tell us. If you know how dangerous 1080 is, you know how bad we wanted to know where he got it. But he wouldn't tell us. He admitted that they put a lot of 1080 into the quarters to make sure they did a good job, but that was all. Finally we offered him immunity on the whole case if he'd just tell where he got the 1080, and he still refused. His lawyer took him into court and pled him guilty to killing a game animal out of season, using a game animal for trapping and wanton waste of game, and the judge fined him \$164. He could have gotten something like 18

months and a \$300 fine, but you could see how the judge felt. Before he passed sentence he told Arambel that he understood his problem. He said something like this, 'I know you ranchers are having a lot of trouble with those coyotes.'

The Arambel trial took place in 1967, in sheep country, and the local reaction was predictable. The people of the area are still annoyed at Creek and Long—"the Gestapo," as one housewife calls them—and John Arambel has become a local folk hero. All he did was cross the yellow line.

There are larger significances to the Arambel case than a sheep-country judge's leniency or a sheep-country people's distorted code of ethics. As Darwin Creek explains, "There is no way to figure the amount of poison that's put out illegally in the state of Wyoming, but it's something awful. Our wildlife is disappearing fast, especially animals like bears and martens and foxes—animals that'll take a poisoned bait. If all the people of Wyoming knew what's going on, they'd be shocked and something would be done, but that's the trouble: all the people of Wyoming don't know. It's kept quiet. This case is an example of how they keep it quiet. The truth is that Max and I had some pretty flimsy evidence. If John Arambel had denied everything and pleaded not guilty and put up a strong defense in court, he'd have had a good chance to beat the case. Why did he plead guilty? Because if there'd been a court fight it would've made headlines all over Wyoming, and then reporters and outsiders would've become interested, and, sooner or later, they'd have wanted to know what we wanted to know right from the beginning. Where'd Arambel get the 1080? And that was one question that could not stand publicity. As soon as the press and the public found out what 1080 was and how it killed and how it was leaking around the state of Wyoming, there'd have been a terrible fuss, so they came in and pled Arambel guilty and got it over with quick and quiet. There was a little tiny item way down in the corner of the local paper, and that was the end of it."

The horror that men like Max Long and Darwin Creek feel at the mention of 1080 is largely unshared by the growing army of conservationists in the U.S. as a whole, and for a simple reason: like the majority of the people of poison-drenched Wyoming, they know nothing about it. Or they only know that 1080 is the favorite poison of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and therefore conclude that it must be safe, reasonable and practical. It is not. The poison was unsafe in the years when it was used only by the trained mammal-control agents of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; it is manifestly unsafe now that it is also being used by the zealous sheepmen of the West.

Of all the lethal agents of history, from Socrates' hemlock down through the Borgias' legendary deadly elixirs and the nerve poisons of modern warfare, it is difficult to imagine a more insidiously homicidal poison than sodium fluoroacetate. The most infinitesimal amounts of 1080 are toxic. A single ounce used at maximum efficiency could kill 200 adult humans, or 20,000 coyotes or dogs, or 70,000 house cats. Except in large quantities of water, 1080 apparently does not degrade biologically or physically. It is colorless, odorless and almost tasteless. No antidote has yet been found.

A 1950 summary by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service noted that since its introduction there had been 12 known and four suspected deaths from 1080. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported several years later that there had been "13 proven fatal cases, five suspected deaths, and six nonfatal cases. . . ." The truth is that no one is certain how many have died from 1080 poisoning, especially now that it is finding its way into private hands, but there is very little doubt that there have been deaths

other than the diagnosed ones. Glen Crabtree, a research biochemist at the Fish and Wildlife laboratories in Denver, tells of a case where a child died from sucking dried-up paper cups that had been used to hold 1080 solutions months before. "Then there was a case in Texas where 1080 cups were put in a barn," Crabtree says, "and the farmer was told to lock the barn and didn't, and a little boy got in and died. In eastern Colorado a store owner kept 1080 solution in a pop bottle. A store employee drank it. And then, of course, there have been the suicides." Crabtree remembers a particularly unpleasant case in which he was called for expert advice. "A woman who worked as a secretary at a pest-control company became despondent, and she took some 1080 out of a locked cabinet and ingested it. Then she changed her mind and called for help. But there's no changing your mind with 1080. During the night the doctors called me, and I told them there was nothing they could do but try to allay the symptoms. Apparently, it was quite painful. She had convulsions, and she lasted several hours."

Where convulsions are present, Crabtree points out, any experienced physician would suspect poisoning, but there also are 1080 cases where the doctor is not present at the time of the convulsions, or the patient does not suffer convulsions at all. In these cases, Crabtree says, doctors "would probably diagnose the death as a heart attack."

The danger to surrounding wildlife from a fatal dosage of 1080 does not end with the victim's violent death. "Following absorption," wrote Fish and Wildlife Biologist Eric Peacock, "sodium fluoroacetate appears to act without being chemically changed." The Western Montana Scientists' Committee for Public Information reported: "Since 1080 remains stable and does not degrade easily, it is extremely hazardous to animals higher in the food chain. House cats, dogs, pigs, foxes, skunks, carrion-eating birds and coyotes have died after eating 1080-poisoned rodents."

But none of these profoundly negative indications has prevented the use of sodium fluoroacetate by both public and private agencies, or its widespread sale by the two U.S. firms that manufacture it—Tull Chemical and Roberts Chemicals—and the Japanese chemical company that imitates them. The only federal restriction on the deadly poison is a requirement that the labels be registered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Wildlife Services makes rules on the use of 1080 for its staff, but they are merely guidelines, not laws. State and local laws about the lethal chemical are almost nonexistent, and the only effective control on its use seems to come from the two manufacturers. According to their spokesmen, both companies limit the sale of the poison to pest-control operators.

"The distribution of 1080 has always been a problem," says Dr. Ralph Heal, executive secretary of the National Pest Control Association. "And it has always haunted the Fish and Wildlife Service—the possibility of this poison getting into private hands. I've been told that there have been some bad leaks. I know that they tightened their operation terrifically about three years ago when they had a real scare after a batch of 1080 got out. The main thing we've got to watch out for is some character setting himself up, getting somebody to write insurance for him and then qualifying himself with the manufacturers. This is always a possibility." It is more than a possibility. It has happened.

A few years ago frightened Fish and Wildlife officials began hearing rumors that 1080 was popping up in illegally baited carcasses throughout the West, and hurried consultations were held with Tull Allen, head of Tull Chemical. "Fish and Wildlife told me that the 1080 I'd sent to three predator-control boards in Wyoming was not being

used by Government trappers at all," Allen says. "What they were doing was dispensing it to sheepmen to use themselves. I cut off all shipments to those people. They'd lied to me, pure and simple." Several years have gone by since Allen put the last shipment of 1080 into the hands of the Wyoming sheepmen, but the official federal poisoning Establishment is still nervous over the leakage.

There is little doubt that the flow of deadly 1080 continues into private hands, controlled only by the good intentions and limited capabilities of the two manufacturers. It is pointless to argue whether the total amounts are large or small, for 1080 is a substance that is toxic in the most microscopic quantities. It is also pointless to argue that the poison is being spread way out there in the middle of nowhere, and therefore it cannot do much harm. As poisoners become more and more bold, 1080-treated carcasses have begun turning up alongside public watersheds in dangerous numbers. "It's common practice for poisoners to put them out on ice-covered reservoirs in the winter," Trapper Charles Orlosky reports. "Reservoirs are attractive places to wildlife, and the trappers have found out they get a high percentage of kills that way. Then, when spring comes, the remains of the bait settle right into the water and they don't have to go to the trouble of burning them."

Defenders of Wildlife News, the trade journal of activist conservationists, is the only U.S. publication that has mounted a continuous program against the deliberate toxication of the U.S. "What is to be the eventual result year after year of this relentless poisoning of our biota and lands?" the journal has asked. "How much 1080 is washed, during heavy rains, into our streams—and absorbed by the root systems of our grasses . . . ? With millions of pounds of 1080-treated baits on Western lands, one ponders the issue of how much of this poison is absorbed by grazing livestock from contaminated grasses, and subsequently transferred to human stomachs in a leg of lamb or roast of beef."

A discussion with a top expert on 1080 is of small consolation. Glen Crabtree impresses one as a dispassionate scientist first and foremost, and no mere apologist for his own Government agency. He minces no words about what is known and what is unknown about the deadly substance. Does it indeed remain intact as it passes from the body of one animal to another? "Yes, it does," he says. Is it biodegradable? "Our information here is sketchy." Does it break down in solution? "It's degradable in solution over a period of time." Are there genetic effects of ingesting the substance? "We know nothing about that." Can it be absorbed by grasses, and thence by cattle and sheep and eventually humans?

"It usually takes a fairly concentrated amount of a substance for such translocations to take place. We've had no indication from experience that this occurs, but we have no data on it." Is 1080 a subtle menace to our water supplies? "In the present state of our knowledge it appears not to be a danger to public water systems." If a minute amount of 1080 were to get into a water system and be consumed by humans, what would be their symptoms? "It would depend on the amount, but with a very small amount they might get a lot of depression, possibly some convulsions. With larger amounts, of course, they might show definite symptoms of poisoning, symptoms that any able physician would recognize, or they might simply appear to be suffering from heart trouble." Is it possible that 1080 could accidentally leak into public water supplies and cause depressions, convulsions and deaths attributable to heart attack, and that no one would know the cause? "I don't think that has ever happened, and it is extremely unlikely because of the

dilution factor. But if you ask me if it's possible, in all honesty I have to say, yes, it is theoretically possible."

One comes away from a discussion with this plain-spoken biochemist—and other experts in the field—with the uneasy feeling that there are serious gaps in the toxicological profile of sodium fluoracetate. Whole tables and booklets have been prepared on such practical matters as the exact amount of 1080 required to kill kangaroo rats, ferruginous rough-legged hawks, Rhode Island red hens and Columbian ground squirrels, but no one seems to have done much research into an equally practical matter: What is the total amount of 1080 and other poisons that the sodden soils and polluted waterways of the West can absorb without becoming lethal agents themselves? One asks, and one is told: "Nobody knows."

Someday we may be dying to find out.

TWO REBUTTALS

(By Jack Berryman, chief of the Government's Wildlife Services)

We're not thrilled at being the defenders for poison. We use only the most selective, effective and humane toxicants with the least impact on the environment and non-target species. It is hard to find a graceful way of killing an animal. No matter how you do it, it is dead.

Animals will be doing damage, and the public wants the heritage of animals. The goal for the future will be more sophisticated methods that can be applied more discreetly. Sophistication costs more money and requires more supervision. Landowners are an independent lot. If what they want done isn't done, they'll do it themselves. They can throw the bait around where nontarget animals also will be killed.

Facts show that Wildlife Services is not decimating the wildlife population. We have not brought to the verge of extinction any target animals, let alone any of the others. None of the poisons we use move through the food chain or pose any threat to humans. We use such small amounts they're just not in the food chain. Some of the poisons have been in use for 50 years, others for 25 years. There has been no environmental accumulation of any significance.

This program was once based on amount of kill. It was a case of "how many did you get." With that kind of background, it was a difficult adjustment, but we have turned the whole thing around. There have been large gains, and the program has been redirected. It's a whole new approach. Some legislation has been attempting to halt the Government program and if this legislation is passed, all our gains and efforts will be lost.

Critics will actually help bring about needed action. We appreciate the roles played by both extremist groups. They push both ways and help develop better programs inside the two ends they represent.

Many different collections of people and task forces have looked into the facts. The truth is there would be more criticism if the Government ducked this business rather than tackled it. The Wildlife Services' program is like a plane flight. No news unless it crashes. The program is no news unless there's a violation of guidelines.

It is the responsibility of the Government to make some unpopular decisions. It takes more courage to stay with the program than to abandon it. And one last point. I would not like to leave the impression that the job is being done 100%. There's a lot to do and not everyone is trying to do it.

(By Edwin Marsh, executive secretary, National Wool Growers Assn.)

If the predator-poisoning program is not made more adequate, the sheep industry will be forced out of business. Predators—especially coyotes, the prime sheep killers—

are increasing. The program will have to be intensified and continued until such time that we can develop—through research—other control methods. Careful research in Utah has produced calculations that \$3,538,846 are lost annually by the range sheep industry to predators. This loss is equal or surpassed in many states. We are doing extensive research at present, hoping to find more humane control methods. One possibility is a repellent on sheep that would discourage predators. Poisoning may be a painful death for predators. But the death suffered by sheep at the mercy of predators is not exactly pretty. Allegations that the poisoning program is harming the environment are vastly exaggerated. I do not think that the balance of nature is being destroyed by the poisoning program. Survival of the wool industry is at stake. The present poisoning program is inadequate to control degradations in sheep areas. We are not interested in control work where there are no sheep. The fact that degradation of sheep by the coyote population is increasing dangerously is indication enough that the present poisoning program is inadequate. We know the program has many enemies, but we will certainly fight to maintain—and increase—it. We have to, if we expect the range sheep industry to survive.

CARGO BARGES

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill, to facilitate the transportation of cargo barges specifically designed for carriage aboard a vessel, is necessary if we hope to obtain for U.S.-flag companies the operating flexibility in foreign waters for efficient and economical cargo shipment in the years ahead. The design, development, and construction of barge-carrying ships is one of the latest innovations in the seagoing transportation of cargo.

This unique type of ocean shipping will permit rapid loading and discharge of cargo barges either in the port area or estuary or in the open seaway adjacent to a port and proceed promptly to the next port of call. The Lash or the Seabee vessels may unload or load directly from a pier, if one is available, but may avoid long waiting periods if such facilities are congested.

I am informed that the utilization of the barge-carrying ships will double the utility of a single ship. Normal port times of a so-called break-bulk ship is in the neighborhood of 3 to 5 days whereas the barge-carrying ships will be able to enter and leave its port of destination within 24 hours. While it is completing its voyage to other ports, the barges discharged can be unloaded, and reloaded for the homeward leg of the voyage.

In the interest of efficiency and economy of operation U.S.-flag operators will find it necessary to reshuffle and consolidate cargoes in these barges. This will entail transfer of cargo from one ship-carried barge before or after the movement of the cargo by barge between points in foreign waters. To obtain such

flexibility of operation in foreign waters it will be necessary to extend like rights reciprocally to foreign-flag barges used in the same kind of operation in U.S. waters.

This legislation will provide maximum flexibility for U.S.-flag companies in implementing this efficient new approach to cargo handling without conflicting with our cabotage laws. It is purposefully narrow in scope covering only barges used as part of an oceangoing barge ship system and only cargoes in the foreign commerce.

This legislation is necessary to realize fully the economic potential of this latest innovation in ocean transportation.

ARVN 39TH RANGERS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the philosopher Epictetus once pointed out that—

Appearances to the mind are of four kinds. Things either are what they appear to be; or they neither are nor appear to be; or they are and do not appear to be; or they are not, and yet appear to be. Rightly to aim in all these cases is the wise man's task.

The Armed Forces Journal of April 19, 1971, had a short article dispelling one of the many false appearances which certain segments of the television media seem so determined to create in the minds of viewers:

MORE TV PARALLAX

One of the most vividly remembered TV scenes from the Lam Son 71-9 invasion of Laos was that of frightened South Vietnamese rangers hanging onto the skids of helicopters bringing dead and wounded from the battlefield into Vietnam. Col. Robert F. Molinelli observed the unit, the 39th Rangers, from above, and had some comments on what actually occurred during the reported "retreat" of this unit.

"The ARVN 39th Rangers went into Laos with about 420 men and set up their firebase. They were hit hard by a North Vietnamese Regiment which came in from above the DMZ. The ARVN Rangers were outnumbered six or eight to one. For three days we were unable to get supplies in to them. When they were low on ammunition they went out and took NVA rifles and ammunition and fought on. When they decided to move off their hill, they beat their way right through that North Vietnamese regiment, killing them with their own guns and ammunition in many cases . . . and they were carrying their wounded and at least two of their dead. They were down to 253 men I would call effective when they joined up with the 21st Rangers.

"The news media said they were overrun. They were not. I observed them until dark that day and they were never overrun. There were reports they were not a match for the NVA. The Air Force photographed the slopes of their firebase and we counted 637 NVA dead. That was all we could see in the open and only on the sides of the slope around their position. Seventeen of their men did panic and they did leave hanging onto helicopter skids. There were a lot more who did not, and I am disappointed that their story hasn't been properly told."

INTERSTATE TAXATION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOMES INTOLERABLE BURDEN WITHOUT A STANDARD

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor many times before over the past 4 years to comment upon the tax injustices being practiced by many States and/or their subdivisions on workers within their borders who reside in other States. I have introduced and reintroduced legislation to curb these practices, motivated initially by familiarity with the Philadelphia wage tax—now at the level of 3 percent of gross earned income—which has been imposed on New Jersey residents working in that city since 1940 at rates equal to those for residents.

Retroactive to January 1 of this year, New Jersey residents who work in Philadelphia and elsewhere in Pennsylvania will also be burdened by the new Pennsylvania State income tax. Unfortunately for these New Jersey residents, whose property, sales, and special purpose taxes are set at rates to compensate for the lack of a New Jersey State income tax, the imposition of the Philadelphia and Pennsylvania income taxes at the full rates, without the benefit of offsetting credits for taxes paid in New Jersey, has become an intolerable burden for many.

On February 22, 1971, the letter I sent to all the Members of this House explained the proposal I am sponsoring in the present Congress—H.R. 24—in these words:

Many of you will recall that the so-called Interstate Taxation Act was passed by the House in both the 90th and 91st Congresses, and each time, an amendment was approved to prevent double taxation of the same income of an individual by several States. The proposal to which I call your attention, however, would do this and much more. While requiring tax credits in situations that would otherwise result in double taxation, the proposal would also make equitable taxation a reality for those individuals who have no "home" State income tax against which to apply a credit for income taxes paid in another State. This objective would be accomplished by requiring the taxing State or its subdivisions to make "appropriate adjustments" to recognize the benefits which are not available to an individual not resident or domiciled in such State. It should be borne in mind that those few States which do not yet have an income tax have compensated by proportionately higher levies in the form of real estate, special purpose, sales, and other taxes.

Furthermore, my proposal would permit legitimate taxation of persons who are statutory residents of a State but who nevertheless still claim their domicile in another State. Such tax, however, would be subject to a credit for the amount of taxes paid to the State in which the income was earned. The important exemption from this provision is for those who are ordinarily required to reside in a State different from that of their domicile. This group consists of those who are already exempt from income taxes under the laws of the District of Columbia: namely, Members of Congress, their staff assistants whose domiciles are in the Member's State, and certain presidential appointees.

Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1971, the Senate of New Jersey approved a resolution which resolves, in part:

That this House hereby expresses and records its vigorous opposition to the discriminatory taxation of New Jersey residents by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania through the imposition of a tax upon the income of New Jersey residents which is derived from their employment within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and its further general opposition to all such unfair interstate taxation upon persons whose places of work and residence are in different States; and

"Be it further resolved, That this House firmly supports the efforts and activities of citizens and citizen groups which are engaged in combating the imposition of such taxes, and urges all citizens of this State to lend their support to pending Federal legislation designed to combat this evil; and

"Be it further resolved, That this House hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to act promptly and effectively upon the pending legislation which would prohibit or restrict such taxation; . . . (Emphasis added)

As I have repeated time and again, legislation of this character is quite properly within the purview of the Congress inasmuch as those who are being unfairly taxed have no voice whatsoever in the governments that tax them. Because interstate taxation of individual incomes is becoming increasingly prevalent, and because there is absolutely no standard now existing respecting such tax levies, I urge my colleagues to give this matter their serious attention.

The full text of the New Jersey Senate resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 2006, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas, By reason of the income tax recently enacted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, thousands of New Jerseyans who commute to work in Philadelphia and other parts of Pennsylvania adjacent to this State will be subject to taxation of their earnings in the same manner as residents and citizens of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas, With respect to those New Jerseyans who work in the city of Philadelphia, this new tax will be in addition to the tax upon earnings which has hitherto been imposed by that city; and

Whereas, Such commuters, while contributing greatly to the commercial activity and economic prosperity of those areas of Pennsylvania in which they work, actually receive only minimal government services from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and are excluded from educational, welfare and other services which have created the demand for new revenue sources in that Commonwealth and have led to the imposition of this new tax; and

Whereas, Imposition of such taxes upon persons who have neither a voice in the levying or disposition of the revenues, nor an equitable share in the benefits created thereby, is highly discriminatory and in effect levies a tribute upon them for the privilege of crossing State lines to earn a living, contrary to the letter and spirit of the United States Constitution, Article IV, Section 2, and Amendment XIV, section 1; and

Whereas, Experience by the people of this State with similar taxation imposed by the State and city of New York indicates that such taxes, once begun, continue to grow more burdensome and more inequitable as the taxing jurisdiction abuses its position in order to mulct a nonresident population without voice or vote in the establishment of its fiscal policies; and

Whereas, There are now pending in the Congress of the United States several bills aimed at ending this abuse; now, therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

That this House hereby expresses and records its vigorous opposition to the discriminatory taxation of New Jersey residents by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania through the imposition of a tax upon the income of New Jersey residents which is derived from their employment within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and its further general opposition to all such unfair interstate taxation upon persons whose places of work and residence are in different States; and

Be it further resolved, That this House firmly supports the efforts and activities of citizens and citizen groups which are engaged in combating the imposition of such taxes, and urges all citizens of this State to lend their support to pending Federal legislation designed to combat this evil; and

Be it further resolved, That this House hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to act promptly and effectively upon the pending legislation which would prohibit or restrict such taxation; and

Be it further resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution, signed by the President and attested by the Secretary, be transmitted to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the President of the Pennsylvania Senate and the Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives; to the Mayor of the city of Philadelphia and the President of the Philadelphia City Council; to the Vice-President of the United States and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each of the members of the Congress of the United States elected from this State.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. MANNED SPACE FLIGHTS BY NASA, CHEERS FOR PIONEER ALAN SHEPARD AND OUR U.S. ASTRONAUTS, AND OUR NASA-PRIVATE INDUSTRY TEAM

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Friday morning, May 5, 1961, more than 2,000 sailors in their dress white uniforms lined the decks of the aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Lake Champlain*, stationed in the Atlantic Ocean about 300 miles off the Florida coast. The weather was perfect, clear skies and a calm sea. Those on board reported there was complete silence as all eyes were peering into the sky.

Suddenly a bright orange object appeared 10,000 feet overhead and the thousands of voices shouted in unison as they watched the first U.S. manned spacecraft parachute back to earth. Just 11 minutes after impact, Astronaut Alan B. Shepard, Jr., and his Freedom 7 Mercury spacecraft were on the carrier deck after a 15-minute flight from Cape Canaveral.

At the launch site 580 news correspondents had watched the Redstone rocket launch Freedom 7. An estimated 45 million people saw the event on television and millions more heard it reported over

worldwide radio networks. The world had just witnessed the first of 24 U.S. manned space missions conducted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Shepard's suborbital flight demonstrated the engineering concepts of the Project Mercury space vehicle system. It protected man during the stresses of rocket powered launch and reentry to earth. Shepard also reported no disorientation during 5 minutes of weightlessness.

Three months prior to the 10th anniversary of the Freedom 7 mission, Shepard commanded the 24th American manned space mission, Apollo 14. This third lunar landing flight was launched January 31, 1971. He spent 9 days in space, including more than 9 hours exploring the moon's surface.

In retrospect, Project Mercury, the first U.S. manned flight program, had been initiated October 7, 1958. This venture to launch a man into earth orbit and return him safely was undertaken to carry out objectives set forth in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. Three of these objectives are: to contribute to the expansion of human knowledge of phenomena in the atmosphere and space; development and operation of vehicles capable of carrying instruments, equipment, supplies, and living organisms through space; and preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in space.

The success of Freedom 7 gave Project Mercury officials assurance that an orbital flight could be undertaken in a short time. It also inspired the President, who requested NASA to recommend a plan for future manned-space flights.

On May 25, 25 days after President John F. Kennedy had presented the NASA Distinguished Service Medal to Shepard at the White House, he addressed a joint session of the U.S. Congress and said:

I believe this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. No single space project in this period will be more impressive to mankind, or more important for the long-range exploration of space; and none will be so difficult or expensive to accomplish.

Congress endorsed this goal, and that summer NASA began to marshal the Government-industry-university personnel and facilities to accomplish the task.

A second suborbital flight by Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom on July 21, 1961, confirmed Shepard's success. The Project Mercury objective was achieved February 20, 1962, when John H. Glenn, Jr., completed a three-orbit mission.

The succeeding Mercury missions later that year and the final flight in 1963 demonstrated that man could survive in weightlessness and operate efficiently as a pilot-engineer-experimenter for as long as 34 hours.

In 1961 and 1962 more than a million man-hours of engineering studies were undertaken before final decisions were made on precisely how the moon landing would be carried out. Project Apollo—a three-module spacecraft to carry three astronauts around the moon—had been presented to industry in 1960. The launch

vehicle would employ clustered rocket engines with high-energy upper stages.

Early in the studies it was determined that rendezvous and docking of spacecraft and Saturn launch vehicles would be employed in a lunar landing mission of about 10 days.

In December 1961 the Gemini program was announced to explore space for up to 2 weeks and to perfect operational techniques required for the Apollo lunar landing. The Gemini spacecraft would carry a two-man crew.

Two unmanned test flights preceded 10 manned missions during 1965 and 1966. Flights of 4, 8, and 14 days confirmed, from a medical viewpoint, that man could fly a lunar mission. Astronauts demonstrated in more than 12 hours of extra-vehicular activity—EVA—that work could be performed outside of a spacecraft. In addition, 52 different scientific and technical experiments were conducted in flight.

Gemini proved that man could operate effectively in space, respond to the unexpected and execute alternate and contingency plans when necessary. Also, the NASA flight operations teams, supported by the Department of Defense recovery forces and the U.S. Weather Bureau, developed the ability to meet unexpected situations quickly.

While Mercury and Gemini were being completed, the Apollo industrial teams were selected to develop the spacecraft and Saturn launch vehicles. The facilities to test and launch the Apollo system were constructed. At the peak, 300,000 personnel and 20,000 business firms participated.

The first manned Apollo earth orbital mission was to be launched in February 1967, when a spacecraft fire took the lives of astronauts Virgil "Gus" Grissom, Edward H. White II, and Roger B. Chaffee, January 27 during a prelaunch test. An investigation of the accident and review of the program produced an improved spacecraft, and safety operational procedures were tightened. Successful unmanned flight testing which qualified all segments of the spacecraft and Saturn V for manned operations continued late in 1967 and 1968.

The first earth orbital manned mission was in October 1968. Two months later the Apollo 8 lunar orbit mission at Christmas demonstrated that man had developed a system to escape earth orbit, navigate in lunar orbit and return safely.

Two additional missions, Apollo 9 and 10 early in 1969, completed preparations for landing on the moon.

On July 16, 1969, Apollo 11 was launched. At the Kennedy Space Center press site and Apollo news center at Houston, 3,497 news correspondents reported the story to the world. Four and a half days later the Eagle—the lunar module—landed and the world watched as Neil Armstrong descended to the surface and said:

That's one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind.

The succeeding missions, Apollo 12 in November 1969, and Apollo 14 early this year yielded vast amounts of additional scientific data.

Apollo 13 failed to execute its landing on the moon because of an oxygen tank rupture in the spacecraft. The safe return of the crew, however, again demonstrated the Apollo team's ability to react immediately to the unexpected and to devise successfully procedures to meet a serious emergency in flight.

The 10 years of progress can be visualized by comparing Shepard's Mercury and Apollo missions. The Mercury-Redstone rocket produced 78,000 pounds thrust, while the Apollo Saturn V, the world's most powerful rocket, produces 7.5 million pounds thrust in the first stage, 1.6 million pounds in the second and 200,000 in its third stage. The 100,000 pound Apollo spacecraft outweighed the combined Mercury spacecraft and Redstone by 15 tons.

Accomplishments of the decade include 24 manned space missions of Mercury, Gemini and Apollo in which 20 astronauts have accumulated 6,919 man-hours in space. The spacecraft have traveled approximately 32 million miles. Approximately 40 man-hours have been spent on the lunar surface by six astronauts who deployed 18 geophysical instruments on the moon and returned 216 pounds of lunar rock and soil to earth.

The achievements and failures have been carried out before the eyes of the world. About 200 teams of scientists from universities, Government, and private organizations in 30 States within the United States, the Virgin Islands and 18 other countries are analyzing the lunar surface material and geophysical data transmitted back to earth.

An agreement reached between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. on October 29, 1970, sets forth procedures and a schedule for joint efforts to design compatible docking and rendezvous arrangements. Another agreement provides for initiating an exchange of lunar samples obtained by the two countries and establishes procedures to produce recommendations for joint consideration of the objectives and results of space research, the improvement of existing weather data exchanges, research with meteorological rockets, techniques for studying the natural environment and the expanded exchange of data on space biology and medicine.

Some of the findings thus far are:
No evidence of water or life.

Ages of rocks and soil returned range from 3.3 to 4.6 billion years. The age of the earth is generally accepted as 4.6 billion years. None of earth's rocks have been found to be older than 3.5 billion years, and few have been found more than 50 million years old because of destruction and covering by erosion and other processes.

Lunar rocks have produced new evidence on the question about the formation of granite. Other data noted first in lunar rocks have now been observed in earth rocks.

Lunar surface material has fallen into three categories: First, igneous rocks, solidified after melting; second, breccia, chunks of rock and soil cemented together by temperature and pressure, and third, fines, small fragments of material.

The rocks are similar to those found on earth but have different chemical compositions.

The seismometers have recorded that numerous moonquakes occur about the time the moon is closest to earth during its monthly cycle.

Seismic signals imply that the moon lacks processes such as mountain building and continental drift on the earth.

Magnetic fields have been detected on the moon which are stronger than expected but much less than that of earth.

The solar wind is not disturbed as it approaches the moon and therefore there are no charged particle layers around it similar to earth's ionosphere.

Comparison of helium trapped in the solar wind striking the moon's surface with helium trapped at various depths in returned surface material may improve understanding of the evolution of the sun throughout the history of the solar system.

The laser reflector experiment enables scientists to improve knowledge of earth-moon distance to a precision of 15 to 30 centimeters or 5.8 to 11.7 inches. It also will increase knowledge of wobbles of earth's axis, which is vital to understanding earthquakes.

The information has excited scientists who will continue to study it for many

years. The Space Science Board of the National Academy of Science has stated:

The Apollo Missions do not simply represent the study of a specific small planet but rather form a keystone for a near-term understanding of planetary evolution.

Recently, when Alan Shepard was asked to comment on what he considered to be the significant achievements of manned space flight, he said:

I feel we have reached the payoff stage, the stage when the information we have learned in the early flights, the techniques we have used for putting man in space and using his abilities have reached fruition so that the public, the nation and the world can benefit from the tremendous technology.

HISTORY OF U.S. MANNED SPACE FLIGHT

Date	Flight time (hours, minutes, seconds)	Revolutions	Spacecraft name	Remarks	
MERCURY					
Alan B. Shepard, Jr.	May 5, 1961	00:15:22	Suborbital	Freedom 7	America's 1st manned space flight.
Virgil I. Grissom	July 21, 1961	00:15:37	do	Liberty Bell 7	Evaluated spacecraft functions.
John H. Glenn, Jr.	Feb. 20, 1962	04:55:23	3	Friendship 7	America's 1st manned orbital space flight.
M. Scott Carpenter	May 24, 1962	04:56:05	3	Aurora 7	Initiated research experiments to further future space efforts.
Walter M. Schirra, Jr.	Oct. 3, 1962	09:13:11	6	Sigma 7	Developed techniques and procedures applicable to extended time in space.
L. Gordon Cooper, Jr.	May 15-16, 1963	34:19:49	22	Faith 7	Met the final objective of the Mercury program—spending 1 day in space.
GEMINI					
Virgil I. Grissom, John W. Young	Mar. 23, 1965	04:52:31	3	Gemini 3	America's 1st 2-man space flight.
James A. McDivitt, Edward H. White, II	June 3-7, 1965	97:56:12	62	Gemini 4	1st "walk in space" by an American astronaut. 1st extensive maneuver of spacecraft by pilot.
L. Gordon Cooper, Jr., Charles Conrad, Jr.	Aug. 21-29, 1965	190:55:14	120	Gemini 5	8-day flight proved man's capacity for sustained functioning in space environment.
Frank Borman, James A. Lovell, Jr.	Dec. 4-18, 1965	330:35:01	206	Gemini 7	World's longest manned orbital flight.
Walter M. Schirra, Jr., Thomas P. Stafford	Dec. 15-16, 1965	25:51:24	16	Gemini 6A	World's 1st successful space rendezvous.
Neil A. Armstrong, David R. Scott	Mar. 16-17, 1966	10:41:26	6.5	Gemini 8	1st docking of 2 vehicles in space.
Thomas P. Stafford, Eugene A. Cernan	June 3-6, 1966	72:20:50	45	Gemini 9A	3 rendezvous of a spacecraft and a target vehicle. Extravehicular exercise—2 hours 7 minutes.
John W. Young, Michael Collins	July 18-21, 1966	70:46:39	43	Gemini 10	1st use of target vehicle as source of propellant power after docking. New altitude record—475 miles.
Charles Conrad, Jr., Richard F. Gordon, Jr.	Sept. 12-15, 1966	71:17:08	44	Gemini 11	1st rendezvous and docking in initial orbit. 1st multiple docking in space. 1st formation flight of 2 space vehicles joined by a tether. Highest manned orbit—apogee about 853 miles.
James A. Lovell, Jr., Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr.	Nov. 11-15, 1966	94:34:31	59	Gemini 12	Astronaut walked and worked outside of orbiting spacecraft for more than 5½ hours—a record proving that a properly equipped and prepared man can function effectively outside of his space vehicle. 1st photograph of a solar eclipse from space.
APOLLO					
Walter M. Schirra, Donn Eisele, Walter Cunningham	Oct. 11-22, 1968	260:8:45	163	Apollo 7	1st manned Apollo flight demonstrated the spacecraft, crew and support elements. All performed as required.
Frank Borman, James A. Lovell, Jr., William Anders	Dec. 21-27, 1968	147:00:41	10 revolutions of Moon	Apollo 8	History's 1st manned flight to the vicinity of another celestial body.
James A. McDivitt, David R. Scott, Russell L. Schweickart	Mar. 3-13, 1969	241:00:53	151	Apollo 9	1st all-up manned Apollo flight (with Saturn V and command, service, and lunar modules). 1st Apollo EVA. 1st docking of CSM with LM.
Thomas P. Stafford, John W. Young, Eugene A. Cernan	May 18-26, 1969	192:03:23	31 revolutions of Moon	Apollo 10	Apollo LM descended to within 9 miles of Moon and later rejoined CSM. 1st rehearsal in lunar environment.
Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins, Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr.	July 16-24, 1969	195:18:35	30 revolutions of Moon	Apollo 11	1st landing of men on the Moon. Total stay time: 21 hrs., 36 min.
Charles Conrad, Jr., Richard F. Gordon, Jr., Alan L. Bean	Nov. 14-24, 1969	244:36:25	45 revolutions of Moon	Apollo 12	2d manned exploration of the Moon. Total stay time: 31 hrs., 31 min.
James A. Lovell, Jr., John L. Swigert, Jr., Fred W. Haise, Jr.	Apr. 11-17, 1970	142:54:41	Apollo 13	Mission aborted because of service module oxygen tank failure.
Alan B. Shepard, Jr., Stuart A. Roosa, Edgar D. Mitchell	Jan. 31-Feb. 9, 1971	216:01:59	34 revolutions of Moon	Apollo 14	1st manned landing in and exploration of lunar highlands. Total stay time: 33 hrs., 31 min.

POLISH THIRD OF MAY CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, Poland reformed the Polish system of government in a bloodless and orderly way. Poland thereby adopted a Constitution eliminating the weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system, and adopting a philosophy familiar to all Americans.

The Polish Third of May Constitution said:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

While the democratic principles espoused in the Third of May Constitution of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria, nonetheless, these great principles are reverently continued by Poles everywhere. In America, this holiday is observed by Americans of Polish descent with appropriate ceremonies throughout the month of May, thereby paying tribute to the Polish nation and its basic principles which Americans of all descents wish to espouse.

The similarities between the Polish philosophy and that of democratic America demonstrates the inherent liberalism and equity of the Poles. The sovereignty of the people, a primary principle of the Polish Third of May Constitution, has nowhere been so highly regarded and practiced as it has within the United States.

We must therefore mark the anniversary of this important occasion, not only because of its importance to Polish-Americans, but because of its deep significance to all peoples. We must strongly support the principles of a sovereign people, for that principle is the very underpinnings of our own free and democratic Nation.

Therefore, let us join hands with our

Polish brethren and wish the people of Poland a future free of the fetters preventing their realization of freedom and sovereignty.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1972

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as is our annual practice, the Committee on Appropriations some weeks ago held an overall hearing on the President's budget for the fiscal year 1972. Those hearings have recently been printed and released. A copy was sent to each Member with the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I enclose a copy of the overall FY 1972 budget hearings held by the Committee some weeks ago, which I trust you will find helpful especially in connection with consideration of fiscal measures during the session. The hearings focused on the main features of the budget, its overall policy recommendations and economic and legislative assumptions. A number of subjects were covered; much helpful information is in the printed book.

The newly adopted full employment budget concept, under which the level of spending is more or less geared to revenues that would be received if the economy were operating at so-called full employment, was discussed in considerable detail. Of course, the actual Treasury deficit is projected heavily in the red—\$11.6 billion deficit for 1972 on top of the \$18.6 billion projected deficit for 1971 on the unified basis (omitting the borrowed trust fund surpluses, the deficit on the Federal funds basis was estimated in the budget at \$23.1 billion for 1972 on top of an estimated \$25.5 billion for 1971).

As you are aware, the budget proposed spending \$229.2 billion in FY 1972, about \$16 billion above the current year estimate. The President proposed new budget obligating authority for FY 1972 of a quarter of a trillion dollars—\$249 billion.

About \$170 billion of the new budget obligating authority proposed for 1972 will require action at this session—mostly in the appropriation bills. As you know, appropriations for debt interest, for social security and other so-called permanent appropriations do not require annual Congressional action. About \$38 billion of the \$170 billion is for on-going programs which require reauthorization bill actions prior to appropriations actions. Another \$11.8 billion involves new legislative proposals, such as general revenue sharing and the all-volunteer Army.

Cordially,

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

Copies were of course also made available to the press and others. Copies are available—as long as the supply lasts—in the committee offices, room H-218 in the Capitol.

The budget is such an important document—touching as it does the lives and welfare of every American in one way or another—that I thought I should call attention to these hearings. The printed hearings contain much helpful information.

REVEREND ALBERTSON OUTLINES UNIVERSITY PROBLEMS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the statement of the Reverend James Albertson of the University of Santa Clara in Santa Clara, Calif. Reverend Albertson addresses himself to the problems of the institutions of higher education in this country today. We must all be concerned about this. What would become of America if these institutions were to fail us? Imagine a nation without young people skilled in such fields as science and sociology. Many of us deplore the present state of American society but without the trained people to meet these problems, our chances of overcoming our disorders as a society diminishes. If we wish to improve our society, one of the first steps we must take is to insure that our colleges and universities can function and address the problems that face this society. Then we must make this education available to every single potentially qualified individual who desires this education.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY REV. JAMES ALBERTSON, S.J., ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF SANTA CLARA, CALIF., BEFORE THE SPECIAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 23, 1971

Madame Chairman and members of the committee, one of the commentators on American higher education has described the current scene in terms of a nightmare vision. He sees the collection of American colleges and universities as a man standing in the middle of a darkened street down which he is peering toward what looks to be a solid wall closing off the street. Just beyond him are two signs which may offer direction. As he comes closer he can make out an arrow pointing ahead with the words "One Way," and another sign with the words "Dead End."

It is unfortunately true, as you have heard many times in the course of testimony, that in several senses American higher education appears to be moving down a one-way street toward a dead end. Most spectacular and most pressing, of course, is the financial cul-de-sac. Expenses are mounting faster than income and the date on which reserves will be exhausted at the present pace of liquidation can, for many institutions, be rather precisely calculated. For some it is only a very few short years away. The dead end is in the next block.

When we consider that in the areas of natural and social science perhaps ninety percent of all knowledge we have amassed has been gathered in the last generation, it is distressing to realize that the great body of American colleges and universities which has taken over three hundred years to develop and which has played a key role in that growth of knowledge may be dead of financial starvation in just another generation.

But the financial dead end facing so many of our institutions of higher education is not the only one. The apparent inability to change educational structures and policies in order to adapt to the changing requirements of society's demand for new forms of postsecondary education is another.

It is this second kind of dead end which

I should like to emphasize in my remarks before you today.

Nearly every major study of American higher education in the last five years has pointed to the urgent need to develop ways of providing vastly expanded varieties of educational options to young people of college age who are just completing high school and to older adults already at work in life careers. The traditional patterns are not enough and they are clearly breaking down under the mounting pressure to provide new things and to provide them for more people.

The typical American college program today is a mixture of nineteenth-century liberal arts idealism, early twentieth-century curricular eclecticism, post-spunk scientism, the mythology of residence colleges as a community of learners, the vision of research and teaching as equal parts of the scholarly whole—all interlaced with the more recent endeavors of the colleges to become centers of social action, rallying points for political causes, dispensers of miniature welfare programs, models of participatory governance, and also providers of resource people for the local community and for the nation at large. Each of these ingredients can be defended, and well defended, as meeting a need of the people more or less present and more or less pressing. Each contributes to a definable and desirable goal.

But instead of making from among this increasing number of recognized needs a selection of those which it could most effectively meet with its existing and foreseeable resources of money and talent, the typical American college has simply added each newly conceived goal on top of the last as part of the ever heavier burden it is attempting to carry. The urge for accretion is apparently irreversible; the street is evidently "one way" only, with no possibility of turning back. And as the colleges begin to stagger and some even to fall under this burden the inevitable end is in sight.

It is certainly possible, and very much to be hoped, that the deteriorating economic situation of so many of our colleges and universities will stimulate a reassessment of goals and programs in view of available resources. More comprehensive planning, which views the parts as subservient to a consciously considered whole rather than the whole as a hodgepodge collective of autonomous and competing parts, is being forced on many institutions as a result of financial necessity. The university which cannot support both a college of engineering and a college of humanities may have to decide which one it will eliminate.

The college which cannot afford both a full-scale remedial program for educationally disadvantaged students and an extensive and costly honors program for the academic elite must make a choice or a compromise, and it must reassess its goals to do so. Strattened budgets are forcing most schools to exercise tighter fiscal control and are arousing in many the desire for better cost accounting and program budgeting.

And so the current financial squeeze will—if its grip can be loosened enough to prevent strangulation—very hopefully have the desirable effect of shaking out the overcrowded agenda of our schools' objectives and of thus freeing the separate institutions of extraneous burdens so they can do well what they can do best. In this way better educational opportunities can become available to the American people.

But even if this shaking out does take place there is considerable evidence from recent history to show that the present body of institutions of higher education will be unable to meet the full need for innovation and reform.

There are so many things that need to be done if meaningful opportunities for postsecondary education are to be opened to the

fifty percent of college-age students who will not be in our colleges in 1975, and opened also to the much larger percentage of those beyond college years whose education stopped with high school, that recent studies have been able only to begin their enumeration. The Assembly on University Goals and Governance of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences has produced a list of eighty-five theses to stimulate academic reform, and each of these theses could generate one or a dozen specific innovations in the procedures of American higher education.

Some of the new models of education being imagined are, of necessity, radical departures from current practice. Schools are envisioned in which students of all age are free to come and go as the varying demands of their work experience dictate—schools which, in other words, offer not a pre-packaged program terminating in a degree and a push out the door, but rather give a continuing open opportunity for educational experiences which parallel the changing needs of a person's life and career patterns. Other schools are envisaged which have no buildings or classrooms but offer instruction over cable television to everyone who cares enough to tune to the proper channel, and which then offer degrees to those who can meet the standards of certain examinations. Even other schools are projected which have no specific curriculum or list of courses, no examinations, and no degrees but only a faculty and a student body that encounter one another in whatever ways they find most intellectually exciting and stimulating.

To implement any one of these new models of education requires such a change in the way colleges—and the faculty, administration, alumni and donors who make them possible—are accustomed to operate that one has the strongest doubts these models can be created out of the environment of existing structures of American higher education. Our experience thus far with academic reform shows, for example, that any change which would involve substantial modification of the behavior patterns of individual faculty members has little chance of getting beyond the drawing board or a committee recommendation. An administration whose personal experience, channeled and reinforced by the accrediting associations, has been with courses and credits and degrees is ill-equipped to be innovative in unstructured forms of education. Nor can alumni and donors be expected to be enthusiastic in support of an institution whose new image seems to them to bear no relation to the one they remember from the days when their loyalty was first won.

In short, there are strong reasons to believe that the requirements of post-secondary education in the generation ahead will not be wholly met by a reformation of the existing structures and institutions of higher education—not even if the current financial crisis of these institutions is met. Some of the new modes of education which will be needed are so radical a departure from what we are doing now that that almost surely will not grow out of our institutions of today. New institutions and new ventures, many of them with very specialized objectives, will be necessary.

I am encouraged to note that recognition of the need to support such new institutions and new ventures is so evident in the bill to establish a National Foundation for Higher Education, H.R. 5192, which is now being considered by this committee. The activities to be supported by this Foundation include: "the creation of institutions and programs involving new paths to career and professional training, and new combinations of academic and experimental learning"; "reforms designed to expand individual opportunities for entering and re-entering institutions and pursuing programs of study tailored to individual needs"; and "the creation of new

institutions and programs for examining and awarding credentials."

In addition to the present financial crisis of existing institutions and programs of higher education there is another no less urgent but perhaps less immediate need for vigorous support of innovation. It is this need which I commend to your consideration.

Madame Chairman and Members of the Committee, it has been a pleasure to have had the opportunity of presenting these views to you.

LAW DAY—CHANGE THROUGH REASON

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the opportunity to talk to a group of young people—black and white, bearded and clean shaven, dressed in suits and ties and jeans and sandals. We talked to each other, discussing hopes and hopelessness.

And I came away with a far deeper insight into the ambitions of our younger generation. I also came away determined that I was going to fight to get those youngsters to believe in a Nation we had built, and that I was going to fight just as hard to get this Nation to believe in the dreams of its young people.

I think that disaffection of our young people is a vitally appropriate topic for this particular Law Day, for law forms the framework of common beliefs on which a democratic society can grow—not the limits within which our society stagnates. The common beliefs which underlie our legal structure are facing the greatest challenge in our history because it is a challenge from within. Hope and achievement lie in the stars, not on the ground, and yet, for too long our national eyes have been cast downward.

Too many of us see only the riots and the drugs on campuses and equate this to the actions of all our youth. Too many of us find it expedient to say "to heck with all of them" and stomp off into the seeming security of age and sophistication. Too many of us find it equally easy to piously state that students have a right to dissent while turning away and ignoring the words and meaning of their dissent.

Yet, it is up to us to make students and the rest of their generation feel that they have something to look up to—a government, a family, a system of justice to be proud of. Let us not make the mistake of judging the quiet majority of our young people on the actions of the vocal minority. But let us not make the mistake of thinking that the majority of our young people do not have the same questions, albeit not the same actions, as the vocal minority.

Dissent is one of this Nation's priceless values. It must be protected at all times and in all areas of thought and action, be it in time of peace or in time of war. But this dissent, of its very nature, requires law for both its expression and its preservation.

In this snowballing world of ours, there is a growing manifestation of unrest—

unrest against traditions. The revolutions of science, technology, industry, communications, education, religion, and morality are exploding throughout the world.

It is indeed true that the recurrent shock of our age is the discovery that concepts and patterns of action of a more secure past no longer fit present reality. The revolution of equality—racial and economic—has given life to new hopes and aspirations, but it has also unleashed deep and dangerous passions.

Changes, of their very nature, produce challenges, and today, on the national level, as well as the campus level, we are facing challenges to our freedoms, traditional principles, accepted values, and historic goals.

Our children have seen us fly men to the moon and back with fantastic skill, build the biggest aircraft in history, and sell 8 million cars in a single year, but remain incapable of eliminating air and water pollution, coordinating our sprawling transportation network, or living in harmony with our fellow man both at home and abroad.

I think that the young may have something when they point out our disorientation in our national priorities.

Let us vault out of the trenches of complacency and reverse this trend. We must put our institutions to work for us rather than becoming intolerant victims of our own genius.

In his now famous soul-searching "State of the Judiciary address," Chief Justice Warren E. Burger called for a heralded streamlining of American overcrowded courts.

"The days of apathy are past, and I intend to be neither timid nor apathetic," he said, in telling about the judiciary's need for more money and better management. He called for a new Judiciary Council of Federal judges, legislators, and executive branch representatives to work on legislation affecting the Federal courts.

Overburdened with frivolous appeals, the courts—I am sure we all agree—simply do not have the manpower and the tools to deliver prompt, effective justice.

I wholeheartedly endorse as most constructive the proposal for a Judicial Council. Therefore, on Tuesday, I will introduce in the Congress legislation to establish a Federal Judiciary Council whose vital purpose will be to advise the Congress, the Executive and the Judicial Conference of the United States on all matters affecting the administration of the courts of this Nation.

As drawn up, my measure calls for the Council to be composed of six appointed members who will serve without compensation. Two will be selected by the President; one each by the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House and two by the Judicial Conference. No member shall serve more than two full 4-year terms.

I can only say that the need for such a Council is long overdue when you consider the tendency of Americans to look to the courts to solve all problems. It is clearly the time that the Congress had some authority to turn to on the impact of proposed legislation on the ad-

ministration of justice in the courts. And, it is equally desirable that workable legislation be proposed to modernize court procedures and thereby ease court congestion.

This clearly, is one way we can improve our institutions. This, clearly, will provide justice under law.

I want to be able to turn to a young person and say look around you and see what is going on that makes this the greatest Nation on earth—not just go read such and such a book and accept on faith what needs to be lived everyday.

As we advance into the new decade of the seventies, America faces challenges greater than any which it has tackled before. This is no time for complacency; neither is it a time for anarchy. This is not the time to abandon the drive and optimism and the imaginative creativity which has characterized this country since its birth.

This is not the time for timidity or doubt or mediocrity in high places. This is the time for boldness and energy—for cooperation and understanding—so that working together we can turn dreams into reality.

EARTH WEEK PROJECT

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the growing citizen interest in cleaning up the environment has brought on a new problem: People are bringing more trash to dropoff points and reclamation centers than county sanitation workers are able to collect. Last week, for example, a half-acre, 7-foot-high pile of junk was collected in Watersedge, Md., by citizens participating in the Earth Week project. Bob Heeter, of Citizens Action Against Pollution, asked me for help when it was discovered that it was beyond the ability of the county sanitation department to clean up the mess.

I called four trash and contracting firms—Potts & Callahan, Buzz Berg, Joseph J. Hock, and C. J. Langenfelder & Sons—which donated thousands of dollars of time, service, and equipment to clean up the junk. United Iron and Metal hauled away some of the metal scraps.

County officials, too, went out of their way to assist in the effort, even though many county trucks were committed to other areas of the county. Charles Farley, chief of the bureau of sanitation, Alfred Jungers, chief of the bureau of highways, Jack Rudasill, superintendent, street cleaning division, and William Tierney, assistant director of the department of recreation and parks, were extremely helpful.

In 2 days, the Watersedge dumping site was cleaned up, with the help of these firms and individuals. It is a pleasure to be able to honor those who helped by including their names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CALIFORNIA'S "OPERATION IDENTIFICATION" HELPFUL IN CRIME PREVENTION

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, Monterey Park, one of the cities I represent, has developed a novel system to prevent burglaries from private homes. "Operation Identification" was started a few years ago and has been proven successful, reducing the number of thefts occurring in participating households drastically. Over 30 communities in southern California have already adopted this method conceived by Monterey Park Police Chief Everett F. Holladay. Inquiries about it have come from nearly every State and from a few foreign countries.

Not only is "Operation Identification" a deterrent to crime, but it also provides assistance to law enforcement officers in cases where property is stolen. Apprehension of the criminal is made much easier, and there is a high probability that the stolen items will find their way back to the owners.

Most amazing, perhaps, is the low cost of initiating and maintaining the program. To the residents of Monterey Park, there is no cost involved. The small investment of \$300 to service the whole community has been made by a local civic organization, the Exchange Club. And it could conceivably be done for a lesser amount.

In these days of television specials about the "besieged majority," and constant warnings from various media, it is good to see a constructive, workable plan of prevention in action. "Operation Identification" could also be used effectively in the public sector.

I commend the reading of this article from the Washington Post, April 25, 1971, to my colleagues. It gives details for implementation and it may prove helpful to communities in their districts. The article follows:

COULD A CALIFORNIA PROGRAM HELP REDUCE D.C. BURGLARIES?

(By Jack Harrison Pollack)

Every 16 seconds a burglary was committed in the U.S. last year. In 1971 there will be an estimated two million burglaries—an all-time high.

Thousands of California homeowners have been dramatically reducing burglaries through a simple, free, new method. It not only discourages theft, but aids police in identifying and recovering stolen property.

Householders in more than 30 Southern California communities now have their drivers' license numbers engraved on the valuables that burglars most often steal from homes—television sets, radios, hi-fi's, tape recorders, typewriters, adding machines, bicycles, cameras, binoculars, tools, jewelry, musical instruments and other portable possessions. If a license-engraved belongings are stolen, it makes them too "hot" for a thief to sell or handle because the driver's license can readily be used by authorities to trace the owner at his most recent address.

Called "Operation Identification," this unique license engraving is done with a

small, lightweight \$10 electric etching tool. It is loaned to people without cost for three days when they apply at their local police station front information desk any time of the day or night. At home, with this etching tool's tantalum carbide or diamond point, the person then engraves his license number on the metal, glass, wood, plastic and ceramic surfaces of his prized possessions.

After he does and returns this etching device, he is given a blank form to list, for his personal files, all of his engraved objects and the exact spot where the license number is etched. He is also given a small blue and yellow sticker to paste on his front door or window which reads:

"We have joined Operation Identification. All items of value on these premises have been marked for ready identification by Law Enforcement Agencies."

Since this unique crime prevention program quietly began in residential Monterey Park, Calif. (pop. 50,000), several years ago, only three burglaries have occurred there among the 3,000 participating households. And in only one home was a license-engraved object stolen—a transistor radio.

In sharp contrast to this amazing near-zero record, Monterey Park's 7,000 still un-stickered residences have suffered more than a thousand burglaries. Largely because of apathy, the victims have never gotten around to borrowing the free etching tool. But after a burglary, they invariably do.

"When we get everybody to participate, we'll have licked the burglary problem," says Everett F. Holladay, Monterey Park police chief, who conceived this idea.

The local Exchange Club, a civic organization composed of business and professional men, has paid the entire cost of this home protection project. Thus far, the total investment has been less than \$300—mainly for purchasing a dozen etching tools and printing the stickers.

People shouldn't engrave their license number on removable parts such as doors, lids and plates, advises Chief Holladay, but preferably in a conspicuous place near the manufacturer's serial number, if there is one. Many manufacturers of appliances and equipment engrave serial numbers on their products. Though insurance companies and police departments have long urged that these serial numbers be listed and filed for ready reference in case of theft, few people do it.

"It is usually very difficult and time-consuming to get from a victim an accurate verbal description of a stolen object," observes Chief Holladay. "Sure, some people are stopped by police officers because of suspicious actions and seemingly stolen objects in their cars. Mere suspicion, though, is insufficient cause for arrest. But when your operator's license is etched on your property, it helps to apprehend a thief possessing it who doesn't have a bill of sale or other proof of ownership. This is prima-facie evidence of an offense and reasonable cause to detain a suspect for further investigation. It also enables the prompt return of your stolen property."

Many stolen valuables are sold at police auctions because ownership can't be established. Proper identification has always been a problem for law enforcement. Thousands of messages are teletyped daily to police departments describing stolen items. But sheer volume of information prohibits any single police department from having more than a cursory knowledge of them and it is generally limited to a local area. "The average patrolman can't be expected to identify a stolen item on sight unless the crime has been reported, has occurred locally and he has had a pre-shift briefing," says Chief Holladay.

But the results of license-engraving among cooperating Monterey Park homeowners have been so spectacular that recently 30 other

Southern California towns have adopted "Operation Identification."

Requests on how to start an "Operation Identification" project have poured into Monterey Park from law enforcement and community agencies in nearly every other state and a half dozen foreign countries. Many ask: "Why isn't a social security number used instead of a driver's license?" The answer: because of federal restrictions, a social security number can't be used to trace individuals. Your operator's license is often the only number readily identifiable by law enforcement agencies. In some states like California, it is never changed or reissued.

This would be exactly the problem if such a plan were tried in Washington: numbers on operators' permits change every couple of years.

"It's a great idea if we could get a (standard, unchanging) number," says Deputy Chief of Police Mahlon Pitts, in charge of the Criminal Investigation Division.

Pitts feels that stickers "wouldn't deter an addict who needs a boost. He won't go around looking for a decal at night." But, Pitts feels, the system would have great value in recovering stolen property, as long as the numbers were always marked in the same place on stealable items, and as long as the number couldn't be obliterated by being scratched or filed off, or treated with acid.

CRISIS IN AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis in America which is only now gaining recognition. I hope it is not too late. This crisis is rural America, where one-half of America's poor people live and where two-thirds of America's dwellings are substandard. We must act now to reestablish a sound balance between urban and rural America to insure stability for the future. We cannot expect those 20 million Americans who have left their farms over the last 30 years to return unless we assure them of a fair return for hard work and a decent environment.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the benefits that revenue sharing will bring to our rural areas. This may be, but what of the immediate needs? I confess that rhetoric about "new" money being infused into rural areas to revitalize them is mystifying. What about those funds already appropriated for agricultural programs for fiscal year 1971—less than 2 months from termination—which have been impounded by the Nixon administration? As of March 1971, \$260 million were being withheld from the Farm Credit Administration, \$47 million from the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, \$25 million from the REA, and \$179 million from the FHA. These figures do not even begin to include moneys which, though not directly administered by the Department of Agriculture or the Farm Credit Administration, do directly benefit the rural American.

We simply must address ourselves immediately to the multitude of problems currently confronting those in our rural areas. New directions in our thinking, intensive concentration on truly effective

programs, substantial upgrading of community facilities, housing and public services—all these things must come together without delay to bring revitalization to our rural areas.

RETURNING POWER TO PEOPLE

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I shall insert in the RECORD an article which presents a compelling case for governmental decentralization, by Patricia M. Lines, a Minnesota lawyer now working as a research associate at Harvard's Center for Law and Education. The paper first appeared in the January 1 edition of the Ripon Forum.

Just the other day, I heard about an elderly lady who actually wrote the President about a chuckhole in the road running by her house. This is a poor reflection on local government, if on no other grounds than on lack of accountability and visibility.

If the American faith in our people is not to become a hoax—an outworn myth indoctrinated through our school systems—then we must view the increase of centralized authority in this country with alarm and regret. We have the tools with which to reverse this trend and we must do it.

There are problems involved in decentralizing because of the diversity of community structure in America. The strength of this article is that it deals with these problems in a basic philosophical context which values the participation of our citizens in their own governing. I join Miss Lines in urging that top priority be given to President Nixon's proposal.

The material referred to follows:

THE EVILS OF CENTRALIZATION AND HOW TO RESTORE AN INTEGRATED FEDERALISM

WHY DECENTRALIZE?

As everything around him has gotten bigger, the individual has gotten smaller by comparison. He's been lost in the mass of things. . . .

The machinery of government seems increasingly remote, increasingly incapable of meeting his needs when action is needed. The community itself begins to appear less relevant, and its standards and restraints become less effective.

Power has been flowing to Washington for a third of a century, and now it's time to start it flowing back—to the states, to the communities, and most important, to the people.—Richard M. Nixon

Since the Emancipation Proclamation, if there is any single historical principle guiding the Republican party, it is this: government should be as close to the people as possible, and excess concentration of powers should be resisted as a danger to the liberty of the people. Thus the party "of the people"—the GOP—has traditionally preferred to meet social ills with individual action, and where that is inadequate, with governmental action at the lowest possible level. Variations on this theme appear in Republican party platforms throughout its history—it may take the form of advocacy of states rights, individual rights "individ-

ualism," "peoples rights," "local self-government," "maximum reliance on subordinate levels of government," "voluntarism," or "decentralization of power."

Opposition to concentrations of power sounds like a negative philosophy. In the past 50 years, Republican "action" towards this goal has often been negative. But there is also a positive version: the nation needs to strengthen local government in small cities and towns and to create community-oriented governments in large cities. This is only one part of the whole picture regarding redistribution of power, but it has far-reaching implications.

The basic idea is essentially Jeffersonian, but it should not be arbitrarily limited to an agricultural economy. The essence of Jefferson's plan for sound government provided for a well-ordered hierarchy among governments, with each performing those functions that suited it best. The system provided at least one tier of government—a small and immediate local government—where an individual "feels that he is a participant in the government of affairs, not merely at an election one day in the year but every day."

We are still searching for a design of government that can maximize the opportunity for an ordinary individual to come forward and influence his immediate environment through the political process. This principle, which, as enunciated by the President, calls for a reversal of the trends towards greater concentrations of power, should also require the creation of new, community-sized governments within large cities. In either case, the fundamental goal is to make government small enough to permit popular self-determination. Thus, local governments should be small enough to give individuals informal access to information and to the policy makers. In large cities, populous states and the federal government, where a relatively small number of officials controls policy for a large population, such an intimate relationship between man and state has become a relic of the past. With this in mind, this essay will set forth the major philosophical reasons why this should be cause for alarm, and why Republicans should back "decentralization"—that is, why they should continue to search for a system of government which permits active and genuine participation by ordinary people in the political process.

WHY DECENTRALIZE?

1. For Freedom. Although the Anglo-American democratic tradition has proved amazingly durable, even its staunchest supporters have occasionally displayed moments of pessimism. John Adams, Walter Lippman, William Hocking and Lord Bryce all observed that the potential for crowd mentality was an ever-present danger to democracies. John Dewey decried irrelevant considerations in voting, sloganism, the inability of the individual to keep well-informed on national issues or to formulate his opinions on these issues in a rational and competent manner.

Irrational rule

Such men were appalled at the behavior and opinions of the "mass man"—the irrational offspring of mass media, national TV, national centralized powers and the pollsters. This individual often permits the media, a centralized political party, a giant labor union, or some other strongly centralized and powerful group to preempt individual decision-making. To be sure, there may be possible adjustments that might minimize these dangers in large governments, but these cannot be adequately discussed here. For the purposes of this study, the point to observe is this: the malady, the "mass" mind, does not appear in a cohesive community. It is a phenomenon found almost exclusively in larger jurisdictions. Walter Lippman, for example, in his most

peissimistic book, *The Public Philosophy*, never once considered the political behavior of the common man in his own community. Dewey did, on the other hand, and found the salvation of democracy in small local governments. "Democracy must begin at home," Dewey declared, "and its home is the neighborly community." Likewise, Lord Bryce, on completing his monumental survey of modern democracies, concluded simply, "Smaller areas are better than large areas, because in the former men can know one another, learn to trust one another, reach a sound judgment on the affairs that directly concern them, fix responsibility and enforce it."

The point is well made. Certain essentials are found only at a community level. Only here can there be a personal relationship between the governors and the governed. Here the intermediaries—the mass media—are only a secondary channel of information flowing back and forth between the electorate and the elected. Here the scale permits men to engage actively in the dialectic give and take that is so vital to sound decision-making. And here every man can hear the local demagogues debate one another; only on a small scale can every man sift the facts and enter directly into the debate and the opinion-making and decision-making process.

It is no small coincidence that the 1933 legislation in Germany paved the way for authoritarianism by first annulling local government—by abolishing the sovereignty of the states and substituting Reich regents for state presidents. Nor is it surprising that the first French Republic, where the local governments were new and unaccustomed to self-government, proved so unstable. The Revolutionary government had abolished the local provinces and created arbitrary departments within France, dampening the natural development of home rule. In contrast, in America and in Switzerland, the local governments existed in democratic form before the republic emerged, and became the building blocks of the new republic.

It is true that even in a small community, popular rule can become mob rule. Most often, however, the interpersonal relationships among the actors works to mollify vigilante action. One can only conclude with Jefferson, "that the evils flowing from the duperies of the people are less injurious than those from the egoism of their agents." In other words, it is easier to turn overly-centralized power into tyranny than it is to subvert decentralized popular control into mob action of any comparable consequence. Thus, decentralization also offers a constructive alternative to both the repression advocated by the extremists on the right and the anarchy advocated by the extremists on the left.

EVILS OF CENTRALIZATION

The centralization of democratic institutions threatens the liberty and welfare of the people in other ways as well. As governmental operations grow in scope, the distance between individuals and decision-makers also grows, and communications between them falter. First, the individual citizen in a centralized democracy becomes increasingly powerless while a technocracy—located within the large centralized bureaucracies—assumes control over most public policies affecting his life. The average man lacks the technical knowledge to make positive decisions about all but the simplest issues and the central bureaucracy manages to keep the data to itself. Secondly, the ordinary man casts his vote in a national election, but thereafter, he does not communicate his individual will to his duly elected representative, except through "public opinion."

To win voter approval, the politician campaigns on clichés and emotion-laden slogans: "power to the people," "no busing," "black

power," or "white power." A leader is elected not for his well-thoughtout programs, but for his ability to hit upon the right slogans and project the right image. In the end, leadership is mediocre and public opinion dominates emotional issues while the technical nuts and bolts of government fall under the influence of special interest groups and bureaucrats. Even if concerned with issues, there is little an individual citizen can do to make his vote effective in promoting or defeating any single governmental act. Worse, the vote for a candidate may be irrelevant to the issue-oriented voter, for he has no choice in the selection of nominees—an act executed behind close doors in legendary smoke-filled rooms. Finally, the individual with an informed opinion may be able to resist the impact of mass advertising, but he has no power to persuade the remainder of the electorate to his point of view. He simply cannot compete with national TV.

Can't do attitude

2. For an Impact on People. Undoubtedly the structure of the body politic has a profound influence on the basic attitudes and culture of the people living within the system. In a survey of Watts residents after the 1965 riots, when asked who would have to do something about the problem, residents responded, in order of frequency, the police, the mayor, the federal government, the whites, the governor, Negroes and whites together, "they" (that ubiquitous group), and finally, the respondents themselves. The thought that the people should take the initiative came last. The results would be the same in any typical urban community—white or black—where people have been deprived of the right to participate in the problem-solving process.

Decentralists expect a different response from a self-governed community. They expect a "can do" attitude, a willingness to attack problems. When responsibility falls on the shoulders of those who stand to suffer most from neglect of duty, it is less likely that they will shrug it off. Moreover, the small-scale political arena is less formidable—one does not need to possess the tenacity of a Ralph Nader to attempt and succeed at a local reform movement. In short, decentralization makes citizen participation more likely.

Education is the most important byproduct of this participation. Learning is not limited to classrooms, and when one is young. The streets, the back alleys, the coffee houses, and the public forum can all serve educational purposes, albeit some will be more constructive than others. Especially in impoverished, culturally deprived communities, development of strong and genuine citizen participation can lead people into a greater awareness of their own problems, and broader issues as well. They become more cognizant of the weapons available to attack such problems. Finally, they become motivated to master the skills needed to work effectively in this arena.

These educational results are not easily measured on an objective scale. Rarely has anyone even attempted such a measurement. In one available test, however, active involvement and responsibility for youths in a tutorial program produced a dramatic change in the reading test scores of the young tutors. In this experiment, New York City's Mobilization for Youth rejected the paternalistic notion that only teachers could teach, and hired youths—good and poor readers alike—to tutor younger children. At the end of a seven-month period, the younger children showed a modest improvement, whether tutored by good or poor readers. But a remarkable change appeared in the reading test scores of the tutors themselves. The poor readers advanced, on the average, three and a half years in the seven-month period.

Such a result suggests that responsibility

has powerful educational value. Such effects make community organization in poverty areas a "social work" tool. A program is justified not just for what it will do to physical problems facing people, but for what it can do to the attitudes and development of the people involved.

5. For a Sense of Community. A much-worn phrase in the oratory of the decentralists is "a sense of community." But it should not be underrated. This quality, insofar as it is capable of definition, exists where a group of people come together to live in an intricately woven fabric of rich and meaningful interpersonal bonds. It exists where people join together, either formally or informally, in the performance of a broad scope of public duties and functions relating to their life and environment. The community structure gives its members a sense of belonging, a sense of place, an identity. It serves not only its present constituency, but future members as well. It provides a context for the otherwise fragmentary and specialized roles that every individual assumes in the modern world.

Assessing the losses

A community cannot be expected to survive if it has no purpose or function. Municipal consolidation, school consolidation, central districts, special districts and similar centralizing measures of the last half-century must ultimately destroy the small community. Even without a formal dissolution of its political boundaries, the gradual erosion of political power in small towns and rural areas destroys community spirit and contributes to the decay. These consolidation efforts have usually been advocated as "progressive." Indeed, they may permit some efficiency in some governmental functions—redistribution of tax resources, increased specialization in service output, and administrative efficiency, for example. However, there may be corresponding inefficiencies and hidden costs in the greater size. The loss of community can be a severe loss to humanity.

To begin, as the small community declines, many things which can give a man an identity and a sense of place and purpose slip away. A common man's genius is not normally recognized beyond the circle of his community. Centralization and its concomitant specialization leave little room for the cabinet maker, the craftsman, the country fiddler, the hometown Thespian, the local sheriff, the school master, the familiar magistrate, the town wit, and the town fool; it replaces them all with factories, mass-produced art and music, Hollywood spectacles, a police force of a thousand strangers, a bureaucratic government, and politicians known only by their images projected through their public relations experts.

At the same time, man is losing any meaningful role he may have had as a citizen. The state has given him a number; he is relegated to filing the appropriate papers at the appropriate times, and, on election day, to pressing little levers in a booth. Of course at all times he must abide by the rules set somewhere beyond his own experience. He sees government and politics as something removed, distant, and for other people. This is exactly what politics is for most big city residents. The average man will never meet the man who decides his fate. The decision maker is literally removed, to city hall, the statehouse, or the nation's capitol.

Demodernization

Renewed emphasis on community could reverse current centralizing trends and bring people together in meaningful nuclear groups. The populace would be richer in its culture, in its ties to the past and most important of all, in personal bonds between neighbors. These are the things that make a community. By bringing people together, self-government can be a catalyst to spur their development.

4. To Restore Community Sanctions. These are the spiritual reasons why action to rebuild communities is necessary. There are practical, concrete reasons as well. In these days of almost hysterical concern over a breakdown in "law and order," one should observe the relationship between crime and the decline of the community. The cohesive community doubtless can do much to hold antisocial behavior in check. Social sanctions, concern for one's reputation, personal bonds—all are more effective deterrents to criminal behavior than one more policeman on the corner. Indeed, in small towns and rural America, where political and social integration seems to be higher than elsewhere in the nation, the major crime rates are the lowest.

Of course, the high crime rate in the city is probably partially due to a large population of the poor and underprivileged. But similar proportions of poor people living together in small communities do not begin to show the crime patterns of their city cousins. For example, the chief of police of Lawnside, New Jersey, a poor all-black town of 2500 people, reports that there is virtually no crime there, save for occasional rowdiness and disorderly behavior of "out-of-towners" who come in on weekends. The social patterns in this town seem to resemble small towns everywhere—they do not at all mirror the pattern of a similar racial and economic population in a big city. In urban neighborhoods which have experienced a strong community movement such as the area served by Mobilization for Youth in Manhattan or the East Columbus Citizens Organizations, a favorable impact on crime rates has been reported, but the relationship has not been scientifically evaluated. Of course, the crime index of a sense of community. It would seem on balance, that developing a sense of community is a desirable goal in and of itself.

5. For Flexible Strength in Government—the Politics of Dissent.

I hold that a little rebellion now and then is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical . . . this truth should render honest republican governors so mild in their punishments of rebellions as not to discourage them too much.—Thomas Jefferson.

Lord Bryce, the tireless student of modern democracies, found that the most decentralized nation, the nation where small local governments were the most important part of the entire system—Switzerland—was also the most stable at all levels of government. His observations are still valid today. Conversely, in the United States, after a generation of governmental centralization, civil disorder has become commonplace.

Powerlessness and riots

The subject of civil disturbance has been much studied lately, but without careful examination of the relationship between political powerlessness and riots. For example, the Kerner Commission, and the various state groups reporting on the ghetto riots of the last half of the sixties all assumed, without providing proof, that conditions of poverty and prejudice caused riots. (This was before students started rioting in earnest.) These studies did not look at the political system itself, but focused on how the same old system could be patched up to improve the delivery of government services in poor areas.

This approach is well-intentioned, but it leaves several questions unanswered. Why aren't the poor always rioting? Why did the students take it up? Why did it occur in the late sixties? Why did it happen when the black were narrowing? Why were the worst ghetto riots often in areas where the black was "upwardly mobile"? Why are middle and upper class blacks sympathetic, if not supportive? Why are there not fewer riots where the city, state, or federal government

has provided generous anti-poverty programs? What's all the talk about revolution? The obvious answer is that the disturbances should first be considered as political phenomena, before they are treated solely as a product of poverty.

The ones most likely to protest are those who most frequently are denied the opportunity of participating in the democratic process. It is certainly obvious that if one wished to organize a little rebellion now and then, the best recruit today would be either a black or a youth—representatives of the most disenfranchised groups in our population.

Shut it down

Why do people take to the streets? All but one of the ghetto riots began with some police-community incident that mushroomed into rocks, clubs, and bullets warfare, complete with the usual wartime pillagers and looters. The students, generally more organized, often have spokesmen, and "demands," before they move into more formal stages of insurrection. Yet there seems to be a common thread: these people have had exasperating experiences with the government (or university administration) which wields considerable power over their daily lives. When the exercise of this power is found oppressive, the black or the student may first seek constructive channels for redress, but these have evaporated. It is futile to try. The bureaucracy running their lives presents a chain of command in which power and responsibility is so removed that no one can be sure who is responsible, and the only sure way to reach the "powers that be" is to attack everywhere.

Assuming that civil disturbances are symptoms of discontent with the governmental process, the important question, then, is not how to control them, but how to restore the peaceful constructive channels of dissent that are supposed to exist in a democracy.

There are too few people making important decisions for the discontented. The system is too centralized. The city government, or the university, have treated the blacks, or the students, as subjects to be cared for, disciplined, directed, controlled. The situation is so bad that the most militant groups claim that they would prefer to tear down the existing institutions rather than improve or replace them.

Work within the system

Decentralization, as defined here, might provide a constructive outlet for the more restless, powerless people. It could provide these groups with an opportunity to attack their immediate problems in an orderly, responsible manner. It gives them clearer targets, the locally elected leaders, and an excellent weapon—the ability to vote for another candidate, or to sponsor a candidate. The necessity for government by demonstrations, peaceful or otherwise, would fade and the country might once again work towards realizing the full potential of a federal democratic system. Rather than alienating minorities, or younger citizens, the government would benefit from their energy, their ideas, and their active participation within the system.

The changing American scene—the eclipse of the individual

Assuming that strong local governments are essential to a healthy democracy, what is the prognosis for America today? It is true that over half of the population lives within local governmental jurisdictions of less than 50,000—rural areas or smaller cities. But almost one tenth of the entire population now lives in cities of over 1,000,000 and almost one fifth lives in cities over 500,000. In these large cities there is no effective "local" government. Contact with officials, with political processes, and with democratic nations is a difficult thing for all but the city

elite. The individual feels severed from the sources of power. To combat this, in the largest cities, administrators have organized a vast array of community bodies in order to better serve the people, but few of these come close to providing the intimate contact between man and man, and man and politics that should exist at this level of government. In the city, government is an alien power, and politics is a dirty word. Politicians are a class unto themselves, to be held in suspicion. Participatory democracy has become a fading memory, except in a few quaint small towns and rural states.

Trend to bigness

For people living in cities, and to some extent, for people living in declining communities elsewhere, local government does not exist, or it no longer serves them as individuals. These people face great aggregations of power without the opportunity to participate at the ground floor of the national power structure. The effect is aggravated because not only governments, but almost all of the major institutions in the nation have become increasingly centralized, while the individual has lost power and authority within their structures. Fewer and fewer people own and control the income-producing capital of the nation. Union mergers have left a diminished number of labor leaders to serve as the collective voice of a much expanded body of workers. In the academic world, the large universities grow larger, and students more numerous, but the policy-making group has not expanded. Even the church seems to be controlled by national organizations rather than local congregations. Government bureaucracies have, of course, assumed a life of their own. They can manipulate and negotiate with the other major groups in the policy-making process to preserve their own position in the system, all without reference to the citizens they purportedly serve.

The real individual is eclipsed by the abstract mass man as these institutions grow more centralized. In the public sector, the reduced influence of the individual citizen may be demonstrated in many ways. The ratio of elected officials to citizens, for example, tells something about a single person's chances of ever becoming an elected official, having personal contact with elected officials, influencing them directly, or individually communicating a need to them. In 1787, the Constitution of the United States mandated that a congressman would represent 30,000 people. In 1970, a congressman represented 469,000 people. The chances for direct contact with a congressional representative have been reduced by more than ten.

The same has occurred in state and local governments. Town meetings, which permitted every townsman to come and vote on important issues, exist only in a few regions of New England. Today a majority of Americans look to big city government as their most immediate direct political contact. But here a handful of elected officials make decisions for millions of people, or in the case of New York City, about twice the number of people in the United States when the first Congress convened. Population has increased steadily while the governmental structure has either remained unchanged or has become more centralized.

Ballooning budget

To further reduce the effectiveness of a single voter, the largest, most centralized levels of government have expanded most rapidly. This, too, can be roughly measured. In the early twentieth century local governments in the aggregate were spending more than combined state and national governments. Federal spending did not overtake local spending until the early 1920's. Today the federal government spends over twice as much as state and local govern-

ments combined. The role of all levels of government, measured by relative purchasing power, has grown. Total government spending, once an imperceptible part of the gross national product, now accounts for 30 percent of it and over two thirds of this is controlled by the federal government (over 20 percent of the GNP).

No one can say at which point the trend towards increased centralization will destroy a free people. Therefore, men who value their freedom will be ever watchful that power and responsibility is never entrusted to the care of a few. Even now, the gradual centralization of the last fifty or sixty years has altered the concept of the American idea. Especially in large cities, the individual citizen has no immediate contact with government.

A New Republican Policy

The traditional Republican concern for government at the level closest to the people should make thinking Republicans become Urban Jeffersonians. But in recent years, Republicans have applied the "government of the people" principle only to urge more responsibility for state governments, as was the case in the proposed "Opportunity Crusade"—a poverty program alternative sponsored by House Republicans; in President Nixon's 1969 manpower program, where he directed the Department of Labor to reassign primary responsibility for federal manpower programs to state governments; and the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control Act, in which Republicans sought to require state management of crime control programs. This may have been appropriate in the past, for small rural states, where state government continues to be close and responsive to a vast majority of the people. State governments are small enough to permit citizen control and participation only in Alaska, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Nevada, North and South Dakota, Vermont and Wyoming, where no city is larger than 75,000, but state programs have an entirely different effect in New York, Illinois, Michigan or California. Here there are cities which hold double the population of the entire United States at the time of Jefferson; big city government is no counterpart to Jefferson's concept of a small "ward" government.

Too few Republicans have equated their own preferences for state's rights with the demand for community control in Harlem. Yet, population is a determining factor in an individual citizen's opportunity to become involved, or know someone involved, in the manipulation of political power. A program controlled by the state of Idaho or Vermont, or the community in Harlem would offer comparable self-determination for the people living in these respective areas. Or, to take another example, one autonomous school district in Harlem would be comparable to a state-wide school system in Vermont—where the citizens are resisting regional consolidation.

Although the growth of the economy and the population has affected the relationship of state and city governments to the individual, Republicans have not adjusted their philosophy to account for the change. It should be the task of Republicans, the historical defenders of "government by the people," to rehabilitate and modernize that concept for the circumstances of today. In other words, the party ought to reinterpret its philosophy to deal with changed conditions, and state the philosophy in terms that are comprehensible to everyone. Now is the time to start: throughout the nation, a growing fear of "big government" is coloring citizen response to national politics. The average citizen feels that things are getting out of hand. Young people feel there are no opportunities for them to assume a meaningful role in society. Minorities desire—and some demand—the opportunity to control their own destinies. Decentralization of po-

litical power should have universal appeal, except to those firmly entrenched in the centralized bureaucracies of the nation, for it strengthens the role of the individual and provides a chance for each to influence governmental decisions, at least at the local level.

The decentralization principle holds out a special promise for racial minorities. These groups now live in increasing numbers in large cities, where the smallest effective political unit, city government, has a population in the millions. Here, discrimination, poor education and lack of experience in government affairs effectively disenfranchise the urban poor. This *de facto* disenfranchisement leaves them vulnerable to gross manipulation by the power structure, and they know it.

Power, not handouts

To be sure, some minority leaders continue to see their needs in terms of welfare and jobs within the establishment, but a vigorous and growing segment has become concerned with power. The whole movement for community control in black and Puerto Rican areas of large cities, and the Indian occupation of Alcatraz, are manifestations of the new thinking. Here are the natural allies of the new Republican.

The creation of community governments would give racial groups control at the community level, although they are a minority city-wide. For many blacks, Puerto Ricans and other minorities, direct contact with government would become a real possibility for the first time. Obviously, the concept is extremely popular among most inner-city minority populations. Today these people can act only as a pressure group, and in coalition with others, because the body politic is usually large.

Black leaders, for example, are aware of this aspect of the centralization-decentralization alternative. Metropolitan consolidation, frequently advocated as a way to shore up the revenue base of the city, would probably be opposed by many black leaders. To them, consolidation (a form of centralization) will dilute the black vote just as it is about to become a majority. For example, resistance to merger of St. Louis and St. Louis county, a plan rejected overwhelmingly by Missouri voters in November, in 1962, was due in part to political considerations by local leaders who feared they would lose their power base. Black leaders, especially, feared a dilution of their political power both in St. Louis and in Miami, where a consolidation move was successful. Conversely, one wonders why consolidation is suddenly so popular among whites in Gary or Hartford—when it was given a cold shoulder just a few years before. Metropolitan consolidation and centralization is a good way to squelch the nascent political power of racial minorities.

Urban Jeffersonians

In suburbia and in rural areas—where most Republicans live—people have resisted consolidation as much if not more than city blacks. This may be due in part to racism, or to fear of higher taxes, but conceivably the suburbanite or the small town denizen also instinctively desires to keep the size of his local government manageable. Consolidation is resisted as vigorously in racially homogeneous areas, such as Vermont, Delaware, Iowa or Washington.

In conclusion, it seems time to turn the slogan "states rights" into the slogan "Community rights." In fact, forward-looking Republicans have begun to adapt Jefferson's scheme for government to urban areas. In large cities, where immediate and intimate contact with government is difficult, they are urging organization of community and neighborhood political units capable of exercising genuine, well-defined governmental powers vis-à-vis local matters. Backers range from Charles Goodell and several House

Republicans who opposed the Green Amendment (to transfer control over the community action program from communities to city governments), to Slade Gorton, Attorney General and Lud Kramer, Secretary of State of Washington, who separately called for community districts with specific governmental powers in Washington's large cities, to John Sears, Republican mayoral candidate in Boston, who adopted a neighborhood-by-neighborhood approach to his city.

Republicans with an eye to the future should constantly seek to find new ideas and new programs that will promote individual action, self-determination and a wide dispersal of power among the people. This is the direction most befitting the party's history and tradition.

In the 1968 campaign, President Nixon promised to organize a new Hoover commission, but this time, to give it a mandate to develop a strategy for restoring governmental powers to local governments. If this mandate is carried out without also examining ways of creating community-sized governments where they no longer exist, the Republicans will have failed the millions of Americans who live in these areas. Of course the process is slow and often difficult, but a national policy could take shape. More importantly, much can be done at the state and local level to create genuine community governments. Time will tell if Republicans are able to respond adequately to the changing conditions of an urban America.

The non-existence of a genuine community within the nation's large cities, and the gradual decline of community power elsewhere pose serious threats to liberty, to individual initiative and development, to human and personal conduct of government affairs, and to the security and stability of the nation. Of course, no one would seriously advocate complete balkanization of the nation into thousands of small local governments, but there is a place for communities within the federal system. Political decentralization in the city would go far in reviving community spirit and individual action where people are now largely apathetic and alienated. But it must be done in a way that enhances community development: it must recognize existing communities in the large city (Harlem, the Bronx Park community, Hyde Park) and it must give the community meaningful and relevant powers and functions. Of course not every city function can be decentralized, but there are many vitally important areas—education, recreation, youth programs, law enforcement, to name a few—where a smaller community can adequately serve in an important capacity. In fact, some of the most severe and pressing problems of today are essentially community-level problems—mental health, delinquency, ignorance, apathy, unrest.

In this article, I have not focused exclusively on decentralization as it affects racial minorities, or the poor. This is contrary to most of the prevailing rhetoric advocating decentralization, but it is done with a purpose. The basic goals of political decentralization are not limited to any racial or economic groups; they should apply to all. Nor have I discussed the potential of decentralization for increasing efficiency and responsiveness in government, for I believe that that issue is debatable and depends on the function to be decentralized, the government structure and the citizens themselves. Nor have I discussed the desegregation-decentralization conflict. Finally, I have not discussed the many federal and local efforts to encourage citizen participation in various programs. These are all complex issues, and must await treatment in separate papers. The point to be made here is simply this: we need a decentralized power structure—for freedom, for a sense of community and for stability. That should be sufficient justification for a major effort in seeking out and implementing plans that can redistribute political power in the nation.

END OF PROGRAMS RUN BY THE
POOR FORESEEN UNDER NIXON
PROPOSAL

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post, Nick Kotz has provided a disturbing account of the Nixon administration's efforts to dismantle the poverty program. According to Kotz, these efforts will only be intensified if the administration's special revenue-sharing plans are approved.

I am including the Post article at this point in the RECORD:

END OF PROGRAMS RUN BY POOR FORESEEN
UNDER NIXON PROPOSAL

(By Nick Kotz)

Last year the Nixon administration closed the Memphis antipoverty agency, citing excessive conflict between city hall and the programs militant leaders. Now black youths who formerly ran the program's self-help clothing business meet behind a locked door marked "White Man Keep Out."

In the Mississippi Delta, the administration recently suspended funding of two black-directed Head Start programs, maintaining they would be operated more efficiently by groups controlled by local white officials. As a result, several hundred black Head Start employees have lost their paychecks and may lose new homes they bought to replace plantation shacks.

These local developments provide a foretaste of what may occur on a national scale if Congress adopts one of President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposals, which would take \$1.5 billion that now goes directly to 926 Community Action programs and give it instead to state and local governments, starting in 1973.

These governments would not have to continue funding Community Action—the seven-year-old experiment designed to involve minority groups and the poor in running programs created to help them. Federal regulations currently require local officials to share authority over the programs with citizen groups and the poor.

The Nixon administration is opposed to giving funds to agencies that battle with regularly elected officials. It also sees benefits from cities and states having freedom to set their own spending priorities and contends they could administer the programs better than the less experienced poverty groups.

But Community Action supporters see other results: the end or sharp reduction of many programs, with diminishing of "maximum feasible participation by the poor" in those that do remain.

They cite several reasons. First, Community Action agencies have often clashed with local governments on such issues as welfare payment levels. Second, control of the money means control over job patronage, the agencies now hire a total of 100,000 men and women, most of them poor and from minority groups. And third, even with the best of intentions cities and states would be under pressure to use the poverty funds for such politically urgent demands as schools, housing and police protection.

Federal support has already been withdrawn, or is scheduled to be withdrawn, from a number of poverty agencies around the country, with results that could represent a preview of what is ahead if the President's plan takes effect.

THE CASE OF MRS. SMITH

Independent funding of programs operated by the poor was dramatic in such states as Mississippi, where poor blacks previously were without economic, political or organizational power.

"To me this program has meant everything," says Mrs. Frances Smith, 40, who started as a teacher's aide in Bolivar County, Miss. Once a 10th grade dropout, she passed a high school equivalency test and is taking college courses. Today she is director of a Head Start center in a program which this summer will lose control to local white officials.

"Instead of going across the tracks to care for white people's kids for \$15 a week," she says, "we are doing something for our own people."

Mrs. Smith makes \$85 a week which, when added to her husband's sporadic earnings as a construction laborer, "means we are buying milk, eggs and bacon for our four children for the first time."

"We would lose everything—our homes, our belongings, all our hopes for the future," says Mrs. Smith.

For the Joseph McChristian family in Holmes County, Miss., the Head Start program has permitted them to buy a \$12,500, 3-bedroom, red brick house with a Farmers Home Administration mortgage requiring \$91 monthly payments. This was formerly beyond their wildest dreams, even though McChristian sought work as a carpenter by day and was a dirt farmer by night. The difference: his wife's \$90 weekly salary as a Head Start supervisor. Her regular OEO paycheck convinced the FHA to grant the mortgage.

"We were living outside before," says McChristian, using a southern black expression referred to a porous plantation shack. "You know the big difference? With heat and running water, the kids leap up to go to school. In the other house, they were too cold to get out of bed."

HOME LOSS FEARED

With suspension of funds to the independent Holmes County program, Mrs. McChristian has lost her Head Start check, and the McChristian family worries that it will lose its new brick home.

Impoverished blacks have gained more than income and technical skills from independent funding of OEO programs. They often have developed independent political power that for the first time influenced the dominant white, affluent communities in which they live. This has happened in a number of cities around the country and it has happened in some of the most rigid white communities of Mississippi.

"Black people never had too much to do with each other before," McChristian says of Holmes County. "They were afraid to discuss things. We have learned to trust each other and work together."

Brought together by their own Head Start program and protected by the independent funding, Mississippi blacks have used the resulting organization to win other benefits from the local political scene, such as access to welfare, hospital care, low-cost housing and the right to vote.

SOME WHITES ADJUST

White leaders, to a limited degree, have started to accommodate the new political cohesion of blacks. A white storekeeper in Holmes County reversed his position as an opponent of the black Head Start program and became an enthusiastic supporter when the newly organized blacks indicated they might boycott his store. The same man was an elected supervisor of the county; he became convinced that the previously unorganized blacks now had the power to threaten his reelection.

The poverty agencies also have produced leaders who went on to gain power within conventional community politics. Robert Clark, of Holmes County, became director of an OEO program for seasonal farm workers and, building on that experience and his following, was elected as the only black member of the Mississippi state legislature.

Similar stories of launching into political power from a poverty program are found in other parts of the country. Among the beneficiaries: Parren Mitchell, a college professor who became a leader in a Baltimore poverty agency and then was elected as a Democratic member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Among the strongest factors in the trend to put poverty agencies under control of city halls and state houses is the history of conflicts of the agencies with their local governments. The Nixon administration contends that it is irrational for the government to give financial support to one agency that fights against regularly elected officials. Many politicians, including Democrats, agree.

George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, said recently that liquidation of OEO's Community Action programs is part of an overall plan "to put an end to the idea that a private citizens' group can veto the elected representatives of the people."

The trend toward local government takeover of federally financed Community Action programs began during the Johnson administration, when Congress authorized greater local government control. But it has accelerated the last two years.

Under President Nixon, OEO has emphasized administrative efficiency, the provision of services (rather than community organization of the poor to get needed services), and, above all, cooperation with state and local officials.

The Nixon administration, as have other critics, points out that many antipoverty agencies have been characterized by chaotic administration. Many have lacked clear goals, torn between the often conflicting role of coordinating other government social service agencies and organizing the poor to protest inequities in these same agencies. And in some programs, fraud has been uncovered.

REPLIES OF SUPPORTERS

In answer to these criticisms, supporters say that incidences of fraud are no greater than in businesses, including prestigious national corporations, and in city halls and statehouses. Disorderly administration was inevitable, they say, as the uneducated poor tried their hand for the first time in the white-collar world of offices and budgets. Of conflicts and shifting goals, supporters reply that institutional change is never painless and neatly executed.

Supporters stress that the programs were specifically created because of the failure of state and local governments to meet or even to recognize the problems of the poor. OEO advocates blame limited progress in eradicating poverty on: insufficient, Vietnam-drained funds that never matched promises; the inability of a new, weak agency to coordinate or reshape powerful, long-established government institutions, and a failure of the sponsoring Johnson administration to couple the Community Action concept with adequate income-maintenance and job programs.

The 926 Community Action agencies provide health care, food assistance, day care, manpower, legal aid, community organization and other services. Since 8.1 million of the 10.4 million program participants and a majority of the 100,000 program jobholders are from minority groups, the fate of these agencies has significant civil rights implications.

OEO Director Frank Carlucci explained in an interview why he cuts off Community

Action agencies' funds if local elected officials are flatly opposed to programs and are hostile to the poor: "You need a community response to make a program work. When a community doesn't respond, you have to make a decision. You put your seed where it can flower. That may seem a heartless approach, but with limited money, I want to put it in where it can do the most good."

FRICITION A KEY

Consequently, Carlucci (as did his predecessor, Donald Rumsfeld) has cut off programs where he feels that Community Action by the poor has produced excessive friction between the poor and city hall. Recent fund cut-offs of programs in cities like Memphis and the suspension of the independent Mississippi Head Starts' funds are cases in point.

The Nixon administration has ordered the independent, black-operated programs in Bolivar, Sunflower and Holmes counties to accept the full control sought by county antipoverty agencies dominated by white political and economic power. Funds of the Sunflower and Holmes programs already have been suspended because program leaders, employees, and parents of Head Start children have refused to join the other programs, fearful that loss of new-found jobs and independence would result.

The Nixon administration says it has ordered the black Head Start programs to come under complete control of local agencies to achieve increased economic and administrative efficiency.

But in the eyes of blacks, the Nixon administration, as part of its Southern political strategy, is finally permitting the white power structure to take over programs whose formation the whites could not prevent seven years earlier.

HEAD START PROGRAM

The struggle for control is particularly intense because the Head Start payrolls represent a principal source of buying power in the poor rural counties, exceeded in federal aid only by large subsidy payments to major plantation owners. Illustrative of the struggle in Sunflower County, suspended and now penniless black Head Start employees have applied for food-stamp aid only to be told by the county welfare office that they are ineligible because jobs were available to them in the other white-dominated program.

Meeting with HEW officials recently, Amzie Moore, chairman of the Bolivar County Head Start program, recited the history of the Mississippi programs and what they meant to blacks.

He told how Mississippi's state and local officials first refused to participate in any of the 1964 antipoverty programs. Led by Mississippi Democratic Sens. James Eastland and John Stennis, the state bitterly fought against the proposal to let blacks and white supporters operate independent Head Start programs. Later, the three Mississippi counties created their own antipoverty agencies in order to seek control of the independents. On a yearly basis, the last three Mississippi governors have vetoed at least one of the independent programs, only to be overridden by OEO.

Moore also told how Head Start leaders were regularly threatened and had their buildings and homes burned.

"FIRST-CLASS CITIZENSHIP"

"You'll put us back where we were before 1960," Moore argued. "We need time to reach people, to get economic power. No one wants to perpetuate a program for the sake of it, but if you take this way, we won't have anything. We can't afford to compromise at this point—the sunrise of the 21st century—for anything less than first-class citizenship."

The regional HEW officials, both black, listened silently, but then stressed again that good administrative and business procedures demanded that his program be absorbed to

eliminate duplication of services and jobs. Not finished fighting (appeals are now being made on all three programs) but contemplating the ultimate choices that may face him, Moore said bitterly: "Yeah, I'll cave in. I'll crawl if it's going to save those peoples' homes and those jobs."

Compromises by black antipoverty leaders are too late in Memphis. OEO Director Carlucci said funds were cut off last year because "there was unnecessary conflict" between black program leaders and local government officials.

The sequence of events in Memphis roughly parallels that in a number of other cities.

When Washington Butler, a black and a former atomic chemist, arrived in Memphis to become director of the antipoverty program, he came equipped with Ivy League suits and enormous confidence that he could commence to work for meaningful programs. But after two years of planning and politicking by the agency, militant blacks complained that the program had done little to touch the core of ghetto problems.

BEARD AND DASHIKI

At this point, Butler identified himself with efforts at pride and self-reliance by the ghetto residents. Along with his top aides, he grew a beard and donned a dashiki. He formed a series of self-help ghetto enterprises called the "black arcades," which manufactured dashikis and pottery and operated retail grocery and record stores.

From that moment on, local white officials considered the program menacing, associating dashikis and self-help businesses with "black power." With the encouragement of the city, OEO cut off funds for the program.

A new, smaller program, tightly controlled by city government, is now being funded by OEO.

Instead of offering young blacks "hopes within the system," Butler says, the city has driven them further into isolation. The blacks involved in the self-help enterprises now meet behind locked doors and react to inquiries with suspicion and considerable hostility.

RURAL EFFORTS IMPERILED

OEO director Carlucci has stated repeatedly that he expects local communities to use their revenue-sharing funds to continue Community Action agencies. He acknowledged in an interview, however, that many of the 496 rural agencies might have difficulty winning local support because rural areas generally are more conservative and lack the structure of social service programs that are an accepted part of city life.

But he stressed that "good urban programs" would not have trouble surviving. He cited programs in Chicago, Boston and 20 other cities given superior OEO ratings.

However, directors of some programs cited by Carlucci as outstanding are much less certain of the future. For example, he praised the Compton-Willowbrook program, one of five in Los Angeles County.

The OEO rating report cited this program for "excellent relations with city government, excellent political contacts, and excellent grass roots support"—all seemingly perfect qualifications for local support.

Yet program director Leroy Hayes said that city and county governments of an area with more population than 37 states have given only \$50,000 annual support to the poverty programs.

"If we are going to be relying on local government or even the local citizenry to come up with a lot of money," Hayes told a Senate subcommittee, "that would put a lot of us out of business."

COMPETING NEEDS

Government and civic officials from Boston, Chicago and New York stressed that competing government needs would take precedence over the Community Action agencies,

with resultant weakening or dissolution of them. A Washington Post random poll of 10 agencies given the highest ratings by OEO showed that 9 of 10 felt their programs would be hurt or destroyed.

The nation's mayors, in a new study prepared for OEO, take a middle position. The mayors indicated that they support general revenue sharing, but also favor a vastly expanded OEO program.

Their report, "The Mayor and Economic Opportunity Programs," prepared by the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors:

Favored doubling community action funds, while the administration budget proposes to cut them.

Opposed the administration's proposal to increase the local share of program costs from 25 to 30 per cent.

Called for a five-year extension of the OEO program. The administration is asking Congress for a two-year extension, as a transition to its revenue-sharing plan, when OEO would be left as a research and demonstration agency.

In criticizing the Nixon revenue-sharing plan, the Urban Coalition, League of Women Voters and 25 other groups said they had little confidence that state and local governments now would respond voluntarily to the needs of the poor.

Despite the sentiments of these groups few members of Congress are rushing to OEO's defense.

The situation in Mississippi, which still has the worst poverty in the nation and the weakest state-local government response to it, confirms the concern of poverty program advocates. State and local officials acknowledged in interviews that continuation of present antipoverty programs would have extremely low priority in the event of revenue sharing.

Viewing the prospects ahead and expressing the thought of many Mississippi blacks whose hopes were raised by civil rights and antipoverty programs, Bolivar County's Moore said of revenue sharing:

"The Nixon administration is turning the money and program back to the same people who have kept us in slavery for 350 years."

A FRESH LOOK AT MANPOWER-EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a paper on the manpower-employment dilemma. It was prepared by Sar A. Levitan and Robert Taggart III of the Center for Manpower Studies at the George Washington University. The paper was presented to the National Conference on State and Local Manpower Policy Planning which met on April 30 in Salt Lake City.

This paper outlines the administrative difficulties, the lack of political accountability, and the difficulties of adjustment to different levels of employment which plague our manpower programs.

One of the most valuable aspects of the presentation is the suggestions it outlines for compromises which could help overcome the legislative quagmire which has stalled constructive bipartisan action by the Congress. For this reason, I hope that all Members of Congress who are interested in manpower-employment policy will give this article close examination:

REVENUE SHARING, PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT, AND
THE REFORM OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS

(By Sar A. Levitan and Robert Taggart III)¹

THE NEED FOR ACTION

The need to overhaul and reform our manpower efforts is generally recognized. The federal government now spends more than \$3 billion to provide a wide range of labor market services to those who need help in finding or better preparing themselves for civilian work. These services are delivered through a number of separate categorical programs including the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Job Corps, New Careers, the Work Incentive program, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Opportunities in the Business Sector, and others which were added in the 1960s to the older vocational education and rehabilitation programs and the federal-state Employment Service. These combined efforts provide needed assistance to millions of Americans, as manpower services have assumed an increasing place in the agenda of public responsibilities. Nevertheless, there is widespread agreement that the manpower effort falls far short of accomplishing what it could and should.

Those who are close to the programs are keenly aware of their administrative difficulties. Operated by a variety of agencies at the federal, state, and local level, the programs are aimed at differing clienteles and needs, varying in their eligibility standards, benefit levels, application procedures, and methods of delivery. There are some 10,000 separate contracts between federal officials and public or private delivery agencies. Because services are fragmented and frequently uncoordinated, clients are often unable to find the assistance they need. Some of these difficulties are the inevitable result of designing and implementing experimental social programs, but many problems result from the underlying philosophy of the manpower efforts—the centralization of authority at the federal level. While only part of one program, the Job Corps, is operated directly by the feds, the others are administered by state and local groups under detailed federal regulations and theoretically under close oversight. Funding comes with many strings attached, and the operating agencies have little flexibility. Centralized administration has too often resulted in the Procrustean solution of forcing all local efforts into rigid programmatic forms.

There is a more abstract but equally inimical aspect to this situation. The reins of power are gripped by federal officials and the bureaucracies which administer the programs at all levels with little political accountability for their decisions. At the national level, most manpower legislation has drawn bipartisan support. Congress has established overall priorities, but its committees have been able to devote only cursory attention to administrative oversight. At the state and local level, there has been almost no accountability because elected officials have not been drawn to participate actively in manpower programs, and they have relied upon the feds for the monitoring of projects. Most of the decisions left to local agencies have been highly technical and have usually been made by the employment service or the state vocational education department. These agencies are remarkably free from political control and they operate normally as self-sustaining bureaucracies. The experiment with "maximum feasible participation" by the disadvantaged was relatively shortlived, and concerted attempts were made to transfer power back to the functional bureaucracies. In other words, the pub-

lic has had very little chance to participate in the decision-making process, with little control over priorities or program operations.

Complicating matters is the current economic slump. The manpower programs were designed for and implemented under favorable economic conditions. Labor markets were extremely tight in the final half of the 1960s generating a need for additional workers which made it easier to find employment for those who were helped. But the recession has made jobs scarce and new manpower approaches and priorities are needed under current conditions. Certainly a public employment program of some sort assumes prime importance when private sector jobs are not available. But other changes are also necessary if the manpower programs are to operate effectively in a slack economy.

If the above observations are valid, there are three major reasons for reassessing and overhauling the manpower effort that expanded during the past decade. First, administrative reforms are in order to reduce red tape, delay, wasteful overlap, and inflexibility. The goal is to improve program efficiency. Second, decisionmaking is too centralized at the federal level, and too concentrated in the hands of functional bureaucracies. Decentralization is needed to strengthen political accountability and when feasible to enhance grassroots participation. Third, the manpower efforts are geared for tight labor markets. The need is to adjust to a changing economic environment, with different approaches to provide jobs for the recession's victims.

THE DIVERGENT PATHS

Any one of these reasons is adequate justification for overhauling the manpower effort. But each suggests a different path of reform, and it is difficult to compromise the divergent interests.

For those who are most concerned with the technical and administrative problems of the manpower programs, the generally accepted goal is one-stop, individualized service. Ideally, the client should be able to get all the help he requires through a single, easily accessible local agency with the capability to assess his needs and to purchase or provide all the prescribed manpower services.

This ideal, however, remains elusive and proposed changes, to be acceptable, must balance competing interests. Cities are wary of state authority and demand automatic pass-throughs of funds, while local community groups that receive direct federal funding fear control by the mayors or governors. Vested interests at all levels, especially the bureaucracies who presently administer the programs and possess most of the needed expertise, can be expected to defend their turf. Even if the separate manpower services could be coordinated for one-stop delivery, there is no assurance that any group would provide the sympathy, understanding, and knowledge required for individualized attention. Agencies that speak for and to the clients of manpower services are usually in opposition to those that represent the "establishment" and can deliver the goods. While the present administrative structure of the manpower programs only widens this dichotomy, the differences are fundamental and not easily resolved.

Of course, Congress could attempt to resolve the most obvious administrative deficiencies that beset the manpower efforts. But there is no great public pressure for reform, and few members of Congress care to invite a confrontation with the various vested groups that are "involved" in manpower programs. Any improvements must, therefore, come about from a compromise among the interested parties. Though voluntary agreements are welcome, they will not eliminate all, or even most, of the administrative problems of the manpower pro-

grams. Legislative reforms can and should be made; but by the time all safeguards, pass-throughs, and exceptions are introduced to make the legislation acceptable to a plurality of interests, the changes will have little political appeal and their substantive impact will be minimal. Reform cannot offer immediate or complete elimination of administrative problems; no group will be completely satisfied with any compromise; and the purposes are so complex that the public at large will not be moved. On the other hand, no bill for revenue sharing or public employment will be acceptable to the proponents of reform unless it promises improvement in the administration of the manpower programs and makes the necessary compromises between competing interests. Administrative reform is apparently a necessary but not sufficient condition for legislative action on the manpower front.

Those concerned with the increasing centralization of government and the inability of states and localities to meet their financial responsibilities find the sharing of federal revenue an appealing solution. The Nixon administration has proposed a general purpose distribution of federal funds, initially at the rate of \$5 billion per year, plus six special revenue sharing programs totaling \$11 billion for broadly earmarked social purposes. Funds allocated to manpower training (exclusive of appropriations for vocational education and vocational rehabilitation) would total \$2 billion. These shared revenues would be distributed to state and local governments on a formula basis for their essentially discretionary use in the provision of manpower services.

Manpower revenue sharing promises administrative improvement over present efforts, but this is only one of its purposes. Likewise the revenue sharing approach is only one of the many possible paths to reform. Proponents argue that state and local governments can administer manpower programs more effectively than the feds because of their closer proximity to clients' needs and local conditions. But an even more important reason for this transfer of authority is to place power into the hands of those who are politically accountable, so that the "community" will have more control over its government. Political accountability, however, does not necessarily insure administrative effectiveness. For this reason manpower reformers may not necessarily agree with advocates of revenue sharing, and vice versa.

Concern with the continuing high levels of unemployment has led some to consider public employment a top-priority measure that should precede action aimed at improving administrative efficiency or arrangements that deal with political philosophy and the relative responsibilities of federal, state, and local officials. Although they may recognize the need for administrative reform, especially in light of the changed economic environment in which the manpower programs must operate, they tend to feel that this can wait until the current, more urgent needs of job creation are met. And though they may agree with the principle of decentralization, advocates of public employment will support reformer revenue sharing proposals only if they are assured large-scale public job creation.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that each of these divergent paths has numerous alleys, so that the political map is checkered with positions representing various views on revenue sharing, reform, and public employment. On the issue of comprehensive manpower reform, four major proposals were submitted in the 91st Congress, varying in the degree of decentralization and decategorization, as well as in their provisions for public employment. A Senate passed version stressing public employment and reorganization but little decategoriza-

¹ This paper is part of a continuing evaluation of manpower programs supported by a grant from The Ford Foundation to The George Washington University's Center for Manpower Policy Studies.

tion had to be compromised with a House bill putting stress on administrative reform and a greater degree of decentralization and decategorization. The Senate version won out, but the bill was vetoed by the President. He objected to the fact that the programs were not decategorized, that the states and localities were not given enough authority, and that the authorized public service jobs would become permanent "make-work" sinecures.

A raft of alternative manpower proposals were submitted for the 92nd Congress. Three separate public service employment proposals were introduced in the House and one in the Senate. Separately, the administration proposed the creation of 200,000 jobs for relief recipients under its welfare reform measures. These various proposals differ significantly in the size of the authorization and in the types of jobs that they would create. In addition, the administration's Manpower Revenue Sharing Act would permit transitional public employment, categorical programs, out of shared revenues, but is chiefly concerned with the decentralization of revenues and authority. The 92nd Congress is still young and more proposals are likely to be added.

A guidebook is needed to follow the complex legislative developments. The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act would sharply curtail the federal role in manpower efforts, passing authority to governors, mayors, and county court houses, with federal responsibility largely limited to supplying the funds. At the opposite extreme, Congressman James O'Hara and Senator Gaylord Nelson favor public employment, categorical programs, and federal control. Probably representing the majority in both the House and Senate, they insist that action on public employment should precede all other manpower legislation. A number of other Congressmen have staked out intermediate positions, while Senator Jacob Javits and Congressman William Steiger have labored diligently but fruitlessly to compromise these proliferating views and divergent interests.

A variety of lobbying groups are also involved. Generally, the mayors support both revenue sharing and public employment; their needs are so critical that they will accept money from anywhere. The governors have not mobilized very effectively, but the National Governor's Conference endorsed legislation which would have given them greater responsibility for manpower. The AFL-CIO strongly supports public employment and is opposed to reform measures that would weaken federal control. Representatives of various agencies, such as vocational educators in HEW, have pushed to retain their present role. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has spoken in favor of a comprehensive reform bill, but not surprisingly opposes the initiation of any new categorical public employment effort.

The intricate maze of conflicting interests must be balanced if any manpower legislation is to be forthcoming. While the interplay of personalities and lobbying groups will have much to do with the eventual developments on the manpower front, the issues themselves must be discussed and resolved if a compromise is to be reached.

THE CRITICAL ISSUES

There are many weighty issues hidden in the technical language of the manpower proposals. The most formidable obstacle to compromise centers on the nature of public employment. There is wide agreement that, with the currently high levels of unemployment, the government has an added responsibility to provide employment for those who are forced into idleness by adverse economic conditions. The controversy is over the types of public jobs which should be created. The administration's position is that increased public service employment should be transitional, leading to "real" jobs in the public

or private sector. To this end, the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act would put a two-year limit on participation by any individual in the program. Most proponents of public employment, on the other hand, oppose such a restriction because they want to create "meaningful" positions which will absorb the structurally as well as cyclically unemployed, putting them to work in useful public service alongside other public employees. Which ever view is taken, the two-year limit is arbitrary and has become a critical issue because of the rigid stance assumed by the administration in vetoing the Employment and Manpower Bill of 1970. The administration presumably seeks to insure that every reasonable effort is made to train and place those who have special difficulties, utilizing and developing their talents fully rather than letting them idle in "make-work." But if workers are to be placed in unproductive jobs, then the two-year limit is obviously excessive and every effort should be made to prevent the waste of manpower before it happens, instead of waiting for two years until the employee is discharged. On the other hand, there is wide agreement that employment must be found or created for public assistance recipients, as suggested by the administration's proposal for the creation of 200,000 work-relief positions. The two-year rule will not insure training, nor will it obviate the need to help those who cannot be trained. The administration's rigidity on this point is inconsistent with its position that states and localities can best decide the types of public employment which they need. Revenue sharing cannot start out with restrictions on local decisions. It might also be embarrassing to ask Congress to limit tenure on federal payrolls to two years.

Decategorization is a much more substantive issue. It is obvious that too much emphasis has been placed on programs rather than the services which they provide. Rules and reporting procedures have been formulated for each categorical effort, and there are gaps and overlaps in coverage. But despite the fact that decategorization could permit more individualized service and a better coordinated delivery, proponents of categorical programs argue that the present system provides built-in controls by allowing comparison of performance among similarly funded projects. Such comparisons would not be feasible if categorical programs were eliminated and each locality's efforts assured a distinct purpose and form. Suggestive is the fact that the knowledge and improvements generated by the federally-operated Job Corps probably exceed the insights gained from the much larger and older vocational education program, whose administration is decentralized to the local level. Oversight and control become more difficult once decategorization has occurred and guidelines and reporting procedures for specific programs are abandoned.

Most of the opposition to decategorization of programs has been generated by self-interest, real or imaginary. Clients, sponsors, and administrators of the various programs have a vested interest in their continuance. The potential, but unproven, benefits of decategorization do not carry a great deal of political weight when balanced against the rigid opposition of those involved in existing efforts. Thus, despite its promise, decategorization has practical and political drawbacks which militate against any sudden change in this direction.

Another crucial issue concerns the ability of state and local governments to plan and direct manpower efforts. While it is true that mayors and governors are closer than the Washington officialdom to the problems which must be met and that they have greater political accountability, there is no assurance that they have the expertise or the power to provide leadership on the manpower front. There is no monopoly on ability at the

federal level, but it is generally true that state and local salaries lag far behind federal and private pay scales, tending to attract less qualified personnel. More significantly, though the mayors and governors have much power in theory, many of their policies are dictated by functional bureaucracies or else by pressure from local vested interests. Whether mayors and governors will assume greater leadership as more resources are channeled through their hands is debatable.

The fact remains, however, that up to now state and local governments have had only limited responsibility in designing and overseeing manpower programs. They cannot be expected to step in and administer such efforts without serious difficulties. It took most of the last decade to hone the federal manpower tools to their present level of effectiveness, and while county officials, mayors, and governors can learn from this example, they cannot entirely avoid repeating old mistakes and many communities will experiment with approaches that have little potential pay-off. It is legitimate to question the impact of any sudden transfer of authority into local hands.

A closely related issue is that of maintaining federal priorities. Decategorization will reduce the potential oversight of the feds, while decentralization will purposefully eliminate control from above. The explicit intent of revenue sharing is to move decision-making authority to the state and local level. But some control must be retained. There are cases where federal priorities are obviously contrary to those at the state and local level. There are certain functions, such as research and development, that are more effectively performed at the national level. There are some programs, such as Job Corps, which may require federal administration. And there must be some oversight to insure that shared revenues are used for their intended purposes—that manpower funds are used to provide manpower services rather than to build housing or stock ponds. The critical issue is the degree of control which will be retained. The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act would distribute 85 percent of all funds with no strings attached, retaining 15 percent for federal use. If 25 or 50 percent were retained or if more careful restrictions were placed on the use of shared funds, the implications would be far different. The need for decentralization must somehow be balanced against the need to maintain federal priorities.

Another thorny issue is the distribution of decentralized authority. States and city governments both want more control, while non-governmental groups, such as community action agencies, are wary of any transfers of power to the elected officials. The legislative proposals that led to the manpower bill vetoed by the President last year contained markedly different conceptions of the proper distribution of authority. One stressed the role of the governors; another gave the U.S. Secretary of Labor authority to contract directly with any governmental or private organization; another attempted to divide control between governors and elected local officials by utilizing a complex system of pass-throughs, but retained considerable federal authority as an active partner in manpower programs. The vetoed measure designated counties or combinations of local governments with a population of more than 100,000, or cities over 75,000, as prime sponsors, eligible for automatic pass-throughs of funds allocated to the states. The governors did not express active interest in assuming greater manpower responsibility and states were given only the small piece of the pie that was left over after the counties, cities, and combinations of local governments took their slices. The Manpower Revenue Sharing bill accepted the 100,000 cut-off, providing some incentive funds for the establishment of metropolitan-wide sponsoring groups.

Whether or not this provision will become a point of controversy remains to be seen; but it seems that the proposed distribution of manpower responsibilities between state and local levels is a reasonable compromise of the major alternatives.

A final and very essential issue is the amount of additional funds which will be provided under any new manpower legislation. The administration's revenue sharing proposal would authorize an additional \$435 million of annual federal outlays above current outlays of \$1,565 million, and an automatic 10 percent increase in funds whenever the unemployment rate exceeds 4.5 percent for three consecutive months. The Senate approved Emergency Employment bill (S 31) authorizes \$500 million for this purpose and an additional \$100 million for each one-half percent rise in unemployment over 4.5 percent. Though there is general agreement that manpower funds should be increased when unemployment rises and though debate has centered on the purposes rather than the levels of increased funding, this matter will become critical if other differences can be resolved. Needless to say, pressure will be mounted by the states and localities against any future cutbacks, even with economic conditions improve. In determining the amount of countercyclical increase, therefore, provision must also be made to reduce outlays when economic conditions improve to enable state and local officials to plan their noncyclical manpower efforts.

In trying to compromise divergent interests—integrating manpower reform, public employment, and revenue sharing proposals—all of these issues must be faced and resolved. While it is a fact of political life that compromises are reached by balancing vested interests, any successful agreement will need to deal with all the major problems.

A WORKABLE COMPROMISE

The logjam on manpower legislation is the product of rapidly shifting interests and concerns. In turn, bills have been discussed on comprehensive manpower reform, public employment, and now revenue sharing. This process is akin to leveling a chair by sawing down one leg after another. There can be no satisfactory agreement unless the three basic issues are attacked together and unless, in the process, there is a true spirit of compromise. If this spirit can be attained, grounds for agreement can be easily hammered out. Until last year manpower legislation achieved a remarkable record of bipartisan support.

One path to compromise is the incremental introduction of revenue sharing. The administration's bill promises \$4.6 for every \$3.6 now available under the Labor Department administered manpower programs, along with an automatic 10 percent boost in funds when unemployment is about 4.5 percent. All of this, except for the 15 percent retained by the feds, will be turned over to state and local elected officials. Instead of distributing the entire amount, the revenue share could be limited to the added dollars plus the automatic boost. More funds could be added during a recession by extending the trigger mechanism and raising the automatic federal contribution when unemployment rises above 4.5 percent. Manpower funds could be boosted, for example, by 10 percent for each 0.2 percent increase in unemployment. This would mean that funds allocated to manpower efforts would double if unemployment rises to 6.3 percent for three consecutive months.

The most important point is that the present categorical manpower programs would be retained, while the mayors and governors would have glue money to fill gaps or to start entirely new efforts according to local needs. Gradually, the shared portion of manpower funds could be expanded. Revenue share could be pegged as an increasing percentage

of federal categorical allocations; for instance, one-third in fiscal 1972, one-half in fiscal 1973, and three-fourths in fiscal 1974. Alternatively, authorization levels for the shared revenue could be stated in dollar terms, say \$500 million in fiscal 1972, \$1.0 billion in fiscal 1973, and \$1.5 billion in fiscal 1974. In this way, the portion of manpower funds administered by the state and local governments would be gradually increased. When the economy picks up, cutbacks in manpower outlays could come from the federal programs. Local efforts would not need to be reduced, and their continued funding could be assured.

The legislation could also provide for an automatic pass-through of funds to each city or combination of local governments with more than 100,000 population with the remainder of funds administered by the states. The formula for distributing the incremental shared funds among the states and localities could be based on criteria such as the number of persons in the labor force, the number of unemployed, and the number of low-income individuals 16 years of age or older, as in the administration's revenue sharing proposal. Neither of these arrangements should be controversial, since they are similar in the vetoed manpower reform and revenue sharing bills.

Much could be done at the national level to improve the performance of existing categorical programs. Availability of funds allocated directly to states and communities should ease federal reexamination of program effectiveness and the reallocation of funds among the categorical programs. For instance, changing economic conditions might favor the transfer of resources from private to public sector efforts; Operation Mainstream, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Public Service Careers could be expanded using JOBS funds that are less effective in a slack economy.

One possibly useful change in the federal programs would be the initiation of variable matching grant formulas, requiring contributions from participating state and local governments. With discretionary funds provided under revenue sharing, governors and mayors could "shop around" for the services and delivery systems best suited to their needs. At the same time, the feds could adjust the matching formulas among programs to influence acceptance of their desired priorities. To maximize their leverage, states and localities would use their shared revenues to match federal outlays, participating to the maximum feasible extent in these national programs. However, all or some portion of matching funds could be included as federal outlays in the calculation of the aggregate amount of revenue sharing. This would insure that states and localities would have money to operate their own programs in addition to participating in federal efforts.

With the revenue shares which are not used as matching funds under the categorical programs, a variety of manpower services could be provided. Under current conditions, the most appropriate and likely use of those funds would be for public employment. It is contrary to the intent of decentralization and eventual decategorization to create a new federal program or to put restrictions on the use of shared revenues. Instead, the governors, mayors, and county commissioners should be allowed to create public employment positions if they deem this to be their most critical need, and the nature of these jobs should depend on local circumstances. However, federal funds can be used as an incentive for the creation of "meaningful" opportunities and the provision of worthwhile training. Authorizations for the Public Service Careers (PSC) program could be expanded, with an attractive matching formula, so that there would be an inducement to combine local public employment programs with subsidized training. Since PSC

provides subsidies for only a year and a half, states and localities would have an incentive to see the trainees become fully productive on the jobs or would move on to positions elsewhere. There would be no requirement that locally initiated public employment efforts tie in with PSC, but it is doubtful that additional federal dollars will be refused.

SOMETHING FOR EVERYONE

It is the essence of compromise that everyone gets a little less than desired, but enough to satisfy minimal anticipations. This briefly outlined proposal combines the most essential features of manpower reform, revenue sharing, and public employment.

The proposal features reform at the federal level, including needed adjustments to changing economic conditions, with a gradual decentralization of control to the state and local level. Gradualism is important to minimize outright and active oppositions of vested interest groups. More significantly, gradual decentralization will grant states and localities the time and resources to build up expertise in the design and administration of manpower programs. The retention of federally administered programs that are currently operating with a fair degree of success provides a foundation on which states and localities can build their own manpower structures.

Revenue sharing is an integral part of the proposal. An increasing portion of manpower funds are to go directly to the states and localities. Within broadly designated guidelines, the mayors and governors will have few restrictions on the use of these monies, particularly in reference to the public employment efforts they may undertake. National policies will be pursued through the continuing federal programs, and attractive matching grants can be formulated to induce states and localities into desired actions, using carrots rather than sticks to insure federal priorities. Funds will be assured for the operation of state and local programs as well as for the matching of federal outlays. By the gradual implementation of revenue sharing, the core of federal programs can be retained as insurance in case the anticipated benefits do not materialize. It is better to wade than to plunge into unknown waters.

Finally, the proposal provides substantial resources for the mounting of state and local efforts to meet current needs. In many areas, most of the shared funds will undoubtedly go for public employment. The mayors and the governors will be free to implement any type of program which will meet their needs. If they have critical shortages of public employees, they can fill their requirements by upgrading the underemployed. If the problem of hard core unemployment is more critical, they can create suitable positions that can be filled by the unskilled and deficiently educated. The availability of federal training assistance under Public Service Careers and the allegedly widespread shortage of productive public employees would suggest that most funds will be used to create "worthwhile" slots. The compromise should help smooth disagreements over the quality and transitional character of public employment positions; by permitting a more rapid passage of the needed legislation, it will hurry resources into the hands of mayors and governors where they are critically needed.

It is vital that a workable compromise be reached. This requires on the part of all parties a flexibility which has been conspicuous by its absence since the onslaught of the recession. It is vital that manpower reform, revenue sharing, and public employment legislation be considered together so that the necessary tradeoffs can be made explicitly. The victims of unemployment have suffered from present inaction and it is essential that all efforts turn to compromise.

LAKE SUPERIOR

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Administrator William D. Ruckelshaus of the Environmental Protection Agency announced on Sunday, May 2, 1971, that he had served a 180-day notice on the Reserve Mining Co. of Silver Bay, Minn., for polluting the interstate waters of Lake Superior in violation of the Federal-State water quality standards.

I shall include the text of the EPA announcement at the conclusion of my remarks.

I have some reservations about the manner in which EPA has acted which I shall discuss later. However, the Agency's action is surely welcomed by all of us who have in our own way been working to save Lake Superior.

In this regard, I feel that it is appropriate to give recognition to a lady who has been waging a valiant fight for several years to save Lake Superior. I refer to Mrs. Verna Mize of Potomac, Md., who testified April 16 before the Subcommittee on the Environment of the Senate Commerce Committee.

I commend Mrs. Mize for a job well done. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to know of her activities on behalf of Lake Superior, I will include the text of her statement to the Senate subcommittee at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mrs. Mize deserves great credit for her efforts. The same cannot be said for Reserve Mining and all of those who participated with Reserve Mining in the outrage which it has visited upon Lake Superior.

Turning to the EPA enforcement action, I congratulate Mr. Ruckelshaus for taking this positive, long-delayed enforcement step toward eliminating this degradation of Lake Superior by Reserve Mining.

I am, however, concerned about two aspects of this action.

First, section 604.24 of title 18 of the Code of Federal Regulations provide that EPA "shall notify" the person violating the "Federal-State water quality standards" and, in such notice, shall designate a time when and a place where any person receiving such notice may appear in an informal hearing relative to the alleged violation of standards so that, if possible, there can be voluntary agreement reached as to appropriate remedial action. This course was followed, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Ruckelshaus announced, last December, that 180-day notices were issued against the cities of Atlanta, Cleveland, and Detroit. I have not seen the formal notice, but I note that the press release does not indicate any such date. I hope one has been set, because I would not want Reserve Mining to claim later that it was not afforded this procedure.

Second, the EPA release stated:

Mr. Ruckelshaus stated that he had arranged to employ the services of a nationally

recognized engineering firm to study the Reserve Mining Company's pollution problem, to submit possible on-land disposal plans, and to evaluate any plan which the company might submit. Mr. Ruckelshaus stated, "Although the Reserve Mining Company has the primary responsibility for ending pollution in Lake Superior, I have no assurance that the company will come forward with an acceptable on-land disposal plan. Hence, I have concluded that I must take positive steps myself, rather than wait for six months for a plan which may or may not be forthcoming. In short, if the company does not respond affirmatively, the government, in order to protect the waters of Lake Superior, will have to take the unusual step of formulating a plan to dispose of the company's waste. Then, either the company will adopt the plan, or something equally effective, or we shall be obliged to take the legal remedies provided by applicable statutes. (Emphasis added.)"

Certainly, it is quite proper for EPA "to employ" an engineering firm "to study" the pollution problem and "to evaluate any plan which the company might submit." But I believe it is unwise and inconsistent with the statutory enforcement scheme for EPA to spend public money to hire this firm "to submit possible on-land disposal plans."

Reserve Mining has allegedly violated water quality standards. EPA has notified the company of the violation. Under the law, Reserve Mining has an obligation to abate the violation within the time prescribed in the notice or face court action.

By the above statement EPA has effectively concluded that Reserve Mining will not act to comply with the law and propose an effective abatement program. In view of this statement, Reserve Mining might decide that, since EPA has so concluded and is having a plan prepared, it will not go to the expense and time to prepare their own abatement plan. Rather, the company can sit back and wait for EPA's plan and then ask for more time to study it. All this may delay pollution abatement well beyond the 180-day notice period to the public's detriment.

Mr. Speaker, EPA's action in engaging a firm to prepare an abatement plan is quite "unusual." Moreover, I believe it will establish a bad precedent. I note that last October the National Air Pollution Control Administration rejected a proposal of the Union Carbide Co., which was in violation of an abatement conference, to cost-share the construction of a scrubber at its Marietta, W. Va., plant to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions. The rejection was in part made because of the precedent.

It is not EPA's responsibility to devise the means for abating violations of water quality standards. EPA has neither the funds nor personnel to do so. It is the polluter's responsibility. The public has had to bare the cost of the pollution to date. The public should not have to bear the cost of pollution abatement too.

I strongly urge that Mr. Ruckelshaus reconsider and notify Reserve Mining that if it does not come up with an effective abatement plan within this 180-day period, EPA will promptly seek a court order for Reserve Mining to do so.

The material referred to follows:

[News release of the Environmental Protection Agency, May 2, 1971]

RUCKELSHAUS SERVES 180-DAY NOTICE ON RESERVE MINING COMPANY

William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, today served a 180-day notice on the Reserve Mining Company of Silver Bay, Minnesota, for polluting the interstate waters of Lake Superior in violation of the Federal-State water quality standards.

The Administrator took the action following the Federal-State enforcement conference on Lake Superior, which was reconvened April 22 and 23 in Duluth, Minnesota.

Ruckelshaus said: "We are taking this action in view of the company's continued delays in coming up with an effective, acceptable, and timely plan for pollution abatement. Lake Superior is a priceless natural resource and we are committed to save it." He pointed out by serving the 180-day notice, EPA is laying the foundation for future court action to halt the pollution of the lake.

Under provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 180-day notices are issued directly to waste dischargers who cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards. These notices provide an opportunity to negotiate voluntary compliance. However, if the violator refuses to take action within that time period, the matter can be referred to the Justice Department for court action.

Ruckelshaus noted that Reserve has been discharging 66,000 tons of tailings directly into Lake Superior daily from its ore-processing plant at Silver Bay. At the August 1970 session of the enforcement conference on the pollution of Lake Superior, which was initially convened in May 1969, it was concluded that the tailings have a harmful effect on the ecology of the lake by reducing organisms necessary to support fish life. The firm was directed to submit preliminary plans by December 1, 1970, but failed to do this until January 1971 when another session of the conference was held. A technical committee named by the conferees found the plan "unacceptable."

Thus, almost two years have elapsed since the conference was initiated, and no specific abatement program has yet been established for Reserve. The discharge of 66,000 tons per day of taconite tailings into Lake Superior has continued unabated.

Mr. Ruckelshaus stated that he had arranged to employ the services of a nationally recognized engineering firm to study the Reserve Mining Company's pollution problem, to submit possible on-land disposal plans, and to evaluate any plan which the company might submit. Mr. Ruckelshaus stated, "Although the Reserve Mining Company has the primary responsibility for ending pollution in Lake Superior, I have no assurance that the company will come forward with an acceptable on-land disposal plan. Hence, I have concluded that I must take positive steps myself, rather than wait for six months for a plan which may or may not be forthcoming. In short, if the company does not respond affirmatively, the government, in order to protect the waters of Lake Superior, will have to take the unusual step of formulating a plan to dispose of the company's waste. Then, either the company will adopt the plan, or something equally effective, or we shall be obliged to take the legal remedies provided by applicable statutes."

STATEMENT OF MRS. VERNA G. MIZE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to testify here today.

I am Mrs. Verna Mize and presently reside

in Potomac, Maryland. I was born and reared in Michigan's Upper Peninsula—and it is *this* fact that explains the activities I am about to outline. I believe my experience will illustrate the need for the kind of legislation you are considering. (S. 1032)

For nearly four years, I have been waging a life-and-death battle—the outcome of which will affect the lives of Americans for centuries—a battle to save Lake Superior—the legendary “shining Big Sea Water” that I have loved from the minute I first saw it as a small child—Lake Superior, clean and transparent—sweet to drink and surpassingly beautiful to behold! To comprehend what is at stake, one must realize that Lake Superior contains 1/12th of all the fresh water on earth. Its value for drinking water alone has been calculated at 1.3 trillion dollars! To this must be added its inestimable recreational, economic and aesthetic worth. Lake Superior is the *last clean* Great Lake and, since it flushes the others, *they* can't be saved unless Lake Superior is. Yet, many feel that priceless Lake Superior is being “killed” by a giant polluter—and we who CARE are powerless to prevent it. Private individuals, and even groups of them, are no match for rich and powerful industries and their lobbies. My appeals to officials who—It seems to me—should be protecting the public interest in this precious natural resource have been unheeded. Since the President has repeatedly expressed an interest in the Great Lakes, it is beyond my comprehension how officials can ignore or circumvent his wishes.

In the summer of 1967, I first learned of Lake Superior's peril when I boasted that it was so clean that one could drink directly from it. A friend informed me that this would be extremely hazardous because “The Big Lake”—as we affectionately call it—was being contaminated by *millions* of tons of taconite tailings which were being dumped into it by the Reserve Mining Company at Silver Bay, Minnesota. My first reaction was disbelief! “Surely,” said I, “No state would permit harm to come to pure Lake Superior!” I was soon to discover that the situation was infinitely more grim than I had been told, as I gathered information about Reserve from every possible source.

It may be well to explain that taconite is iron-bearing ore—and tailings are the pulverized wastes that remain after the iron has been extracted. Simply stated—and perhaps it is oversimplification—the ore is ground and crushed to flour-like fineness, during which process it is repeatedly washed with enormous amounts of water from Lake Superior—some 600 million gallons a day! Giant magnets remove the particles of iron, and the waste is dumped into clean Lake Superior at the rate of approximately 67 thousand tons a day—a day, mind you—or some 47 tons a minute!

Here is a sample of the waste-laden water taken from near Reserve's “waterfall of tailings”—and here is a picture of that shocking scene.

In order to conserve the Committee's time by avoiding a lengthy recital of the history of Reserve's controversial operations, I ask that, with the Committee's permission, the following documents be entered in the record as if read:

An article, “Call It Lake Inferior,” by George Laycock, from the May 1970 issue of Audubon, the official magazine of the National Audubon Society.

Articles entitled, “The Art of Pollution,” by Grant Merritt, and “Perspective on the Pollution of Lake Superior by Taconite Tailings,” by Charles W. Huver, Ph.D. both from the March 1970 issue of The New Twin Citizen Magazine, published by Metropolitan Magazines, Inc., St. Paul, Minnesota.

An article, “The Pure Railroad,” by David P. Morgan, in the January 1969 issue of TRAINS—The Magazine of Railroad, pub-

lished by Kalmbach Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

An article, “New Life for Waste Lands,” from the September 1970 issue of the Environment magazine which, I understand, is published by The Committee for Environmental Information, St. Louis, Missouri.

The Report of the Mesabi Trust dated March 17, 1971.

Brochures of the Empire Iron Mining Company, Palmer, Michigan and the Reserve Mining Company, which outline the process used by each.

In order to be fair, I am including a copy of Reserve's beautiful full color brochure. You will notice, however, that it contains not one picture of their dumping.

The publication, “Your Visit to Reserve” states that they produce 10 million 800 thousand tons of pellets (iron) a year and that for every ton of pellets there are two tons of waste—tailings. Gentlemen, this means 21 million 600 thousand tons of waste are dumped into pure Lake Superior by Reserve annually. Not far from Isle Royale National Park and the new Apostle Islands National Lakeshore—the latter almost opposite the taconite plant at Silver Bay—Reserve is using clean Lake Superior for a convenient free private dump! It operates under permits granted by the State of Minnesota in 1947 and by the Corps of Engineers in 1948. The permit from the Corps has been renewed repeatedly, although it is revokable.

Naively, I thought that public officials in my native State of Michigan and also here in Washington were as unaware of Lake Superior's plight as I had been, so I determined to inform them. As it turned out, I had not only been “in the dark” about Reserve's use of the lake for an industrial dump—I was also ignorant about the power and influence of that multi-million dollar company, owned jointly by Republic Steel and Armco Steel.

I made up my mind to contact every official who might help—and I did so—but without getting any real action. Oh, I had polite replies and words of thanks “for bringing the matter to my attention,” as bureaucrats put it—and even an occasional pat on the back for my efforts. Little more! Nobody seemed willing to be committed or involved. When concern—real and pretended—for the environment became popular, I wrote letters again—but with the same negative results.

When the Lake Superior so-called “Enforcement” Conference was convened in May 1969, I had high hopes for Lake Superior. I felt certain that Reserve would be required to stop its dumping and to deposit its tailings on land, just as all other taconite plants do. My hopes were dashed, however, as one session after another adjourned without substantive results—and Reserve continued its free dumping. Since the conference was first convened two years ago next month, some 43 million tons of tailings have been dumped into that sweet water!

Last summer, after three years of writing letters without results, I decided to use my vacation to circulate in Michigan's Copper Country a petition to President Nixon asking him to intervene. I felt I could get at least a hundred signatures to prove that I was not the only one who cared about Lake Superior's fate. So, I started out for my native Houghton County. There, I found, each town and village had its Lake Superior devotees. In less than a day, a host of volunteers joined the campaign. The petitions were posted everywhere—in banks, stores, restaurants, filling stations, resorts, bars, barbershops, a senior citizen center, and in the tabernacle of a Bible camp! A local radio station (whose manager had signed the petition on the airplane that took me “home”) made daily announcement of where the petitions were located so that people could sign

conveniently. The local League of Women Voters cooperated, as did the Chamber of Commerce. Everybody wanted to do his part for Lake Superior. One zealous worker returned a sheaf of signed petitions with a note regretting she had obtained only 390 signatures because of the short time available! Another visited patients in the hospital and said, “Just think, even the sick and the dying want to do their part to save Lake Superior!” A 16-year-old schoolboy from Monroe, Michigan, wrote to inquire how he might help. A college professor, in returning his, reported that he had no trouble getting signatures and would obtain more if I would send him the forms. In response to the flood of requests, I left supplies of blank forms at designated places.

Some tourists even took them away and mailed them back filled with signatures. The tourists, who were from every part of the country, welcomed the opportunity to sign. Their recurring sentiment was that the *only clean* Great Lake must be saved at all costs. Their lakes, they said, were already polluted—unfit for drinking, swimming, fishing, boating—pleasure of any kind. They appreciated Lake Superior for the gem that it is. It is evident from the addresses on the petition that people everywhere care about the fate of the Big Lake and want it saved! This was proved by 5,182 individuals who signed the petition in a brief ten days. Many wanted to continue the campaign, but I felt the message should reach the White House before the August session of the conference. I suspect that many would take advantage of the legislation you are considering, if it is passed, which would enable them to sue to save their heritage.

You may be wondering if there is an alternative to using the lake as a dump. Indeed there is—and it is used by every other taconite plant. All of Reserve's competitors deposit their tailings on land. In Michigan, where not a grain of waste is dumped into Lake Superior, the Empire plant near Ishpeming, for instance, uses an alternate method and even recycles the water! (See their brochure.) Yes, there are alternatives and, in my opinion, Reserve should be required to adopt one. No company should be allowed to pilfer a priceless natural resource for private gain!

Now to get back to the Lake Superior “Enforcement” Conference. After 23 months and five sessions costly to the taxpayers, Reserve's dumping continues unabated. I feel that the conference has been an exercise in futility. Saul Friedman, in the Detroit Free Press, reports that even Murray Stein, Chairman of the Lake Superior Enforcement Conference, acknowledges “it has been a cumbersome and ineffective device in ending the pollution of Lake Superior.” After repeatedly failing to meet deadlines for submittal of an alternate method of tailings disposal, Reserve, at the *fifth* session of the conference last January, finally submitted the long-awaited plan. They proposed to *continue* dumping into Lake Superior! As I understand it, they propose to thicken the tailings with chemicals and to pump them deep beneath the surface. This would be convenient, of course, because a horrified public would no longer see the ugly “waterfall” of tailings. In effect, the dirt would be swept under the rug! Although the Technical Committee that studied Reserve's so-called “alternate” plan has, I understand, rejected it—I am told that the committee has recommended *further study* and a plan that would overcome the objections! I have yet to see or hear a forthright official statement that *only on-land* disposal of the tailings will be acceptable. Officialdom continues to ignore the facts and/or to make compromises with them—and all the while, Lake Superior is being *studied to death!*

At this rate, Reserve can go on making un-

acceptable proposals indefinitely—leading to still more studies and delays. Indeed, according to the Minneapolis Tribune and other sources, Reserve saves from \$14,000 to \$24,000 each day they are permitted to postpone spending the necessary money to convert to on-land disposal. There are indications that Reserve and its beneficiaries may actually be counting on delays and the savings derived therefrom. For instance, the report of the Mesabi Trust states: "It is likely that considerable time will elapse before a solution to this problem is found, during which various hearings and other proceedings may take place." Worse yet, the volume of dumping is likely to increase and even more than the present twenty-one and a half million tons will be dumped—because Reserve's brochure states: "Reserve looks forward to continued growth. All of the company's facilities have been designed and built with expansion in mind." The foregoing statement is Reserve's own—not that of an enemy. Their own words betray them!

It was necessary to give you this background information so that you might know that my experience with officials did not concern some insignificant local problem, important only to a few—but the most precious water resource of all!

In my efforts to rescue Lake Superior, I wrote or otherwise contacted officials from the state legislature level to the President of the United States, including members of the Congress, the past and present Governors of Michigan, the Attorney General and Department of Natural Resources of that state—and also committees, commissions, surveys, bureaus, agencies and councils! I saw the Lake Superior Enforcement Conference Chairman, who is also the government's chief water quality enforcement officer—and even a member of the staff of the President's Environmental Quality Council. It made no difference whom I approached—my efforts were in vain! Sometimes, the staffs of officials were enthusiastic, and help seemed imminent—but it always ground to a sudden and unexplained halt.

I even wrote the Corps of Engineers with those permit Reserve operates. I suggested certain lake-wide tests and recommended that the rail cars that carry ore to the plant and return empty—be used to haul away the tailings—either back to the pits from whence they came or to other abandoned mine pits, there to serve a useful purpose as fill. The aforementioned article, "The Pure Railroad" is testimony to Reserve's capability to move the tailings away from Lake Superior. Several engineers have told me this was an excellent idea. Admittedly, this would be more costly than simply using the lake as a FREE private dump—but waste disposal is an expected business expense that Reserve should assume just as all its competitors—indeed all businesses—and even we individuals—must. As a matter of fact, some mining companies in Northern Michigan are having considerable success in revegetating and reforesting tailings basins—and this with a view to conserve the land for game preserves and the tailings for possible future use. There is a feasible alternative now; so further studies are, in my opinion, delaying tactics that may cost the taxpayers untold sums, posterity a backbreaking burden—and Lake Superior its very life!

Everybody in officialdom seems to agree that Lake Superior is a priceless natural resource—but nobody has been willing to take action to save it! Where else can a private citizen go for help? I hope that the frustrating experience of this private citizen will convince you that some recourse should be provided by the Congress. The individual citizen with limited time and resources is no match for rich—and therefore powerful—industries, which can hire attorneys and lobbyists who have nothing but time and al-

most unlimited resources to stall and delay action.

And now, Gentlemen, since I try never to let pass an opportunity to intercede for Lake Superior, I here and now beg you—each of you—to help me save Lake Superior. Further delays are intolerable. The fate of Lake Superior is not negotiable!

I will close by quoting from a letter to the New York Times of September 28, 1969, from Dr. Loren R. Graham of the Institute for Advance Study, Princeton:

"Lake Superior is the last of the Great Lakes that can be called clean. The saving of this magnificent lake from the fate of Lake Erie is a task that fully deserves a permanent effort of nationwide scope. It is the largest body of fresh water in the world. It follows automatically that its pollution would be the greatest crime in the pollution of fresh water of which man is capable . . ." He continued: "Let us hope that we never have to ask, 'Who killed Lake Superior?'"

Gentleman, I believe Lake Superior is being killed. I cannot be an accessory by failing to defend it—and I hope that you cannot!

Thank you.

ON VIETNAM AND VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican National Committee's excellent publication *Mondat* again this week has a few stories in it that I believe would be of interest to my colleagues. They are as follows:

TV NETWORKS IGNORE PRO-ADMINISTRATION VIETNAM VETERAN

The three major television networks last week ignored testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of a Vietnam veteran who argued against a fixed date for withdrawal from Vietnam and for President Nixon's Vietnamization program.

Former Navy Lt. Melville L. Stephens, who spent nearly 34 months in the Southeast Asia combat zone, criticized calls for unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam and the setting of an immediate date for ending American support. The two weaknesses of these arguments, he said, are that, first, they are based on supposition valid a decade ago, and second, if put into effect, they would result in a settlement of the war which would be unacceptable for the South Vietnamese.

"The reason I am here today," Stephens testified, "is to ask you to consider carefully your course, so that peace for Americans does not come at the cost of additional sacrifice for these people. I ask you to consider carefully the manner in which it (the war) is to be ended." Stephens declared that the overwhelming majority of the Vietnamese people are opposed to the Communists and a great many of them have taken this stand because of the American commitment to help. "I would like to think that you and I and the American people have a responsibility to these Vietnamese who have had faith in us and risked their lives for something they believe in," Stephens said. "Peace for us must not come at the cost of their lives."

The former Navy officer said he was offended by some demonstrators he saw carrying the flag of the Communist Viet Cong. "I fear that some of the American people have, in their passion for peace, made heroes of the Viet Cong. In South Vietnam they are not

heroes." Stephens noted that in recent weeks he has heard a great deal about American atrocities in Vietnam but very little about Communist atrocities. He personally knew of two, he said: One, which he saw, was a Viet Cong blowing up a clearly marked school bus, which killed two children and wounded several others; and, two, an 11-year-old South Vietnamese friend of his whose right arm was cut off with a machete because the boy's father was elected to a minor hamlet office. The father and mother of the boy were later killed in the Tet offensive of 1968.

"Anyone who spent any time at all in Vietnam can tell you of the brutality of the Communists," Stephens told the Senators. "They have been quite blunt in stating that terror and mass executions are principle strategy. The South Vietnamese I lived with know this. They know that they take their lives in their hands to support the South Vietnamese government. They depend on us for the support we have promised."

Stephens said he understands the passion of everyone for an end to the war but it is his firm conviction that peace at the price of the South Vietnamese people is too expensive and a peace that could not be lived with. "I want to tell you from my personal experience, that setting an arbitrary date for American withdrawal can only hurt the chances of the South Vietnamese," he declared, "and the current program of American withdrawal is as rapid as I believe the situation permits. . . . I think that the issue of how we end the war is not one of a Nation's saving face, but of our responsibility as a Nation and individuals to these citizens of South Vietnam. Many have committed themselves because we asked them to, and I hope in our urgency for peace, that we do not abandon them."

STUDENTS AGREE WITH AGNEW MEDIA CRITICISM

A random sample of 50 dormitory residents at the Storrs Campus of the University of Connecticut has shown a majority of students agreeing with Vice President Agnew's criticisms of the media but not with the Vice President. The poll, conducted by Seth Schneider, a student in international relations, asked students if they agreed or disagreed with quotes taken from Agnew's November, 1969, speech about the media. The quotes were not attributed to the Vice President. Sixty-four percent of the students surveyed agreed with Agnew's statement that the TV news media "wield a free hand in selecting, presenting and interpreting great issues in our Nation;" 94 percent agreed the media could "make or break a personality or event," and 70 percent agreed the media should be more responsive to its audience.

When the students were asked: "Do you agree with Spiro Agnew?," 90 percent said no, 10 percent said yes. Interviewer Schneider commented on the poll in the U of Connecticut paper, "Chronicle," saying: "I find this a dangerous situation, because in the U.S. today people are forgetting about the important issues and looking for personalities that they find agreeable and with whom they can identify. This means moving further and further from the issues and a realistic approach dealing with issues, causing an even dimmer future."

VIETNAM "DATING GAME" IS BOMBING HALT PLEA WARMED OVER

Every so often in the Vietnam debate there emerges a new central theme, which, its advocates say if only followed will lead to an end of the war. The theme has changed over the years. In 1968, the cry was stop the bombing. This they said would lead to "serious discussions" with the enemy and thus hasten an end to the war. Presidential candidate Hubert Humphrey was a prime pusher of this line. In a Salt Lake City speech he announced that he would favor a bombing

halt as an acceptable risk for peace. He felt such action would lead to a negotiated settlement with the Communists. The bombing was halted and next year marks the third anniversary of the "serious discussions" with the enemy in Paris. So much for stopping the bombing.

But the critics of the Nixon Administration's Vietnam policies are resourceful. They have come up with a new theme, a sort of "Dating Game" which goes like this: If the President would set a fixed date for American withdrawal from Vietnam, the war could be ended and American prisoners of war set free. This, in the words of Washington Star Foreign Editor Crosby Noyes, is "an entirely phony issue."

As President Nixon said in his April 7 Indochina Progress Report: "The difficulty in making such an announcement (a fixed withdrawal date) to the American people is that I would also be making that announcement to the enemy. And it would serve the enemy's purpose and not our own. If the United States should announce that we will quit regardless of what the enemy does, we would have thrown away our principle bargaining counter to win the release of American prisoners of war; we would remove the enemy's strongest incentive to end the war sooner by negotiation; and we will have given enemy commanders the exact information they need to marshal their attacks against our remaining forces at their most vulnerable time."

Why a fixed withdrawal date on the part of the U.S. would lead to "serious discussions," advocates of the plan don't say. President Nixon, supported by South Vietnam's President Thieu, has put forth a five point program for peace in Vietnam:

An internationally supervised cease-fire in place throughout Indochina;

The establishment of an Indochina Peace Conference;

Negotiation of an agreed timetable for the complete withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam on the basis of North Vietnamese reciprocity and international verification;

A fair political settlement reflecting the will of the South Vietnamese people and of all the political forces in South Vietnam;

The immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war by all sides.

The United States has also supported South Vietnam's proposals of July 11, 1969, calling for free elections in which all people and parties of South Vietnam, including the National Liberation Front (NLF) can participate and for a mixed electoral commission on which all parties including the NLF can be represented to work out the modalities and verification procedures for such elections.

In addition, the United States has undertaken other major steps toward peace. Each of these steps was urged by the Communist side and its American supporters as constructive contributions designed not only to reduce U.S. involvement but also to open the door to negotiations. These steps include:

The 1968 halt to the bombing of North Vietnam;

Agreement on the participation of the NLF in the Paris talks;

U.S. agreement to the principle of troop withdrawals;

U.S. troop withdrawals totaling 265,000 by May 1, 1971, to reach a total of 365,000 U.S. troops withdrawn by December 1, 1971. The authorized ceiling for U.S. military personnel in Vietnam will have dropped from 549,000 in January 1969 when President Nixon took office, to 184,000 by December 1971. Further reductions are expected under the Nixon Administration's Vietnamization program;

A series of de-escalatory steps substantially cutting back B-52 activity and U.S. tactical air activity in Southeast Asia;

Appointment of a new senior negotiator in Paris.

The response?

Hanoi and the National Liberation Front (NLF) have rejected these proposals and all other proposals and steps for peace:

They refuse even to consider the Allied proposals as agenda items at the Paris talks.

They have continued to reject all notions of reciprocity, verifiable open elections or international verification.

Despite their promises, they refuse to negotiate with the Government of Vietnam.

They demand that the United States commit itself unilaterally and unconditionally:

To total unilateral withdrawal of all troops and war material, and the dismantling of all U.S. bases,

To the overthrow of the leaders of the Government of Vietnam (President, Vice President and Prime Minister),

To the arbitrary imposition of a so-called "coalition" government established prior to any elections and in the absence of any international verification. It would consist of the NLF's "Provisional Revolutionary Government" and various personages defined in the NLF's view as "really standing for peace, independence and neutrality."

In exchange for such a total unilateral commitment by the U.S., Hanoi and the NLF have pledged absolutely nothing. They have at best indicated that if all this was done they might "discuss"—i.e., not release—the prisoners of war.

While Hanoi continues to deny that there is a single North Vietnamese soldier outside of North Vietnam, 100,000 North Vietnamese soldiers are in South Vietnam, 90,000 are in Laos, and 50,000 are in Cambodia continuing to wage wars of aggression against North Vietnam's neighbors.

These facts raise the question as to whether the demand for a fixed date for U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam isn't another political ploy designed to embarrass President Nixon. Those who feel this is the case point to a remark by Democratic Sen. Birch Bayh that, although he voted for it, a Senate resolution calling for a U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam by December 31, 1973 "doesn't mean anything at all. It's ambiguous. It's pie in the sky. Like a Mother Hubbard skirt, it covers everything and touches nothing."

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN'S WEEK

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, in a number of States, the week of May 3 to 7 is dedicated to the achievements and artistic craftsmanship of the Nation's 7 million handicapped children. "Exceptional Children's Week" is a celebration of hope. The Congress has duly noted the crisis aspects of providing education for the child with special means by devising the funding mechanisms and programs that make special education a reality. This week, examples of the artistry of these children is on display in the large open lounge next to the Education and Labor Committee on the first floor of the Rayburn Building. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor to address the conference in my home State of Connecticut designed to formulate a program of increased quality education for exceptional children.

This conference was cosponsored by the bureau of pupil personnel, special education services of the State depart-

ment of education, the Connecticut College Office of Community Affairs, Eastern Connecticut State College, the school of education at the University of Connecticut and the Norwich area special education project. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include those remarks which point out the need for further Federal action if we are to reach the goal of full education opportunity for the handicapped by 1980.

PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL DISTRICTS FOR BETTER FUTURE PLANNING SPECIAL EDUCATION

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to participate in this timely and important conference. As a Nation, we have only recently begun to devise the funding mechanisms and programs needed to provide public education for the child with special needs. At all levels of government, it is all too clear that programs have been poorly coordinated and underfunded for many years. The latest figures from the Office of Education estimate that there are now 6 million school-age and one million preschool-age children who are handicapped. Only 40 percent of these children receive any special education at all. This is an intolerable situation in a country which aims to provide an equal educational opportunity for each and every child.

Earlier this month, Sidney P. Marland, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education, urged that we adopt as one of our national goals, the provision of full educational opportunity for every handicapped child in the Nation by 1980. "The right of a handicapped child to the special education he needs is as basic to him as is the right of any other young citizen to an appropriate education in the public schools," said Dr. Marland. "It is unjust for our society to provide handicapped children with anything less than the full and equal educational opportunity they need to reach their maximum potential and attain rewarding, satisfying lives."

Today I would like to bring you up to date on recent developments in programs of special education at the Federal level. Then I will discuss some specific objectives which must be achieved in the decade ahead if Dr. Marland's goal is to be fully realized by 1980. And finally, I should like to talk about the potential role of the teacher, parent, and concerned citizen in strengthening the Federal, State and local partnership in special education.

Ten years ago, the Federal Government was spending less than \$1 million a year for services relating to special education. This year, the figure is about \$170 million. In addition, it is estimated that state and local outlays will total nearly \$3 billion in 1971. Connecticut in particular has made impressive progress during the last few years in meeting the needs of its exceptional children. But remarkable as these developments have been, they pale beside the problems of many thousands of children who have yet to be served. Edward Martin, head of the Bureau of the Handicapped in the Office of Education, estimates that adequate programs for all 7 million handicapped children would cost about \$10 billion a year. In the long run, however, such expenditure is an investment which not only results in savings for the taxpayer, but also prepares the handicapped person for a full and productive life in society. According to a recent interview with Dr. Martin: "A handicapped child who does not receive special education is likely to wind up in an institution or on the welfare rolls. . . . The cost to the public of maintaining him in that dependent status may total, in a normal lifetime, around \$300,000. The same child could grow up to be a responsible, self-supporting adult if he had the benefit of 15 years of special education

at an average cost of \$2,000 per year, or \$30,000 in all. In other words, educating a handicapped child costs only one-tenth as much as neglecting him." Thus one of our goals must be to increase public awareness of the urgent need for sufficient funds for special education.

Money, however, has not been the only problem. There has also been a lack of coordination between a variety of Federal programs affecting the education of the exceptional child. In 1966, as you know, Congress passed major legislation affecting special education. Under Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funds were provided for a program of State grants, regional resource centers, and several other purposes. Existing programs continued to function under separate legislation, however, and subsequent programs, such as the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act, were not integrated with Title VI of ESEA. This situation not only created confusion for those applying for Federal funds, but it also led to a certain loss of focus at the national level. Rather than a comprehensive approach to the education of the handicapped, we had created a legislative jungle which sometimes hindered as much as it helped.

Just last year, in an attempt to remedy this situation, the Congress enacted the Education of the Handicapped Act, Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969/79 (P.L. 91-230). In my view, this legislation is bound to have a profound and constructive impact on special education. A recent article in the journal, *Exceptional Children*, summarized the accomplishments of this piece of legislation in these words:

In treating the authorities of programs for the handicapped as a single, interlocking package, the Congress has:

Clearly recognized the distinctiveness of the handicapped as a major target population;

Established a legislative framework which prepares for a total response to their needs, increasing authorizations from \$320 million to \$486 million by 1973;

Reaffirmed and extended the mandate of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped as a part of that response;

Encouraged the increasing efforts of special education to emphasize the humanity of handicapped people and to resist mechanical categorizations of them as extensions of particular afflictions; and

Given impetus to the broad range of cooperative actions among state and local agencies and universities.

Specifically, this legislation amended and consolidated the various special teacher training programs, the Early Education Assistance Act, and provisions for instructional media for the handicapped, with the programs formerly authorized under Title VI of ESEA, and extended their authorizations through 1973. In addition, a new program was created which provides special assistance for children with specific learning disabilities in the form of support for research, teacher training, and model centers. The amendments also revised the teacher fellowship program under the Higher Education Act to include teachers of gifted and talented children, and called on the Commissioner of Education for an evaluation report and recommendations to the Congress on the extent to which the needs of the gifted are being met.

In fiscal year 1971, Connecticut received \$415,459 under the Education of the Handicapped Act. For the coming year, both the President's budget and the House-passed appropriation bill request additional funds for special education.

According to the latest annual report from the Office of Education on the education of the handicapped (*Better Education for Handicapped Children, Annual Report Fiscal*

Year 1969—Aid to State and Local Schools), during the 1968-69 school year the two major programs of aid served approximately 225,000 handicapped children through grants of more than \$54 million. 41,000 staff members received inservice training and 16,500 new staff members were employed. This year the Office of Education reports that grants totalling almost \$30 million have been awarded to help train approximately 20,000 people for work in the education of the handicapped. Compared to the 237,000 additional teachers and specialists who are needed if all handicapped children are to be served, however, it is obvious that we still have a long way to go.

Other recent developments at the Federal level include the establishment of a national Special Education Information Center in Washington, D.C. to provide computerized information to parents, teachers, and other interested persons on the facilities and other special education programs available to handicapped children throughout the country. The Center, which is a part of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, conducted a nation-wide survey to determine the names, addresses, and the services of every educational project in the United States which offers programs for the handicapped. The nature of the response so far indicates that this will be an invaluable resource for those who are interested in improving educational opportunity for the handicapped.

It is apparent from this brief summary of activities at the national level, that significant strides are being made in the right direction. It is equally obvious, however, that there is much to be done if we are to reach the goal of full educational opportunity for the handicapped by 1980.

The Commissioner of Education has already established target objectives for fiscal 1972. These include:

Programs for an additional 250,000 school children, raising the total number to nearly 3 million;

Career education, including placement and employment services, for 250,000 teen-age handicapped children already receiving special education;

17,000 trained teachers to support the additional special education programs, and 12,000 teachers trained to work with handicapped children in their regular classrooms.

Long-range goals must also include an emphasis on preventive health care for young children, an expansion of programs for the preschool-age handicapped child, and the provision of badly needed services to the inner-city and rural child.

In the interim it may also be necessary to consider the possibility of providing some form of emergency aid to those parents and children whose needs cannot now be met in the public school system. In Connecticut, for instance, about half of our handicapped children are being served with Federal, State, or locally-funded programs. This compares favorably with the efforts being made in many other States, but the fact remains that many thousands of lives will remain unfulfilled as a result of our inaction. We must have full funding if we are to meet the astronomical costs of providing special education.

My third and final point is the pressing need for better coordination and communication among people and programs of special education at all levels. There is great potential in the regional service concept which allows small school districts to pool their resources and thus expand their programs. There is great potential in the improved exchange of information and even staff between the various levels of government. And there is great potential in establishing better communication between Congress and the people it serves. As your representative in Washington, I am often struck by the many issues which neither the educator nor the legislator can resolve alone, by the many

challenges which neither the Federal Government, the State nor the local district has the resources to meet independently. The partnership between people, programs and levels of government must be both strengthened and improved if our efforts to aid the exceptional child are to provide maximum benefits.

If existing programs are to be improved and new programs devised to meet your needs, your views are essential to the legislative process. Both the concerned legislator and the concerned teacher, parent and citizen share a common goal—quality education for every American child. I look forward to working with you to achieve this goal, and I hope that I have given you some idea of the issues which we will be facing together in the coming years. I thank you for your continuing devotion to the cause of special education, I solicit your advice, and I pledge my assistance to your efforts to insure that each exceptional child will soon share in the equal educational opportunity which this Nation has promised to make a reality for all.

THE INTERNATIONAL WALK FOR DEVELOPMENT

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution designating May as "Human Development Month" and May 8 and 9 as the "International Walk for Development Weekend."

As a member of the U.S. sponsoring committee of the International Walk for Development, I have long been aware of the humanitarian work of the Young World Development organization of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation.

The development of human resources is a cause which we can all support. The walk itself is symbolic of the commitment to that cause. As a sign carried by some of the walkers says: "Walking hurts, but hunger kills."

By walking or sponsoring a walker we can make a contribution to the noble goals of human resource development. As outlined by the sponsors of the walk, they are:

First. Reduction of world military expenditures.

Second. Assuring an adequate existence for every family and every nation.

Third. Feeding the world's population.

Fourth. Living in ease with our own and the world's diversity of peoples and cultures.

Fifth. Harnessing the growth of the world's population.

Sixth. Reversing the degradation of the earth and its environment.

To the end of accomplishing these objectives, walks for development will be held in more than 350 communities in the United States and in 51 countries around the world.

In the midst of this dedicated activity it is difficult not to hear the echo of the late Robert Kennedy who often quoted:

Some people see things as they are and ask why. I dream of things that never were and ask why not.

We have heard much of the need for the "lift of a driving dream" for our

Nation. Projects such as the International Walk for Development provide that lift and a sense of purpose for many thousands of Americans.

Equally important, the results of the human resource development activities will allow others to see and share such dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our colleagues Don Fraser and Fred Schwengel for sponsoring this special order, and I hope the House will add its collective sanction to the International Walk for Development by early and favorable action on the resolution.

POLISH THIRD OF MAY CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is a significant date for millions of Americans of Polish ancestry, and for Poles everywhere in the world. It is an important Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

Throughout the United States today, Americans of Polish descent pay tribute to the land of their ancestors, and remind their fellow Americans that Poland was one of the pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

On May 3, 1791, without a bloody revolution and without even serious domestic disorder, Poland eliminated the basic weaknesses of her parliamentary and social system and adopted a democratic constitution.

Unfortunately, this dramatic highlight of Polish history led to but a short period of democracy. Only 4 years later came the third partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution is found this significant statement of democratic principles:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people; its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

This philosophy of government is based on the same principles that our own Republic adopted at about this time period, and under which we have operated for nearly two centuries.

Separated from Europe and its 19th century turmoil by 3,000 miles of ocean, the United States grew and prospered during the years that Poland became a pawn in the hands of European military powers.

Today, as we recall that bright moment of Poland's history, we join in a prayer that the spirit of freedom shall remain alive in the hearts of the brave Polish people until the inevitable day that Poland again shall take its place among the world's democracies.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
April 19, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FORD: Since the outbreak of World War II, during which Poland's valiant

struggle against nazi-communist totalitarianism has become "an inspiration for mankind", the United States Congress annually commemorates one of the brightest events in Polish history—the adoption of May 3rd Constitution of 1791. These special observances in both Chambers of Congress demonstrate American friendship toward the Polish nation, whose millennial heritage of Christianity and participation in the growth of Western culture is now being ruthlessly suppressed by communist tyranny.

The Poles, longing for the day of deliverance, do need your words of hope and encouragement to sustain them in psychological resistance to communism and Soviet domination.

The Polish American Congress, representing over twelve million Americans of Polish ancestry, sincerely appreciates your past participation in May 3rd Observances and appeals for your assistance in making the coming program in the Congress as impressive and memorable as in the previous years.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a fact-sheet dealing with this event.

Sincerely yours,

CASIMIR I. LENARD,
Executive Director,
Polish American Congress.

MAY THIRD—THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3rd Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish National Holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3rd in 1791, barely two years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May Third Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given use as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and ob-

ject being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the Third of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Mediation on the anniversary of May the Third deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty and her territory by one of our former allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

LETTER OF COMMENDATION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Daniel E. Zabel, 13 Bonnie Avenue, Bel Air, Md., has brought to my attention the outstanding job being done by two teachers at the Villa Cresta Elementary School, Baltimore County: Miss Rose A. White and Mrs. Elizabeth Riley. These teachers have shown an exceptional concern for their students outside the classroom as well as inside. I would like to pay tribute to them by including Mr. Zabel's letter of commendation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG, Towson, Md.

DEAR MR. LONG: In a day in which there is so much criticism of our institutions and leaders, I feel those, who by their example prove the validity of our system, deserve equal time. It is for that reason that I would call to your attention Miss White and Mrs. Riley, teachers at the Villa Cresta Elementary School, Baltimore County, and hope you will share this information with their supervisors.

While knowledge of their abilities as teachers reaches me only at second hand, the enthusiasm with which it is conveyed leaves no doubt in my mind as to their effectiveness. Recently I helped the entertainment committee with their Fiesta, and experienced this close teacher-student relationship, which I can say was mutual admiration.

Touching close to my life are my own grandchildren and it is in this context that the above teachers have renewed my faith in my fellow man and of the best of our way of life.

It was at a time of personal trouble and illness of my daughter and her husband that these two teachers sought out my grandchildren to take them to the movies, bowling, and other recreational activities. I understand that this is not just an isolated incident of their industry, thoughtfulness, and charity, but that many have been touched by them.

It is my sincere hope that these words will in some way convey my thoughts and bring to these fine examples of the teaching profession the recognition that I believe is due them.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL E. ZABEL.

NATION'S CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REQUIRES REFORM

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday this Nation observed "Law Day U.S.A." It was a reminder that if constructive changes are to come in our society, they must result under law and through reason.

That Law Day occupies only a single calendar day is merely symbolic. For it is an annual reminder that while the principles embodied in the observance are constant their viability cannot be taken for granted. Instead, they must be nurtured and sustained by all Americans.

Much of this Nation's attention has been centered these past few weeks on the throngs of young Americans who have demonstrated here in Washington and in other places against the war.

Thus, there is a temptation to dwell on the issue of violence, of mob actions and the place for peaceful dissent within the law in our society.

But there is another serious problem in this country. That is the problem of our floundering system of criminal justice; a system in which the speedy trial is too often only a heady philosophy expressed by wishful thinking politicians.

Our courts and the judges who preside in them are the ultimate guardians of our basic freedoms.

There is no excuse for the shortage of judges, of prosecutors and of accessory help for them, or for the hopelessly inadequate court facilities in far too many urban communities.

There is no excuse for larger and larger dockets, and heavier and heavier backlogs, in trial courts and in some places in appellate courts, and often in both.

The inevitable results are a denial of justice, citizen disrespect for the law and those who enforce and administer it, and a general breakdown in the administration of justice.

In many States, not, I am glad to say my own, judges are elected. If there is any single principle upon which most leaders concerned with the administration of justice almost universally agree, it is that any system other than a merit selection plan is undesirable.

Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, in an address to the American Bar Association last August, put his finger on the real problems facing the Federal judiciary and recommended steps to be taken to improve the system in the future.

Justice Burger pointed out that while 61 new Federal district judgeships were added by Congress last year, it was the result of efforts which began 5 years earlier:

We see therefore that the additional judges, needed in 1965, were not authorized until 1970—

Justice Burger said:

We cannot solve our problems by meeting needs five or more years after they arise. The time to plan for 1975 and 1980 needs is now, and I hope this can be accomplished, not simply by adding more judges, but by

the more efficient use of judicial manpower and greater productivity through improved methods, machinery, management and trained administrative personnel—

He said.

The Chief Justice pointed out that while more judges were added, more laws were passed resulting in more cases coming before the Federal courts.

Observed Justice Burger:

The difficulty lies in our tendency to meet new and legitimate demands with new laws which are passed without adequate consideration of the consequences in terms of case-loads.

Included in the Chief Justice's recommendations were the following, which I believe are particularly important:

The system of criminal justice must be viewed as a process embracing every phase from crime prevention through the correctional system. We can no longer limit our responsibility to providing defense services for the judicial process, yet continue to be miserly with the needs of correctional institutions and probation and parole services.

The whole process of appeals must be re-examined. It is cumbersome and costly and it encourages delay and it takes too long. Some courts... have developed procedures to screen out frivolous appeals. Finally at some point is indispensable to any rational—and workable—judicial system.

We made a wise choice in guaranteeing a lawyer in every serious criminal case but we must now make certain that lawyers are adequately trained, and that the representation is on a high professional basis. It is professional representation we promise to give—nothing more—and always within accepted standards of conduct. This Association has now provided lawyers with comprehensive and authoritative standards and it is up to the courts and the bar of every state to make sure they are followed.

This Nation, if it is to protect the sense of confidence in the courts which is essential in maintaining the fabric of ordered liberty for a free people, must make changes in its judicial methods and procedures and machinery.

I call on the Congress to cooperate with the judiciary in this regard.

SLAUGHTER OF SEA MAMMALS

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, some of the most historic whaling communities in the Nation can be found in my Second District of Connecticut. So, I am no stranger to the lore of this ancient and venerable craft. And, I am as concerned as anyone that the whale be saved from extinction threatened by the bootleg whaling fleets of foreign nations. However, it has come to my attention that there is disagreement among the various affected government agencies over the proper position the United States should take on whale conservation and membership in the International Whaling Commission. Based on the following information published in the latest edition of the trade bible, *Ocean Science News*, I have called for an in-

vestigation of the official Government's position on marine mammal conservation.

Under the leave to include my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which pinpoints the need for immediate clarification of United States policy and the need for action to preserve and protect all marine mammals.

OCEAN SCIENCE NEWS

The U.S. has taken unilateral actions over the last 12 months in regard to international whaling operations. In June of 1970, the Interior Department—without regard to the efforts and actions of the International Whaling Commission (IWC), without regard to the findings of a special study group of the IWC's Scientific Committee, without prior consultation with the State, Commerce and Defense Departments—added the sperm, finback and sei whales to the official U.S. Endangered Species List, thus prohibiting their taking by American whalers and any import into the U.S. of products derived from their taking by whalers of other nations. Interior also failed to consult with either Dr. J. L. McHugh, U.S. Commissioner to the IWC (and at that time himself in the Interior Department) or with Dr. D. G. Chapman, Chairman of the IWC Scientific Committee (also with the University of Washington Center of Quantitative Science in Forestry, Fisheries and Wildlife) and, seemingly, ignored testimony offered before a meeting of the IWC by observers from The Fauna Preservation Society, the International Society for the Protection of Animals, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and the World Wildlife Fund, none of whom suggested that there should be a complete ban on the killing of sei, fin or sperm whales—only that the catch limit is set by the IWC, for some stocks, were too high. More recently (OSN, 23Apr71), Commerce Department established an absolute ban on whaling by U.S. citizens effective 31Dec71—again without any evident consultation with either U.S. or other experts. This is a unilateral action, taken without recognition of our membership in IWC, which includes these member nations: U.S.S.R., Japan, U.K., Canada, Norway, Australia, New Zealand, Republic of South Africa, Mexico, Spain, Portugal, The Netherlands, Panama, Iceland, France, Chile and Peru.

Personally, we like whales, especially porpoises; we view them more as friends and associates than as wild animals to be killed and hunted for profit. However, that's a subjective view and, perhaps, not very realistic in the world in which we live. Marine mammals have been hunted and harvested for many centuries as both food and sources of materials for commerce. It is something men do, and one does not change the human species overnight (or even in centuries). Indeed, sperm whale oil is classified as a strategic material and is substantially stockpiled by the U.S. government. (Office of Emergency Planning, a White House agency, tells us we have 23.4 million lbs. of sperm oil stockpiled, that it is worth \$7 million—compared to the \$4.8 million the government paid for it—and that we haven't bought any of it since 1955. Attempts to develop substitutes for the great lubricating qualities of sperm oil have yet to produce a completely acceptable replacement.) And, many people in other parts of the world depend on the meat from marine mammals as an important source of animal protein in their diet. Whales are big, beautiful, majestic and apparently quite intelligent. When viewed as food, however, it is difficult to argue convincingly that they are much different from beef cattle or chickens. Besides, among the

toothed whales, there are marine mammals that eat other marine mammals for the same purpose. It's all part of nature's way.

What is important is that species not be fished to the point of extinction. And, so long as whales are a common high seas fishery resource, well beyond the exclusive limits of any single national jurisdiction, and so long as a number of other countries still conduct whaling operations—mainly the U.S.S.R., Japan, Norway, Canada, Republic of South Africa, Australia, and a few smaller operators—the only hope for conservation of the species lies in the development of effective international control. Without international control, the big whaling nations (U.S.S.R., Japan, Norway) would most likely go all out to catch what's left before the others do. That would be the end of many important species of whales.

The International Whaling Commission has not stood out as the paragon of international regulatory agencies. Indeed, until a few years ago it was rather a dismal failure. In recent years—as much through the efforts of the U.S. delegation as anything—the IWC has grown in effectiveness and stature and shows every indication of becoming even more effective in the future. Unilateral action as taken by the U.S. can only generate distrust in the U.S. and the IWC among other IWC members and thereby weaken the effectiveness of its controls. It has been a tough battle, bringing the IWC to the point of beginning to exercise effective protective controls on world whale stocks. The U.S. action can only work in the direction of reversing this trend—if not bringing about the dissolution of the IWC entirely. The guilty party, specifically, appears to be the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as it was called in Interior, or the National Marine Fisheries Service, as it is now called in Commerce's National Oceanographic & Atmospheric Agency.

The IWC in 1963 concluded (rather belatedly, it is true) that the blue and humpback whales were, indeed, endangered species and placed an absolute ban on their taking. Killing prohibitions on white and gray whales were approved even earlier. In 1965 the IWC agreed to a program for a stopped reduction in the taking of fin and sei whales. It has also introduced controls on the taking of sperm whales, limiting the catch only to males 38 feet long or over and only those found north or south of the 40th parallels; the harem herds (sperm whales are polygamous) and calves remain largely between 40° S. and 40° N., while lone males range beyond those limits to feed.

A summary of presently estimated whale stocks outlines the nature and, indeed, the urgency of the need for continuing progress towards effective international control of whaling. The two major world whaling areas are the Antarctic and the North Pacific. In the Antarctic there remain an estimated 6,400 blue whales, 1,700 humpbacks and 1,500 right whales; the number of these species in the North Pacific isn't known but is almost certainly less. The Antarctic population of blue whales is believed to be at 4% of its virgin (stock before the onset of whaling) stock; the humpback, at 5%. The Antarctic fin whale population is estimated at 70,000; in the North Pacific, 32,500, compared to virgin stocks of 250,000 and 65,000 respectively. At these population levels, which are at 33% and 50% of original levels (maximum sustainable yield—msy—for fisheries stocks occurs, generally, when harvesting holds stocks at 50% of virgin levels), sustainable yields are estimated at 2,700 and 1,700 respectively; quotas have been set accordingly by the IWC. IWC's long range objective is to restore stocks to msy levels and hold them there.

Sei whale populations in the Antarctic and North Pacific are at 75,000 and 46,000, respectively—a little over the msy level—

with sustainable yields of 5,000 and 3,100 animals, respectively. Sperm whale stocks are estimated for Southern Hemisphere at 300,000 animals and for the North Pacific at 210,000. No evidence of over harvesting has been discovered in the Southern Hemisphere, though the take of mature males in the North Pacific is considered too high, and the IWC members have agreed to a reduction in 1971. Stocks of other whales, such as the minke (just now becoming subject to considerable harvesting by both the Norwegians and the Japanese) are considered to be well above msy limits.

IWC enforcement procedures still leave something to be desired. International inspectors are not yet allowed on whaling expeditions, but broadly speaking, at least, the catch can be checked by monitoring the ratio of the various whale products brought into port—oil, meat, teeth, baleen, etc.—which increasingly is done. IWC member states do agree to the rulings of the IWC and appear to be trying to adhere to them. Norway, which dropped out of the IWC a few years ago, is back in. There are reported to be two "bootleg" whaling operations (i.e., operating outside the IWC under flags of convenience)—one possibly out of Panama and the other thought to be emanating from somewhere in the Caribbean. There is no effective machinery for dealing with this kind of piracy—though Peru a few years back detained such a bootleg (i.e., outside of the IWC) fleet operated by Onassis (of Jacqueline and Greek shipping fame) and made him pay a \$3 million fine before releasing it. (See Colombos, C. John, "The International Law of the Sea", McKay, 1967, New York.) The IWC certainly isn't perfect, but it's better than the *laissez-faire* situation which previously existed, and its effectiveness has been improving. It is irresponsible for the U.S. to work against the IWC. Our action could be disastrous for the whales we are all trying to save, if the unilateral position taken by Interior and Commerce Departments, and hence by the U.S. government, were to result in the failure of the IWC.

SPEEDUP IN COURTS IS NO CURE— ALL FOR CRIME

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, be wary of efficiency. In judicial matters, that principle should be considered an unalterable one. Somehow, however, our values in the business world often impose themselves as desirable standards for all governmental activity, and efficiency then becomes a goal to be achieved for its presumed virtues alone. But to sight our judicial reforms on achieving efficiency is to aim at the wrong target. Justice is too fragile a product to be submitted to expedient dispensation. Increasing the efficiency of our judicial system is desirable only insofar as it contributes to a higher aim, namely, the assurance of greater equity and fairness in our legal system.

This is to say that in the event of a conflict, efficiency should always defer to justice; certainly a reasonable proposition, but one often ignored in practice. If we are to guard against the persistent erosion of our civil liberties and prevent

the evolution of our courts into virtual judicial vending machines, then it must be acknowledged that justice must never be abridged merely to increase the case-handling ability of our court system.

In last Sunday's edition of the Washington Post, Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals treats this very problem. He points out the deceptions that elude many proponents of reform and discusses the undesirable consequences that can result from certain efficiency schemes. The article is a fine statement of the largely unrecognized and undesirable side effects some of these proposals would leave, and suggests a most instructive analysis of the potential dangers of some current proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith the full text of this excellent article:

SPEEDUP IN COURTS IS NO CURE—ALL FOR CRIME

(By David L. Bazelon)

(NOTE.—The following is excerpted from a lecture given last week at the New York University School of Law by Bazelon, who is chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.)

From all sides we are assailed by cries of a crisis—a crisis of crime in the streets and congestion in the courts. We hear the cry that we can reduce both street crime and court congestion by increasing the efficiency of the courts.

In the name of efficiency, many proposals for reform have been advanced. The courts are urged to experiment with new ways of managing their calendars, and new ways of expediting the flow of paper through the court system.

Certainly any such reforms that can help the courts cut into their backlogs are long overdue. But I think there is a grave danger that we have been oversold on the benefits of judicial efficiency. In a great burst of wishful thinking, many of us seem to have decided that cutting down on court backlogs will cut down on crime. The theory seems to be that would-be criminals are more likely to be deterred by the threat of swift punishment than by the threat of remote punishment.

But in reality we know next to nothing about the way deterrence really operates. There is simply no evidence that speeding up the judicial system is likely to make a measurable dent in the crime rate.

First, if the public is led to expect such miracles from judicial reforms, we may put the more important reforms on the back burner. It would be a serious mistake to think that it is more important for us as a nation to repair our judicial machinery than to repair the institutions that provide unliveable housing, inadequate health care, and insufficient food to the people who commit the crimes that concern us.

Even if we were to dispense with trials altogether, and simply lock up every person who was not discharged at his preliminary hearing, we would still have a serious crime problem. For every criminal we take off the streets, a dozen more will come of age until we do something about the conditions that force people into a life of crime.

Second, there is another danger inherent in allowing the public to expect too much from judicial reforms. That is the danger that in our enthusiasm we will be willing to pay an inflated price for judicial efficiency. In the name of efficiency, we are urged to rely ever more heavily on guilty pleas, to eliminate "frivolous" appeals, and to pare to the bone collateral review of criminal convictions.

Devices like these may cut down court backlogs. But we should not forget that problems come to the courts only when every other social mechanism we have failed to solve them. Almost by definition, these problems are hard problems—cruelly hard problems. Speeding up the process of decision doesn't make them any easier to solve. And devices like those just mentioned will speed up decision only at the cost of short-circuiting the process established by the Constitution for the administration of criminal justice.

A QUESTIONED BARGAIN

I think that we are already relying far too much on acceptance of bargained guilty pleas. In hopelessly backlogged courts, most defendants are convicted without any trial at all. Some of our most vital decisions about guilt and sentence are made not out in the open, but behind the scenes. Equal adversaries do not compete in public before an impartial judge and jury—instead, the two sides meet in secret in a test of nothing more than raw bargaining power.

Today the practice of plea bargaining is widely regarded as indispensable for the operation of our system of criminal justice. We are told that the courts would collapse into chaos if every defendant exercised his right to a trial. If so, we are in a sorry state indeed, for the continued existence of the judicial system is dependent upon the good will of criminal defendants. But if they continue to have our best interests at heart, and the practice of plea bargaining is to continue, at the very least we should bring it out into the open and surround it with safeguards.

The American Bar Association and other groups have made important proposals in this regard. The courts of the District of Columbia, I am happy to say, are presently experimenting with devices intended to put such plea bargains as are made on the public record.

But no safeguards can eliminate the fundamental problems inherent in plea bargaining. When the government actively encourages defendants to forego the very rights that government is established to secure, it may not offend the Constitution but it certainly raises some pretty basic problems. With one hand we offer the defendant a public adversary trial, and with the other we rush him out of the courtroom and into the bargain basement, where he can buy a short sentence by pleading guilty. One result of the bargain system is that the resulting sentences are based less on any rational or consistent policy than on the fluctuating demands of the marketplace.

To begin with, a prosecutor negotiating a plea simply doesn't have before him the information necessary to make any sort of informed judgment. He usually knows almost nothing about the defendant. He often has as little as 10 or 15 minutes to reach his decision. And in any event, his options are severely limited by the economics of the marketplace. For in order to buy a guilty plea, he has to offer something in return. What he offers is a sentence significantly shorter than a defendant would expect to receive if he were found guilty after a trial.

If that short sentence is sufficient to serve whatever ends we seek to serve through the sentencing process, then it must be true that sentences handed out to defendants who go to trial are too long. Conversely, if the defendants who go to trial are, by and large, getting sentences of the proper length, then the sentences resulting from the plea bargaining process are too short. If the basic aim of our sentencing policy is to rehabilitate defendants, then the result of our commitment to plea bargaining must be either that the prisons are clogged with

people who should have been out on the streets a long time ago, or else the streets are clogged with people who should still be receiving rehabilitative treatment. It is a false efficiency indeed that speeds up the criminal process in order to speed up an unrehabilitated defendant's return to the streets.

In order to speed people through the system, then, we are running a bargain counter that may tempt even innocent people to plead guilty. For any defendant—innocent or guilty—must pay a high price for asserting the right to go to trial. We may be confident that not many innocent defendants are convicted, but we know that imperfections in the factfinding process must mean that some are. And one ironic quirk of the plea bargaining process is that it gives the heaviest sentences to the group most likely to include some innocent people—the group with close cases. For an innocent defendant is most likely to resist the pressure to plead guilty, and insist on going to trial. Some of these people will be convicted—after all, no system of justice is perfect—and those innocent people will get the heavy sentences reserved for people who insist on trials.

A CRUEL PARADOX

The problem is even worse in the context of the delays that presently beset the criminal system. For court backlogs increase the pressure on all defendants, innocent or not, to give up and plead guilty. The price of a trial is not only a longer sentence for defendants who are found guilty. For defendants unable to make bail, insisting on trial may increase the time they spend in jail in another way as well. In many jurisdictions, the usual sentence on a plea of guilty to a misdemeanor is "time served"—the amount of time spent by the defendant in jail before the plea was entered. Since it usually takes a longer time to get a trial than it does to get a plea taken, the price of a trial is several extra months in jail even for an innocent defendant.

Life magazine recently told a story that makes the point. One defendant, in jail for 10 months, was approached by his lawyer with the suggestion that he enter a guilty plea; he could probably get a one-year sentence which, with credit for time served and good behavior, would put him right out on the street. If he insisted on trial, on the other hand, he would have to spend a few months in jail before he could get one, and would get a stiff sentence as well if he lost. The poor defendant could hardly believe it: "You mean if I'm guilty I get out, but if I'm not innocent I stay in jail?" But that's the way the system works.

That story makes clear, I think, that court backlogs and bargained pleas are both damaging to our system of criminal justice. If we can only reduce backlogs by increasing bargains, it's hard to see what we gain. Criminal trials are too valuable to sacrifice for the sake of efficiency.

But there may be other matters that could be removed from the courts at far less cost to society. Automobile negligence cases come immediately to mind. Or Congress—and the state legislatures—could cut down on the judicial burden by providing more efficacious means of challenging criminal prosecutions under statutes that are unconstitutional on their face. At present, it seems that the only way to challenge an unconstitutional statute is often to violate it and wait for trial.

If we take steps to clear the courts of unessential matters—and more important to do something about the causes of crime rather than its results—we may be able to move toward a world in which we mean what we say, a world in which every defendant who wants one can have what the Constitution is supposed to guarantee him—a fair, speedy, and public trial.

VA EMPLOYEE EDDIE REINMUTH
RETIREES AFTER 52 YEARS OF
SERVICE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a forthcoming retirement in the Veterans' Administration.

Edward Reinmuth, better known as "Eddie," plans to retire the end of May after completing more than 52 years of service in the Veterans' Administration and its predecessor agencies—Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Veterans' Bureau.

Upon graduating from the Washington Business High School in 1919, he started his career as a clerk-stenographer in the Life Insurance Division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance when the agency was scattered in various buildings in Washington, D.C. He moved with the agency into the present Central Office, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., then known as the Arlington Building—when it opened in 1920.

Eddie was too young to serve in World War I and was rejected for service in World War II for physical disability—so it is believed that he is the first employee to actually serve all 52 years in this agency alone.

After working in the Insurance Division in many capacities, he decided to study law. He graduated from Columbus University Law School in 1934 and was admitted to practice before the District of Columbia Bar the same year. He successfully passed the adjudicator's examination and was appointed an adjudicator in the Dependents Claims Service in 1935.

This service handled claims for death compensation and pension filed by widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of the Civil War, the Indian wars, the Spanish-American War, World War I and peacetime service.

After serving as claims authorizer, legal consultant and section chief, he was designated in charge of establishing, staffing, and maintaining dependents and beneficiaries claims divisions in the 13 branch offices of the VA, which were created in 1946 by Gen. Omar Bradley, then Administrator, and in which all claims for death benefits, including insurance, were adjudicated.

When the branch offices were reorganized in 1949, Eddie headed the supervision of death claims activities in the 13 newly established district offices. He actively participated in the supervision of these offices by personal visits and in 1955 assisted in consolidating them into three offices—Philadelphia, Denver, and St. Paul.

He also supervised the preparation of guidelines and other instructional material for use by the RO's and presided over several training sessions for adjudication officers who would be responsible for the death claims work.

Eddie was promoted to the position of

Assistant to former VA Administrator, W. J. Driver when Mr. Driver was Director of the Compensation and Pension Service. He served in that same capacity under former Directors A. W. Stratton, A. W. Farmer, and J. C. Peckarsky, and now under J. T. Taaffe, Jr., present Director of Compensation, Pension and Education Service.

Eddie is one of the few native Washingtonians who has served his entire career in VA Central Office.

BETHEL FLOOD CONTROL

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, there is a serious threat to the city of Bethel that I believe deserves our immediate attention. Because of the erosion along the banks of the Kuskokwim River, there is a strong possibility that the river might overflow and cause immeasurable damage to life and property in Bethel.

The Bethel area is the trading center of the Kuskokwim River Basin and is also an important cultural region to the State. Any flood to this area would have not only a great effect on the people of Bethel but also on the entire western region.

The Alaska State Legislature is keenly aware of this problem and has passed the following joint resolution that I commend to your attention:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 33: RELATING TO FLOOD CONTROL IN THE BETHEL AREA

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas Bethel, Alaska is the trading center of the Kuskokwim River Basin, and is in all ways important as a cultural and regional center; and

Whereas a major threat to the continued existence of Bethel and the safety of its citizens is the continued erosion of the Kuskokwim River banks which prevent flooding of the area; and

Whereas major structural measures to prevent the banks from eroding are essential at the earliest possible time in order to remove this imminent threat to Bethel and its citizens; and

Whereas a recent report by the Corps of Engineers recognized the serious nature of the problem existing at Bethel, but declined to fund a corrective project for the reason that the necessary structural measures were not economically feasible;

Be it resolved that the Seventh Alaska Legislature considers the protection of the Bethel area citizens and their property of the highest priority and urgently requests that the Corps of Engineers and the United States Congress seek and provide adequate funding for a Corps of Engineers project in the Bethel area to alleviate the existing disaster potential occasioned by the erosion of the banks of the Kuskokwim River.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to Lieutenant General F. J. Clarke, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army; the Honorable Jennings Randolph, U.S. Senator and Chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee; the Honorable George H. Fallon, U.S. Representative and Chairman of the House Public Works Committee; the Honorable Allen J. Ellender, U.S. Senator and Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable George H. Mahon, U.S. Representative and Chairman of the House Appropriations

Committee; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

LT. JOHN E. O'NEILL, VIETNAM VETERAN, SEEKS PRIVILEGE OF TESTIFYING BEFORE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Senate Foreign Relations Committee provided a forum, with television coverage, for former Navy Lt. John Kerry to present his views about the war in Vietnam. Mr. Kerry, a leader of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, was in Washington as a protester.

I recently received a copy of a letter, the original of which was sent to the Senate committee, written by Navy Lt. John E. O'Neill, a constituent of mine, in which he requested the committee to grant him the same privilege as that accorded to Mr. Kerry.

It is assumed the committee will grant the request. From reading Lieutenant O'Neill's letter it is apparent that he is eminently well qualified to discuss the same subject matter as was presented by Mr. Kerry. They served in the same mission. Both were decorated. It happens, however, that their views are diametrically opposed.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of Lieutenant O'Neill's letter to the Senate committee. It follows:

APRIL 26, 1971.

DEAR SIR: I am currently a Lieutenant in the United States Navy stationed at the NROTC Unit, Holy Cross College. I have submitted my resignation from the Naval Service and it has been accepted. I will revert to the inactive reserves on June 4, 1971.

I graduated from the Naval Academy in June 1967. I spent most of the period from August 1967 to May 1969 on board a small minesweeper, the USS *Woodpecker*, an Operation Market Time in the waters of the Republic of Vietnam. From May 1969 until May 1970, I was attached to Coastal Divisions 11 and 13. I received two Bronze Stars for heroism and various other decorations.

On April 22, 1971, Mr. John Kerry appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate to testify on the views of Vietnam veterans concerning the course of the war in Southeast Asia. His testimony purported to represent the prevailing view of veterans, namely the United States aid to the Republic of Vietnam should end immediately.

My qualifications to speak on the war are the same as Mr. Kerry's. As a matter of fact, I was assigned to the same organization (Coastal Division 11) while I was in Vietnam. In addition, I had one uncle killed in World War II (Lt. Crane, USN); one uncle killed in the Korean War (LCDR Vogel, USN); one cousin killed on the USS *Scorpion* SN Frankie). Unlike Mr. Kerry, I would not presume to speak for the dead. (Including some nine members of the class of 1967 at the Naval Academy). However, my father (Rear Admiral E. J. O'Neill, USN, Retired) and three of my brothers (Brian, Edward,

and Michael) are veterans. For them and myself, I would like to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in favor of the Nixon policy on the conduct of the war.

I have never joined any veteran's organization and I never will. Nor have father or brothers joined any such organization. We like to speak for ourselves. I believe that my views are far more in line with those of the average veteran than Mr. Kerry's. I think as a matter of justice and equity, I should be allowed to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, for after all, the United States has always been the forum of the people.

I will be in Washington in June and will be happy to testify at any time. I request your assistance in gaining the right to testify. I believe that a combined total of forty-three active service years in the United States Navy, spanning three wars, merit a favorable consideration of this request.

My current mailing address is:
Lt. John E. O'Neill, 717911, NROTC Unit, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts 01610.

After June 4, I may be reached:
c/o Rear Admiral E. J. O'Neill, USN (Ret.), Post Office Box 6012, San Antonio, Texas.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. O'NEILL,
Lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE POLICY STATEMENT

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the State of Israel requires the steadfast support of the United States as never before. Those of us in Congress would do well to keep in mind the fact that Israel is a nation attempting to retain her security against the threat of annihilation, which is a threat strengthened by the Arab-Soviet bloc.

In this context, I believe it is appropriate to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the statement submitted by the Executive Committee of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee to its 12th annual policy conference in Washington. The statement was adopted in Washington on April 29.

I include the article as follows:

THE GOAL

The goal in the Middle East is peace. A genuine and lasting peace can be achieved through negotiations between the parties directly concerned. A peace between sovereign states cannot be imposed by the Great Powers and its durability cannot be contingent on their intervention or guarantees.

Four years after the six-day war, the Arab states still reject a negotiated peace with Israel. While Egypt professed to offer peace in its communication to Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, she stated conditions which made peace impossible. Moreover, on April 17, Egypt announced her readiness to join with Libya and Syria in a new federation which, inconsistent with Egypt's earlier offer, reaffirmed the 1967 Khartoum formula of "no negotiation, no recognition and no peace" with Israel. Fortified by Soviet support and by the position of the Great Powers on territorial issues, the Arab states are encouraged to believe that the Great Powers will ulti-

mately impose a settlement which will force Israel back to the pre-1967 demarcation lines, exposing her to renewed attack.

The Government of the United States can play a major role in preventing a new war and in promoting a negotiated peace which will lead to stability and security for all states in the area.

The Arms Race

The Soviet Union has expanded its presence and influence by deploying weapons and military personnel in Arab states and by spearheading a diplomatic offensive against Israel. The Soviet Union intensifies its pressures by continually providing Egypt with the most sophisticated planes and artillery in its arsenal. Once again, as always in the past, the Soviet Union is setting the pace in the Middle East arms race.

In mid-1970 President Nixon announced that Israel would receive the weapons she needed to defend herself and that the balance of power would be maintained, and he recognized Israel's need for "defensible" borders.

This strong stand was widely supported in Congress.

We welcome this crucial decision, which helped to persuade Egypt that she could not bring about Israel's destruction.

We commend our Government's determination not to permit an arms imbalance. It is essential that our Government continue to provide Israel with military supplies to enable her to deter renewed aggression.

We also urge our Government to give sympathetic consideration to Israel's economic needs which arise from the War of Attrition waged against her by the Arab states, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union.

Geography and security

We regret that the United States accedes to Egypt's position that Israel must withdraw to the old Egypt-Palestine international frontier, abandoning territories which have served as bases for Egyptian aggression.

Israel believes that she must have the security that geography can provide; but the United States is asking Israel to accept most of the Arab boundary demands and to entrust her security to international "guarantees"—which proved so valueless in the past.

Our Government has stated that the UN Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, which calls for secure and recognized boundaries, neither bars nor endorses the pre-June 1967 armistice lines. Yet its proposals are tantamount to an endorsement of those precarious frontiers. Our Government has frequently stated its opposition to an imposed peace. Yet the procedure it has adopted is tantamount to imposition and impedes attainment of a negotiated peace.

Our Government should reject pressures on Israel which would force her to surrender to Arab terms. A peace-at-any-price solution, imposed by the Great Powers, has proved to be a prelude to war in the past.

We appeal to our Government to reconsider its stand on territorial issues in order to enable Israel and the Arab states to negotiate freely and to establish agreed and secure boundaries.

The United States should work to obtain withdrawal of Soviet military forces and oppose any arrangements legitimizing their presence, which constitutes a threat to the survival and independence of all the states in the region.

We believe that all outstanding issues between the Israelis and the Arabs can be resolved by peace treaties obligating the parties to each other and leading to:

Peace.

The establishment of secure and recognized boundaries and demilitarized zones.

Freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran.

Resettlement and compensation for refugees, Arab and Jewish.

Preservation of the unity of Jerusalem with free access to the Holy Places for all faiths.

Effective controls to end terrorism and hijacking.

The end of economic warfare, boycotts and blockades.

Deescalation of the arms race.

Much will depend on a firm and consistent policy by the United States. The United States and Israel share a common objective: the achievement of an Arab-Israel peace contributing to the welfare of both Arabs and Jews.

BACKGROUND

In 1957, after the Sinal war, our Government joined with the Soviet Union in insisting that Israel withdraw from all territories occupied in that conflict without requiring the Arab states to negotiate a peace settlement.

That action led to the 1967 war.

The Arab post-1967 strategy has been to create a mood of panic and crisis—a peace-at-any-price or war-at-any-moment psychology—to intimidate the Great Powers into forcing Israel's surrender as in 1957.

Yielding to this pressure, our Government early in 1969 agreed to join Big Four talks to draw guidelines for a settlement.

Our Committee criticized this procedure on the grounds that:

1. The Arab governments would rely on the Great Powers to impose a settlement, thus relieving them of the need to negotiate a peace treaty.

2. The United States would be subjected to pressures to agree to compromises at Israel's expense.

These apprehensions were confirmed.

As the Big Power talks began—and encouraged by them—Egypt renounced the UN cease-fire and opened up her fourth war against Israel, the War of Attrition.

Late in 1969, Secretary of State William P. Rogers announced proposals for a settlement which went a long way to meet Soviet-Arab demands.

While our Government continued to adhere to the fundamental principle of "no withdrawal without peace," these proposals weakened Israel's negotiating position.

Boundaries

The United States has called categorically for Israel's complete withdrawal from Sinai to the old international frontier, with demilitarized zones and with international arrangements at Sharm el-Sheikh to secure navigation through the Straits of Tiran.

Abandonment by Israel of Sharm el-Sheikh would enable Egypt to close the Straits of Tiran as she did in 1967 and blockade Israel's ports of access to the Red Sea, the Orient and Africa.

The U.S. proposal on Sinai sets a precedent which encourages the Arab states to demand that Syria's old international frontier also be restored. This would return the Golan range to Syrian forces, from which they could resume attacks on Israel's Galilee and Jordan Valley villages and renew their schemes to divert the northern sources of Israel's water supply.

In the case of Jordan, our Government has called for a return approximately to the former armistice lines—with only "insubstantial" changes.

These proposals make it impossible for Israel freely to negotiate secure and recognized boundaries.

The issue here is Israel's security. It is not territorial expansionism by Israel. Return to the 1967 lines means retreat to 1967 close-range exposure to terrorism, siege, renewal of attack and war.

While continuing to maintain that Jerusalem should be a unified city and opposing arbitrary return to its partition, our Govern-

ment has proposed that Jordan become a partner in its administration—a form of condominium or binational rule which is neither feasible nor equitable. Jordan has no just claim to Jerusalem and merits no reward for her record there. She seized the Old City by defiant aggression in 1948. She expelled the Jews, desecrated their synagogues and cemeteries, and denied access to the Holy Places to Christian and Moslem Israelis—as well as to Jews.

Refugees

The United States has proposed that Israel permit the Arab refugees to opt for repatriation to Israel or resettlement in Arab lands with an annual quota to be fixed between Israel and Jordan.

Mass repatriation would mean the destruction of Israel by a hostile fifth column. The U.S. proposal goes beyond past UN resolutions and feeds irredentist opposition to the exchange of populations and resettlement, the only realistic solution. The proposal ignores world experience in solving other vast refugee problems in that way.

The Arab war against Israel created two refugee problems.

More than 500,000 Jews were forced to leave Arab lands, where they were the victims of discrimination and oppression. Most of them were resettled in Israel.

A similar number of Arabs fled what became Israel in 1948. They fled because Arab leaders destroyed their right to self-determination by starting a war against the UN resolution that would have established an Arab Palestine. While many of these refugees have been settled in other Arab lands, the majority have been denied resettlement and have been exploited as hostages by Arab governments in their war against Israel.

Arab governments must assume their share of responsibility for solving the refugee problem. Arab refugees must be resettled in Arab lands where there is room and opportunity for them to lead useful lives. Israel has announced that she is prepared, even in advance of a general settlement, to enter into international discussions for the development of a five-year plan to resolve the refugee problem with international and regional aid.

The Cease-Fire

Initially, all the parties rejected the Rogers plan, but when it became apparent that Egypt was losing her War of Attrition, Egypt, Jordan and the Soviet Union changed their position. In the summer of 1970, they accepted the U.S. proposal for a cease-fire and standstill agreement as a preliminary to the resumption of talks under the auspices of UN Envoy Gunnar V. Jarring.

Israel feared that a temporary cease-fire would undermine the original 1967 UN unlimited cease-fire and provide a respite to facilitate a Soviet-Egyptian missile build-up near the Suez Canal. Nevertheless, Israel agreed to the U.S. initiative.

Israel's fears that the standstill provision would not be enforced were, unfortunately, well-founded. The Soviet Union and Egypt swiftly violated the agreement, and, despite Israel protests, they installed a massive missile system in the prohibited zone. Israel refused to participate further in the Jarring talks unless the violations were rectified.

In January 1971, although the violations were not rectified, Israel agreed to return to the talks at the urging of the United States and Ambassador Jarring resumed his mission. The UN envoy then adopted the Rogers proposals. He called on Egypt to agree to peace with Israel; but at the same time he called on Israel to agree to total withdrawal from Sinai. Egypt's response was to mention the word "peace" in connection with Israel, but setting forth conditions that precluded peace. She declined to negotiate unless Israel agreed to total withdrawal. Israel declared that she would negotiate on all issues including boundaries but without preconditions, and stated

her position that she could not withdraw to the 1967 lines.

Egypt revealed the insincerity of her ostensible desire for a settlement by including reservations and escape clauses.

Egypt called for the withdrawal of Israel from all the territories, including those claimed by Jordan and Syria. There was the unrealistic proposal that demilitarized zones be astride the borders in equal distances. There were ambiguous reservations on undertakings to ensure freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran, such as Egypt has used to justify the denial of navigation in the past. There was a call for Big Four troops, which would put the Soviet Union on Israel's frontier.

The spurious nature of Egypt's talk of peace became demonstrably clear on April 17, when the announcement of a new Arab federation of Egypt, Libya and Syria included a revival of their 1967 declaration of no negotiations, no recognition, no peace with Israel.

If the Arab rulers were sincere, they would be willing to negotiate all the terms of the agreement by which all the peoples in the area must live.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps some day new Arab leaders will rise to repudiate negative doctrines, to abandon past enmities and to participate in a new era of cooperation which will help all the peoples of the Middle East. The death of President Nasser may have liberated the people of Egypt from past servitude to pan-Arab slogans. And King Hussein has overcome the terrorist forces which constituted a major obstacle to an Arab-Israeli peace.

It has taken Egypt and Jordan 23 years to speak of peace with Israel. Israel has always called for peace. Given additional time, Egypt may yet come to recognize that she must be ready to make a contribution to a fair and just peace and that she cannot expect Israel to surrender to her ultimata.

We are confident that whatever differences there may be between the United States and Israel over tactics can be resolved, as have others in the past, for there is a basic understanding and friendship between the United States and Israel, an understanding which rests on their shared commitment to democracy and freedom—an understanding crucial to Israel's development and survival and consistent with the highest interests of the U.S.

A CRITICAL CHOICE ON WELFARE REFORM

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the time is rapidly approaching when Congress will be voting on alternatives for welfare reform. As this most important decision is made, I believe that it is important to ponder its significance. The basic decision is whether we are willing to devote our resources to giving people another chance. I believe that this Nation owes its citizens opportunity, not a guaranteed income. Richard A. Nenneman in the May 1 Christian Science Monitor, speaks cogently to this point, and I commend his article to your attention:

TREND OF THE ECONOMY—THE QUALITY OF WELFARE: MUST IT BE RESTRAINED?

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

This is not a column about the economy this week, or this month, or even the rest of

this year. The nation appears to be moving ahead again, and while the experts argue about the speed of that forward motion, let us look at a longer-range problem that troubles all Americans—the welfare muddle and the related problem of our attitude toward individual responsibility.

Both are more than economic matters. They reflect our view of society and of man. But how we resolve them will have a profound effect on how the American economy develops from now till the end of the century.

In the hundreds of letters and comments in response to a recent page in this newspaper on the federal budget, there was this comment from a woman in Pennsylvania: "I am an old lady, 81. A proud American, of double pioneering background, back to 1624. Courage, enterprise, willingness to work—all this must be retained in our country. Things must not become too cheap and easy."

And on a question about federalizing welfare, she added, "More than enough is being done. The birds on the tree must use their bright eyes to get their bugs and worms or else. The present system is ruinous to character and will be ruinous to a country as mighty as ours has been."

She was not against government spending per se. She wanted to go along with the space program, for instance: "The universe out there seems full of possibility."

But this woman's doubts about welfare—from whatever level of government—reflect the fears of probably millions of Americans that money got too easily will ruin the fiber of any people. Yet, most of these same people are humane and would admit that every man deserves something approaching an equal chance in life.

What is difficult for many of us to see is how completely the nation has moved away from its 19th-century moorings, which were on the farms and in small-city life. It was easier for an individual to think of himself as someone who mattered. If he had problems, there was also someone around who saw he had a problem and could help him.

Of course some of the mythology of the rugged individualist was overdone. But the American experience has in actuality been built on the basis of more individuals taking their destiny into their own hands, on a sturdy self-reliance. This is the element that we at least think makes us different from other nations.

The problem today, as all over the world mankind becomes urbanized, is to reconcile this desire for individualism with the fact that in the big cities we are necessarily all dependent on one another. None of us can expect to survive for long in any degree of civilized personal existence if our neighbors feel they are unjustly deprived either of their share or their chance. And our "neighbor" today may literally be millions of people, which calls for a great adjustment in thinking from the kind of neighborhood—and the kind of personal concern—associated with small-town America.

The question to be resolved about welfare is not whether everyone deserves something approaching an even chance in life. Our society is founded on that proposition. The question is whether there is any feasible road besides what fits the general description of social democracy for an urbanized industrial society.

Is America following the example of the Western European nations, only more slowly? Or is there another way, one that is humane and does recognize changed social conditions, but also is in harmony with the special elements of the American past? This, I think, is the basic question Americans are wrestling with as they try to solve the welfare dilemma.

GAO REPORT: MORE COMPETITION IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENTS FOUND POSSIBLE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a report issued in March of this year by the General Accounting Office. The report, entitled "More Competition in Emergency Defense Procurements Found Possible," deserves our careful consideration because it brings to light a serious source of wasteful spending on the part of the Department of Defense.

The Armed Services Procurement Act stipulates clearly that proposals be solicited from the largest possible number of suppliers when a negotiated procurement exceeds \$2,500. The law makes exception for time limitations when the procurement is deemed to be of an emergency nature.

During fiscal year 1968, the Department of Defense negotiated procurements classified as "emergency" totaling \$5.4 billion, 72 percent of which were issued on a noncompetitive basis. Although the actual dollar amount of so-called emergency procurements declined from \$6 billion in fiscal year 1967 to \$2.5 billion in fiscal year 1970, the percentage of noncompetitive procurements remained at approximately the fiscal year 1968 level.

The GAO, in preparing its report selected 54 contracts valued at \$33 million which had been awarded noncompetitively. After detailed study, the GAO concluded that 36 of these contracts should have been awarded on a competitive basis because other suppliers were available who could have delivered the requested items at lower prices within similar time limits. These 36 contracts amounted to a total of \$31.5 million.

On the basis of this representative sampling, it is reasonable to conclude that the Department of Defense has wasted tens of millions of dollars each year by negotiating too many contracts on a noncompetitive basis.

I would like to cite the following example which is illustrative of the many instances of noncompetitive contracts which were covered in the report: The Army purchased 812 multiplexers at a cost of \$3.24 million. Supplier "A" was eliminated from consideration for the contract because the Army determined that supplier "A" could not begin deliveries until July 1968, one month later than requested. However, supplier "B" who was awarded the contract, was given until August of 1968 to begin deliveries. If competition had been obtained for that contract, as much as \$1.65 million could have been saved on the \$3.24 million contract. In other words, the costs could have been cut in half.

Mr. Speaker, instances of unjustified waste such as that which I have described seem to be proliferating unchecked within the Department of Defense. There is obviously a lack of pro-

cedural guidelines within the Pentagon for determining when a contract is of an emergency nature, and if it is, whether that precludes awarding the contract on a competitive basis.

These consistent violations of the Armed Services Procurement Act must be halted, and I call on the Department of Defense to institute a fixed procedure for the awarding of contracts on a non-competitive basis.

First, the Pentagon should determine how much more quickly one contractor can deliver the requirements than other contractors can. Second, an estimate should be done on how much additional cost this would involve. And, third, a statement from the requesting agency should be required which specifically explains why the materials have to be received on the date requested.

This sort of procedure would be both easy and quick and could lead to savings of a significant amount of money each year. It is disturbing that the Pentagon has allowed such an important determination to be made in such an arbitrary and haphazard manner for so long.

I would like to underscore the report of the General Accounting Office and urge the Department of Defense to strict compliance of the Armed Services Procurement Act at the earliest possible date.

ON CHOKING OFF THE HEROIN TRADE

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues, Congressmen RANGEL, HAMILTON and DELLUMS, are on the right course in the approach they have taken, through the introduction of H.R. 7822, to cutting off the domestic supply of hard narcotics—particularly heroin—at the source.

The plant from which heroin is derived, the opium poppy, is not grown in the United States, so our entire supply must be imported, mainly from the Middle East. In the countries where opium is produced, controls vary widely. Those governments that have been reluctant to exercise adequate controls might do so if threatened with loss of their U.S. aid, as provided by H.R. 7822.

I particularly applaud the language in the bill that would make the withholding of such assistance automatic, rather than leave it to the discretion of the Executive, if a country failed to take action to prevent the smuggling of drugs into the United States.

Experience has taught us that when given a choice, the executive branch is notably reluctant to use authority mandated by Congress for reducing or suspending foreign aid. A case in point are the 1968 amendments to the Fishermen's Protective Act, which directed the Secretary of State to "take such actions as he may deem appropriate" to recover fines

and other penalties illegally extracted from our fishing fleet by foreign governments. If a claim were not honored within 120 days, an equivalent amount of aid was to be withheld from the offending government.

But what has happened? Despite a series of seizures that should have triggered action by the State Department—nothing. The Department's lawyers have interpreted the language as a polite request, rather than a forceful mandate from Congress, and Ecuador and Peru continue to take in and shake down our fishing boats with relative impunity.

It may be the Executive can fully grasp the intent of Congress only when it is cut out of the decisionmaking process altogether in legislation of this type.

Our colleagues deserve credit for wording H.R. 7822 so as to remove opportunities for the Executive to thwart the will of Congress. However the bill does—and wisely, in my view—contain an escape hatch, for the President may ask Congress to allow aid to continue if he deems it in the "overriding national interest." But the onus would be on the Executive to show why the assistance should not be rescinded, and termination of the aid would be automatic unless Congress accepted an administration appeal and granted a specific waiver.

The heroin problem is ubiquitous. No section of the country is spared. In my own county of San Diego, it is believed that as many as 2,000 persons are addicted. In 1969, in San Diego, there were 4,791 arrests for hard narcotics violations. County officials estimate well over \$100 million is stolen annually, in cash and property, to enable addicts to support their habit.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 7822, and urge its early consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

STATUE OF BOB BARTLETT PLACED IN ROTUNDA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, in the rotunda of the Capitol there now stands a statue of a most important figure in the achievement of Alaska's statehood—Bob Bartlett.

Last week, on April 27, 1971, the people of Alaska made their first contribution to Statuary Hall in the form of a bronze statue of Bob Bartlett, territorial Delegate to Congress and Alaska's first senior Senator.

The statue is the work of Felix G. W. deWeldon who spent many hours with Mrs. Bartlett while working on the statue.

It was she—

Mr. deWeldon said—

who helped me to show her husband's sensitivity.

Mrs. Bartlett came from Alaska to at-

tend the ceremony in the rotunda and to unveil the statue of her husband. Also present for the unveiling were the two Bartlett daughters.

Bob Bartlett spent so much of his productive life in Washington that it is fitting that his likeness will remain here always. He first came to the Congress in 1945 as a nonvoting Delegate from the Territory of Alaska. Many of you were his colleagues until 1959 when he became Alaska's first senior Senator. He remained in the Senate until his death on December 11, 1968.

It is with pride that Alaskans have honored their first citizen to be commemorated in Statuary Hall. The son of Klondike pioneers, Bob Bartlett seemed to embody the best qualities of a new land; pride, energy, and an ability to dream of things yet to come.

I hope that the millions of people who will visit the Bartlett statue will take the time to look at his face because it is one of warmth and compassion. We all would do well to remember that a capacity for friendship is the greatest of gifts and Bob Bartlett had that in abundance. His statue is a lasting reminder of his many friends and of their appreciation and love.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL VOLUNTEERS EARN SALUTE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the work of volunteers, who put in long hours with no pay at our Veterans' Administration hospitals across the country, should be given wider notice.

I am afraid that many of us and our fellow Americans simply take this marvelous effort for granted.

On February 22, 1971, the work of these volunteers was noted in special ceremonies at the Veterans' Administration hospital in my city, Philadelphia.

Some 135 individuals and 47 groups were honored.

Their volunteer service amounted to a minimum total of 23,900 hours.

Many of the individual volunteers are affiliated with various veterans and fraternal groups and these affiliations are indicated by the group's initials in the list which follows. Many of the individual volunteers are not affiliated with these groups. Their names in the following list carry no initials.

I would like to add my heartiest congratulations and thanks to all my fellow Philadelphians who year in and year out give of themselves to this worthiest of efforts and with the unanimous consent of my colleagues here enter their names and honors and the names of the groups also honored in special tribute:

LIST OF HONOREES

HONORABLE MENTION

Regularly Scheduled (RS) Volunteer Workers still active who served during 1970

but not entitled to 100 hour certificates or the next plateau (300, 500, 1,000, etc.) certificates.

Dorothy Bandor
Lavina R. Bardsley, ALA
Albert Beaty
Dolores Bridges, MOCA
Catherine M. Carr, CWVA
Florence Carter, ARC
George Cessna
Anna Clay, IBPOEW
Rose Cloud, SCC
Anna Compton, VFVA
Ethel Corcoran, AMVETS
Richard Croft
Elizabeth Davy, DAR
Eileen F. Grablec
Florence Graham, ALA
Eleanor W. Greene, ALA
Ray Gregory, Masonic Svc. Assn.
Frederick Haas, VVWI
Linda Haentze
Andrew Harkisheimer, American Legion
Clifford L. Hoag, USAAC
Vada Hyde
Lillian M. Jacobs, DAR
Elizabeth Jones, CWV
Jean McC Joyce
Louis Katz, Jewish Welfare Board
Ethel Kehm, AMVETS Aux.
James Kehm, AMVETS
Helen King, American Legion
Joseph R. Klotz, Jewish Welfare Board
Ann Lavelle
Harry Lincoln
Inez Lincoln
Mabel Dotsen
Margaret Lippincott, AMVETS Aux.
Paul Luciw
Florence Martin, AMVETS Aux.
Henrietta McCloskey, AMVETS Aux.
Mae McElvaney, VFW Aux.
Ann McHugh, American Gold Star Mothers
Anna McKenna, VFW Aux.
Ann Miller, Jewish War Veterans Aux.
Sarah Myers, American Legion
Fay Morgan, IBPOEW
Jane Olson, ARC
Joseph Poduslo
Michael Radvansky, 315th Infantry
Emma Reutlinger, DAR
Catherine Rotay, ALA
Samuel Schiff, Jewish War Veterans
Wilson Shive, VVWI
Margaret Shockley
Meyer Squires
Paul S. Stewart, Masonic Svc. Assn.
Capt. K. Strehle, Salvation Army
Anna Suhar, CWVA
William Toy, VVWI
Jean Lyons Tustin, DAV Aux.
Anna M. Vito
Katherine Wagner
Lelah M. Weiss, ARC
Emeline M. Wiggins, IBPOEW
Beatrice Williams
Lida Wright
Jacob Zaslav, DAV

CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION—100 HOURS

Mary Abrams, Jewish War Veterans.
Louise Alberts, DAR.
Neta R. Anderson, DAR.
Timothy Babbage.
Margaret Barnes, C.D. of America.
Ethel Bischoff, VFVA.
Mark Braunlick.
Hilda Brophy.
Kathryn Brownse.
Kathryn Cannon.
Edith Carbaugh, ALA.
William Clark, AMVETS.
Anna Coady, AMVETS Aux.
Amelia Di Prima, C.D. of America.
Anna Dugan, C.D. of America.
Elizabeth Frick, AMVETS Aux.
John A. Frick, AMVETS.
Katherine Gormley, ACSH.
Horace Hopkins, American Legion.
Dorothy Jones, AGSM.
Kathryn Kilpatrick, DAR.
Ernest P. Knorr, Masonic Svc. Assn

Howard Lambert, American Legion.
Anne C. Lauff, American War Mothers.
Anne Marie Longfellow, ARC.
Katherine Padula, C.D. of America.
Marion E. Roberts, DAR.
Prudence Sheperla, VVWI.
Margaret Siegman.
Ralph Twiford, Navy Mothers Club.
Antoinette Vermillion, ARC.
Elizabeth Weatherby, AGSM.
Jennie Weintraub, Jewish War Veterans.
Virginia Wood, AGSM.

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT—300 HOURS

Walter Bardsley, Masonic Svc. Assn.
Helen Doris Braun.
Vincent De Paul.
Donald E. Digian, American Legion.
Francis Fager.
Bettyann Helene Funk, AGSM.
Sarah Gooddell.
Helen Hoefler, Navy Mothers Club.
Vada Hyde.
Margaret Miller.
May Richards.
Dorothy Rose.
Pauline Sitkin.
Isaac Smith, Jewish War Veterans.
Florence Toupe.

CERTIFICATE OF OUSTANDING SERVICE—
500 HOURS

Elizabeth Aro, ALA
Alma Day, Marine Corps League
Carol E. Oakes, AWM
Emily O'Toole, AWM
Catherine Thompson, AWM

CERTIFICATE OF DEVOTION TO VOLUNTEER
DUTY—1,000 HOURS

Esther R. Biddle, ALA
Paul J. Biddle, AMVETS
Rose Gorman, CWVA
Marie Kenney, ALA
Florence Killion
Mary Olsen, DAVA
Tillie Rose
William Tadley
Frances Urwiler, ALA
Bernadette Ward, ALA
Mae Weisgrow, DAVA

VA BRONZE PIN—1,750 HOURS

James Doonan, AL
Eleanor Kilpatrick, MOPHA

VA SILVER EMBLEM—2,500 HOURS

Agnes Hausler, VFW
Fae McElvaney, VFVA

VA GOLD EMBLEM—5,000 HOURS

Edward Johnson

100 PERCENT AT VAVS MEETINGS—FEBRUARY,
MAY, SEPTEMBER, NOVEMBER 1970

American Gold Star Mothers
American Legion
American Legion Auxiliary
American Overseas Association
American Red Cross
AMVETS
B'nai B'rith Women
Catholic War Veterans Auxiliary
Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary
Jewish War Veterans Auxiliary
Masonic Service Association
Military Order of the Cootie Auxiliary
Military Order of the Purple Heart Aux.
Navy Mothers Club
Supreme Cootiette Club
315th Infantry Association
Veterans of Foreign Wars
Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary
Veterans of World War I
Women's Army Corps Veterans Association
Organizations to receive certificates in recognition of exceptional or continued outstanding service to patients through VAVS:
American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.: Rep: Mrs. Catherine M. Gormley. Dep: Mrs. Elizabeth Nittrouer.
American Legion: Rep. Mr. Samuel J. C. Greene, Dep: Mr. William W. Woolingham.

American Legion Auxiliary: Rep: Mrs. Frank Kenney. Dep: Mrs. Frank Ward.
American Red Cross: Rep: Mrs. Lelah Weiss.

American Overseas Association: Rep: Mrs. Charles Ward. Dep: Miss Ann McCaughey.
American Veterans Committee: Rep: Mrs. Florence Miller. Dep: Mr. Chester Sheets.
American War Mothers: Rep: Mrs. Catherine Thompson. Dep: Mrs. Emily O'Toole.
Amvets: Rep: Mr. James Kehn. Dep: Mrs. Ruby Earle.

Amvets Auxiliary: Rep: Mrs. Ethel Corcoran. Dep: Mrs. Dorothy Gorman.
B'nai B'rith Women: Rep: Mrs. Eugene Glaser. Dep: Mrs. Beatrice Silvers.
BPO Elks of the United States: Rep: Mr. Frank P. Nocitra.

Catholic War Veterans: Rep: Mr. Cheston Hunter. Dep: Mr. Charles J. Parker.
Catholic War Veterans Auxiliary: Rep: Mrs. Rose Gorman.

Daughters of the American Revolution: Rep: Mrs. Earle F. Jacobs. Dep: Mrs. Lawrence Kilpatrick.

Defense Personnel Support Center: Rep. Mr. Samuel Hedd. Dep: Mrs. Emily Keenan.
Disabled American Veterans: Rep: Mr. Jacob Zaslav.

Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary: Rep: Mrs. Mary Olsen. Dep: Mrs. Mae Weisgrow.

40-8 Voiture Locale No. 1, Inc.: Rep: Mr. Elmer R. Confair. Dep: Mr. Max Ochs.

IBPOEW—Department of Veteran Affairs: Rep: Mr. Dennis C. White. Dep: Col. Wm. A. L. Clay. Second Dep: Mrs. Emeline Wiggins. Third Dep: Miss Theanita Cambridge.
Jewish War Veterans: Rep: Mr. Isaac Smith. Dep: Mr. Joseph Goldstein.

Jewish War Veterans Auxiliary: Rep: Mrs. Ann Miller. Dep: Mrs. Mildred Lermack.
Jewish Welfare Board: Rep: Mrs. Milton Gold.

Marine Corps League: Rep. Mrs. Alma M. Day.

Masonic Service Association: Rep: Mr. Paul Stewart. Dep: Mr. Ernest P. Knorr.

Military Order of the Cootie: Rep: Mr. I. Frank Houck.

Military Order of the Cootie Auxiliary: Rep: Mrs. Evelyn Hibberd. Dep: Mrs. Dolores Bridges.

Military Order of the Lady Bugs: Rep: Mrs. Florence E. Miles. Dep: Mrs. Marie V. Nixon.
Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc.: Rep: Mr. James Valentine.

Military Order of the Purple Heart Aux.: Rep: Mrs. Eleanor Kilpatrick. Dep: Mrs. Elizabeth Watson.

Mothers of World War II: Rep. Mrs. Stella Snyder.

National Catholic Community Service: Rep: Mrs. William Dougherty. Dep: Mrs. Catherine Auerwick.

Navy Mothers Club of America, Inc.: Rep: Mrs. Helen Hoefler. Dep: Mrs. Marge D'Ulisse.
Old Guard, City of Philadelphia, Inc.: Rep: Col. Harry S. Burr.

Order of the Eastern Star: Rep. Mrs. Ruth E. Whiteley. Dep: Mrs. Frances Schott. Second Dep: Mrs. Helen G. Daniel.

Reserve Officers' Assn. Ladies' Clubs: Rep: Mrs. Charles Hangsterfer. Dep: Mrs. John Gilmore.

Supreme Cootiette Club: Rep: Mrs. Rose Cloud. Dep: Mrs. Mary McKinley.

The Salvation Army: Rep: Mrs. A/Captain K. Strehle. Dep: Mrs. Mabel Hagerty.
315th Infantry Association: Rep: Mr. Michael Radvansky. Dep: Mr. Cheston Hunter.

United Spanish War Veterans: Rep: Mr. John Lynch. Dep: Mr. J. A. Coleman.

Veterans of Foreign Wars: Rep: Mr. Cassel Wechter. Dep: Mr. Thomas C. Hart.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Aux.: Rep: Mrs. Mae McElvaney. Dep: Mrs. Ann Compton.
Veterans of World War I: Rep: Mr. Wilson Shive. Dep: Mr. William Toy.

W.A.C. Veterans Association: Rep: Mrs. Ann L. Godsho.

HONORABLE MENTION

Brith Sholoh: Rep: Mr. Aaron Goldenberg.
 Dep: Mr. Samuel Winkler.
 Philadelphia, USAAC Post No. 1: Rep: Mr.
 Clifford L. Hoag. Dep: Mr. Charles Carpenter.
 Polish Legion of American Vet. Ladies Aux.:
 Rep: Mrs. Marge Barber. Dep. Mrs. Marion
 Rodemer.
 Veterans of World War I Auxiliary: Rep:
 Mrs. Mary Dougherty. Dep. Mrs. Alma Tracey.

HOW TO STAY ALIVE

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. ZION, Mr. Speaker, great concern is being shown in Congress for the health crisis that our country is facing today. Contributing significantly to this problem are the questionable life styles adopted by average Americans.

The National Institutes of Health on May 4 is presenting "How To Stay Alive," a 1-hour health documentary sponsored by Bristol-Myers Co. This program focuses on our life styles, the impact of our longevity, and even more important how we have altered our daily activities to help achieve normal life spans.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sylvia Porter, who includes specific information concerning the program which I think will be of interest to my colleagues:

"How To Stay Alive", AN NIH DOCUMENTARY
 (By Sylvia Porter)

Test your chances of staying alive:

How often do you exercise? Daily, three times a week, weekends only, rarely or never?

How much do you smoke? Not at all, five cigarettes a day, one-half to a pack, two packs or more?

What's your weight as against your height and age?

What are your cholesterol and triglyceride levels? Your blood pressure?

Do you drink an average of more than three ounces of alcohol daily? Have such between-meal snacks as potato chips, peanuts?

When was your last physical checkup?

The medical bill for circulatory diseases in our country is now soaring past \$6.2 billion a year, an almost unbelievable 10 per cent of our national bill for all illnesses. At the top of all killers in the U.S. are diseases of the heart and blood vessels.

The loss to the nation in terms of income and productivity from deaths caused by heart attacks tops \$1 billion a year, with half of it lost in the top-productive age group of 45-64.

The loss to the nation in terms of income and productivity from persons becoming ill of heart conditions and unable to work tops \$2.6 billion annually, and again the bulk of the loss is in the most productive age group of 45-64.

The economic costs involved in heart and blood vessel diseases alone—not to mention the emotional and other costs—are so vast that any steps which might possibly curb these costs come most properly into the economic sphere. What's more, our costs are jumping instead of sinking. We are actually falling behind other nations in keeping our men alive longer.

Thus, I learned with pleasure that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is presenting a one-hour TV special, "How To Stay

Alive," under the sponsorship of Bristol-Myers Co., Tuesday, May 4, on the ABC-TV network (WTVW-7 in Evansville at 9 p.m. CDT).

The show will demonstrate dangerous activities which shorten our lives and will concentrate on obesity, diet, exercise, smoking, stress, blood fats, blood pressure.

The NIH will also submit its life-extending recommendations to us and our physicians.

As one illustration, you surely are aware of the danger of a high cholesterol level, but the NIH doctors will say this is not the "terrible bugaboo" it has been pictured. New discoveries in another blood fat—triglycerides—have added another warning device, with the two comprising what are called blood lipids. In some patients, "cholesterol was found to be relatively normal, while the blood triglyceride count was dangerously high."

Has your physician ever had your triglyceride count checked? Interpreted it with your cholesterol level?

As another illustration, during the German occupation of Scandinavian countries, when butter, milk and cream became scarce, the incidence of coronary artery diseases went way down. But a NIH doctor will explain, the disease rate went way back up after World War II when these foods again became abundant—"pretty good proof, on a large scale, that there is something to dietary control."

As a third illustration, stress aggravates high blood pressure and circulating blood fats—high risk factors in heart diseases—but exercise lowers them. And a NIH physician will add, "Sex is also a very good exercise."

We can't do anything about any adverse family histories we may have, but we can do a great deal about every life-shortening activity or life-lengthening hint I've excerpted here from the coming show. Just by honestly answering the sample quiz in this column, you're helping yourself to stay alive.

NONCHEMICAL CONTROL OF PESTS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. OBEY, Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in the past few weeks regarding \$12.7 billion in funds appropriated by the Congress for various projects which have been "frozen" by the administration. But there is no money which has been frozen which is of greater importance to the protection of our environment than \$1 million in funds which were earmarked for use in research on nonchemical methods of pest control.

Just about a year ago when the 1971 agriculture appropriation bill was before the Congress, Senator NELSON and I discussed at length in the Senate and the House the need for additional funds in that budget for research in the non-chemical control of pests.

We pointed out that according to Department of Agriculture officials additional funding totaling \$4.4 million "could be utilized effectively" in 1971 for such research, and additional funding of \$2.6 million could be utilized for staffing several pesticide research laboratories.

When indicating that they could effectively use additional money to do research in the nonchemical control of

pests—which includes the use of sterilized males, light and sound, integrated control techniques, and biological controls—the Department outlined the types of research they could conduct with those additional funds.

The Congress responded by adding over \$4 million not requested in the Department budget for the staffing and equipping of these labs and \$1 million for increased research to develop methods of pest control that do not involve conventional insecticides.

Some weeks ago I wrote to the USDA in an effort to find out what had been done with that \$1 million in increased funds. To my dismay I was told that "in view of the overall Federal financial situation" this \$1 million was "placed in budgetary reserve."

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that decision to freeze these funds. Frankly, I consider it a shortsighted action and a foolish mistake. It brings into question whether this administration is truly committed, as it says it is, to reducing the pesticide burden in the environment and to limiting the adverse effects of pesticides on nontarget organisms.

There are other indications too which make me question their understanding of the importance of this matter.

In testimony before a House committee a few weeks ago, for example, Under Secretary of Agriculture Campbell said that biological controls for insect pests have met "relatively meager success." While allowing that "several interesting leads" with regard to sex attractants and hormones for insect control have been made, he said "at present they are hardly more than leads."

I might add that the first report of the President's Council on Environmental Quality also gave scant—and in my view superficial treatment—to the subject of alternatives to the use of pesticides. That report seemed to ignore the breakthroughs which are made public almost daily in various kinds of nonchemical control for pests, including the development of a new breed of genetically flawed mosquitoes which could in time wipe out infestations of normal but disease-carrying mosquitoes.

The administration and its Council on Environmental Quality seem most skeptical about nonchemical means of pest control because such means now available remain relatively small in number.

But as the Mrak report on pesticides and their relationship to environmental health pointed out:

The prime reason for the slow development of these alternative methods is that generally this research requires a great expenditure of time and money.

Furthermore, said the report:

This aspect of pest control deserves greater attention and the research effort should be both encouraged and supported.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about this "freeze" because of the particular projects which would have been carried out had these research funds been made available as the Congress intended.

To quote directly from correspondence I received from the Office of the Administrator, Agricultural Research Service:

The non-chemical control funds would have been used to conduct large-scale field tests of biological, cultural, and genetic techniques that have been promising in laboratory or small field tests. Specifically, the tests would have involved sterile insect releases of the tobacco budworm, a destructive pest of cotton, and the corn earworm (bollworm on cotton), as well as cultural control of the green peach aphid and integrated control of the codling moth.

The importance of this particular research can be seen when it is viewed in light of a report by the American Chemical Society last year which indicated that the eradication of just three pests—the boll weevil, the boll worm and the codling moth—could reduce the amount of insecticides applied annually in the United States by an estimated 40 percent.

I might point out that while some research is being carried out to control the cotton boll weevil with nonchemical means, other research to gain knowledge about the control of this pest with nonchemical means has been put off. The tobacco budworm has developed a resistance to insecticides and alternative biological controls are urgently needed. The codling moth continues to be destructive to several types of fruit crops.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point is clear: The administration is withholding funds for research on controlling by nonchemical means the very pests for which we now use a major portion of all insecticides. Clearly this means that unless research on a major scale is begun now—including that which would have been carried out had this freeze not been put into effect—we cannot look forward to any day soon when we will have at hand alternative means to control certain pests which we attempt to control today with thousands of pounds of chemicals. Developments such as this, Mr. Speaker, emphasize my concern that we will not have alternative means of pest control available for the time when our farmers are told they must stop using one or another pesticide.

As the Farmers Union noted in a newsletter some time ago:

Farmers, dependent upon pesticides on the production of crops, are caught in the middle of an emotion-laden controversy in which some say pesticides should be banned, and others say they are perfectly safe.

There is "urgency" in the matter said that farm organization, and one of their recommendations for seeking a solution is that research budgets "be doubled or tripled."

Less than 2 months ago the Environmental Protection Agency issued notices of cancellation for three new chemicals—aldrin, dieldrin, and mirex. Many studies indicate these substances have been found to be harmful to the environment. If these findings are correct, their use ought to be prohibited.

But what happens when more and more of these chemicals are barred from use, and no alternative means of controlling their target victims is available. I doubt that those concerned about our farmers or those concerned about the environment, and I consider myself in both categories—urge the prompt facing of that dilemma.

We can avoid it. But we would not unless the Congress and the administration

take seriously the need for increased research, expensive though it may be, to control pests without environmentally damaging chemicals. The Congress last session took a step forward in this regard when it voted to increase by \$1 million the funds available for such research. Unfortunately that forward-looking and prudent action was frustrated by the administration's decision to freeze this badly needed money.

The administration ought to look at this one again and raise its sights a few yards and release this money now.

A BALANCED LOOK AT THE FBI

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the editorial pages of the Nation's newspapers have for several weeks been smoking with broadsides aimed either at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, or at vocal critics of the agency. Few controversies have been marked by such partisan and emotional commentary—on both sides.

Last Sunday, the editors of the Los Angeles Times took exception to the tenor of the current debate, and offered the most thoughtful and balanced analysis of the issues involved that I have seen. I commend this excellent editorial to my colleague's attention:

HOOPER, THE FBI AND THE NATION

J. Edgar Hoover ought to resign. Just about everybody knows that: the last several Presidents and attorneys general, senators, congressmen, heads of police departments, FBI agents.

Until recently just about nobody said that. Hoover has been a symbol, untouchable. The FBI which he built and over which he has exercised absolute sovereignty since 1924, has, for much good and some ill, been immune from the normal influence of the political process.

Now the criticism is sharper, more frequent, sometimes reckless and demagogic. This criticism is coming in conjunction with other things. The people are increasingly uneasy about surveillance by the government. The Army has been found out snooping on all kinds of politicians and public figures. Attorney General Mitchell rudely asserts the government's absolute right to tap wires without a court order when the government decides the "national security" may be affected. Electronics make easy the secret eye, and the people are uneasy under its glance, real and potential.

So now the debate about Hoover, the man, and the FBI, the organization, is becoming partisan and polarized. The right defends him because he has become an emblem of law and order, anticommunism. The left attacks him for the same reason. Some Democratic candidates for President see Hoover as a chink in Mr. Nixon's armor, as if there were something different about the FBI under this Administration. There isn't, of course. And Mr. Nixon seems to be saying that if only people would stop criticizing Hoover, he could retire with dignity and not "under a cloud."

The trouble with that is the criticism won't stop, because, its more reckless aspects aside, there is reason for criticism. Hoover has simply been there too long. And he is too

old for so demanding an executive job. He is 76.

It is sad, for he has done much good for police work in the country, and for the country. The FBI under Hoover has set standards for professionalism and correct conduct in police work that have influenced police forces throughout the nation.

Hoover has done much to make law enforcement a respectable career. On the whole, he has been neither partisan nor reckless in his use of the enormous potential power of a national investigative agency. He established trust. No mean accomplishment, when you consider the history of the use of national police through the world in the last 47 years.

Yet his accomplishments have not been without their costs, and now, at his advanced age after so long on the job, the costs are beginning to be revealed. What was once a necessary job of public relations has become tainted with personalism, and what was once a tough new director's sensible insistence on independence has become touched by a pettish use of authority. It is pretty well established that within the FBI he brooks no criticism of procedures or decisions; good men of independent judgment have been forced to leave; open discussion is frowned upon and punished.

That kind of conduct, like his querulous remarks about public figures, is embarrassing. And, to the FBI itself, damaging. In his zeal, perhaps, for the good name of the FBI, the director has kept that organization from cooperating with other government law enforcement agencies; taken an all-or-nothing approach.

His single-minded approach to the threats facing the country has been at times singularly effective: the bank robbers and kidnapers, Nazi saboteurs and Communist spies. Now Hoover sees the danger as leftist internal dissent. True, true; but there are other dangers. Organized crime, for instance, in which the FBI has shown little interest even as that crime has grown to great proportions. Hoover's FBI was reluctant to touch corruption within organized labor, chary of looking too closely into violations of civil rights laws in the South. The FBI has not been partisanly political; but its direction has had a strong color of ideology, and Hoover has appeared to recognize where the power lies in Congress. There is more to law enforcement in the 1970s than Hoover perceives.

So, for the good of his FBI, and for the country, he ought to offer his resignation, and accept such extraordinary honors as the country can devise for his extraordinary work, and let the President and the country get on with the difficult task of finding a successor who will, over the years, do as good a job as he has done in the past 47.

But the successor is only part of the problem. Would the country be willing to entrust such power to one man for the next 47 years? No. What has to be devised is a new mechanism for handling the FBI, for bringing it under the scrutiny of the people without opening it to the control of any President or any political party. You can't depend upon finding another Hoover, nor should you.

Congress has already voted to make the appointment of Hoover's successor subject to confirmation by the Senate. There is serious discussion of limiting his term by law. To avoid political influence, his term ought not be coincidental with the President's; maybe six years, or nine years, would suffice. There are proposals also for a public commission to oversee the bureau's operations. Not foolproof, certainly, but probably sound.

The country needs the FBI. The country needs the FBI to be both effective and restrained. The FBI needs confidence in itself. And the country needs confidence in the FBI.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL TO DEDICATE NEW BUILDING

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, after 80 long years, the Georgetown University Law Center is moving to a new and modern location.

The new Georgetown Law School building is scheduled for completion this coming September, and as an alumnus of the Georgetown University Law School, I want to offer my sincere congratulations and best wishes to the faculty and students on their new "home."

The new law school, built at a total cost of \$11.3 million, will provide vastly improved library facilities, parking space, and classroom accommodations, and will continue to provide students with easy access to the Congress, the Supreme Court, the District of Columbia courts, and the Library of Congress.

Mr. William Delaney has written an excellent article which appeared in the May 3 Evening Star, regarding the new Georgetown University Law School, and I would like to include his story at this point in the RECORD:

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL GOING MODERN

(By William Delaney)

Of the 145 accredited law schools in America, the one closest to the Capitol and the Supreme Court will soon be moving a couple of blocks closer.

After 80 years in a Victorian hodge-podge on the fringe of Washington's shopping district, the Georgetown University Law Center will open this September in a modern, sparsely utilitarian new home designed by Kennedy Center architect Edward Durrell Stone.

Shorn of its typically Stone-planned marble facing for reasons of economy, the \$11.3-million structure occupies the entire block between 1st, 2nd, F and G Streets NW, within easy walking distance of the District's court complex, Union Station, the Senate office buildings and—just beyond the Capitol—the Supreme Court and the Library of Congress.

LOCATION HAS VIRTUE

By virtue of its location, the new school will provide a readily accessible lecture site for important lawyers on quickie business trips to Washington—though only slightly more so than the present red-brick school at 506 E St. NW.

But the biggest advantage of the new building, according to Dean Adrian S. Fisher, lies in its structural capabilities.

Two of its three underground levels will provide parking for 200 cars.

Two of the four floors rising from an encircling promenade level will house the law library, quadrupling the school's present open-stack space and tripling the seating space for students.

The floor on the street level, immediately below the elevated "campus-like" promenade, will house offices for the school's legal assistance programs (providing clients with direct access from the street), the placement office and student activities areas, including a chapel.

Also on that street-level, semi-underground floor, is a 500-seat auditorium for both student "moot court" practice and for use by outside judicial groups and bar associations as a conference center. "We'd be

able to accommodate the Supreme Court in here, if they're so disposed," said one school official.

Seminar rooms surrounding the auditorium and large classrooms on the promenade level are designed for eventual installation of closed-circuit television, enabling another 900 to look in on proceedings in the moot-court room.

LIMITATIONS REMOVED

"A building is no substitute for teaching," says Fischer, "but this does take away the artificial limitations that our present building has."

The present Georgetown Law Center, just southeast of the main Hecht Co. department store, opened in 1891 and today is a cluttered jumble of buildings, housing what has grown into one of the nation's half-dozen largest law schools.

Though Georgetown's main campus is some 3 miles to the west, its law school first opened 101 years ago at 4th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW, close by the Capitol.

And despite discussion over the years of moving it to the main campus, the lure of a downtown location—with proximity to local and federal court rooms—has always won out, especially in view of Georgetown's traditionally strong evening division for working students and the current trend toward community-involved, "clinical" law training.

COST \$2.3 MILLION

The new site, acquired in 1965 at a cost of \$2.3 million, was described by Fischer's predecessor, Dean Paul R. Dean, as perhaps "the last available large property desirably located in the downtown judicial area."

For old Washingtonians like Fischer, the site evokes odiferous memories—it was, for many years, the location of the old Holmes & Son bakery.

The new building's planners set out to get a big-name architect and ultimately found one in Stone, whose new National Geographic Society headquarters here then just had opened.

"He gets a lot of flak for the Kennedy Center," concedes Associate Dean Thomas C. Fischer, a 32-year-old alumnus and chairman of the school's building committee, "but he was clearly a good choice for us, I think."

The building designed by Stone was a sleek, marble-faced block with overhanging roof, like the Geographic building and Kennedy Center. In 1965 prices, it was designed to cost \$12 million.

By substituting a buff-colored brick for the marble, chopping down the eaves and making a few other adjustments, the building committee cut back the projected cost to \$9.5 million.

The center was to be completed for dedication on July 4, 1970, in the school's 100th anniversary year. But construction difficulties—labor troubles and revisions in the foundation work (the Center Leg Expressway, running subsurface along the west front of the school, caused an elevation in the water table under the site)—have delayed the formal opening until this Sept. 17-18.

And the projected cost has risen by nearly \$2 million, largely due to inflation, Fischer says.

Despite its spacious classrooms and library, and despite a record 4,800 applicants thus far this year, the new building was designed to house a student body only slightly larger than the present one.

ENROLLMENT TO RISE

According to Fischer, the present enrollment of about 1,570 (1,100 day, 350 evening, 120 advanced level) was boosted last fall in anticipation of the new building and will rise again this fall to an envisioned stable level around 1,800.

Meanwhile, Dean Fischer says, negotiations are underway to sell the present law school site. Though he declines to identify

prospective purchasers, he expects that the purchaser will want to raze the memory-laden old buildings and put the E Street site to some new use.

As for Fischer, the former deputy director of the U.S. Arms Control Commission who became the school's dean in 1969, the new building will provide him with the Washington executive's dream—a top-floor corner office with a window framing the Capitol dome.

"Just barely," he chuckled the other day, pointing a visitor toward the window of his uncompleted new suite, "but there it is."

HON. NICK BEGICH, ALASKA AT LARGE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Alaska's geographical size is one-fifth that of the entire United States and because 95 percent of the State is rural, modern technological communication systems would be of great assistance to our State's growth.

Satellite technology offers Alaska the opportunity to instantly link one end of the State to the other without the burdensome rate base of ground network investment. Alaska's growth depends on our ability to communicate messages swiftly and dependably. It is for this reason that the Alaska State Legislature passed the following joint resolution:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 78
Relating to additional frequency allocations by international agreement for satellite communications
Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas satellite technology offers a unique opportunity for Alaska to realize an integrated communications system while avoiding the burdensome rate base of ground network investments; and

Whereas present domestic satellite proposals utilizing the 4 and 6 GHz bands are limited in signal strength (power flux densities) because of international agreement, thus requiring elaborate ground stations too cumbersome for rural-Alaskan use; and

Whereas full accrualment of satellite communication efficiencies to the user public requires greater frequency availability; and

Whereas the dedication of additional bands, such as between 1700-2700 MHz, would afford the use of simple and very low cost earth stations suitable for bush communications, as well as educational-instructional television reception (ETV-ITV); and

Whereas liberalized utilization of band sharing, regionally administered, would especially benefit Alaska which has not developed extensive frequency traffic; and

Whereas the availability of these bands is predicated on International Telecommunication Union (ITU) allocations to be reviewed this summer at Geneva during the World Administrative Radio Conference for Space Telecommunications;

Be it resolved that the Alaska State Legislature strongly urges ITU acceptance of the following United States proposals as adopted December 18, 1970 by the Federal Communications Commission in Docket No. 18294:

- (1) 87 108 MHz, providing for FM satellite broadcasting within a band now utilized by most radio receivers;
- (2) 614 890 MHz, authorizing broadcasting

satellite service in a band compatible with television receivers now in the hands of the general public;

(3) 2150 2200 MHz uplink, for communication satellite systems on a demand-assignment, multiple access basis for low demand users in remote areas (e.g. Alaska);

(4) 2500 2690 MHz downlink, for low-demand users in remote areas and satellite service systems dedicated to the distribution of education and public service material.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary, Department of State; the Honorable Dean Burch, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Dr. Clay T. Whitehead, Director, Office of Telecommunications Policy; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

DRUGS—CRISWELL SPEAKS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently the White House held a 1-day meeting to discuss America's drug problem with the Nation's religious leaders. The meeting was effective and Dr. W. A. Criswell, a leading Southern Baptist, brought the message home.

Many of my friends heard his sermon at the First Baptist Church in Dallas. We need more of this straight talk from the pulpit. I want you to read the discussion that resulted from this stimulating White House Conference:

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. W. A. CRISWELL, PASTOR, FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, DALLAS, TEX.

On the radio, you are sharing the services of the First Baptist Church. This is the Pastor, bringing an address, not a sermon, entitled "Drug Addiction is Spelled D-E-A-T-H." I will read a scripture as a background. It is the familiar and meaningful one in the twelfth chapter of the Book of Romans:

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.

And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God. Romans 12:1, 2.

As I begin the address may I remind you that I cannot speak the language of the underworld. I have never been introduced to it and when I listen to it, I am shocked beyond measure. For example, behind a screen the Conference at the White House presented the shadows of those who were standing there. The reason for their shadowy appearance was, according to the Commissioner, to hide the identity of these men who are informers. They are men who live in the underworld. They had turned and had become informers to the government. They are called "fingers." They tell the undercover agents the names of those who are engaged in this illicit traffic. Their language is beyond anything I ever heard. Many of their words I do not even know what they mean. Many are dirty. For example, heroin is called that four-lettered word for human excretion. Truly, they have a world of their own. It is down and down and down. I have

never been introduced to it. Consequently, when I deliver this address it is altogether from the viewpoint of one who is looking at it for the first time. I just lay before you what has been introduced to me.

DRUG DEFINITIONS

First we are going to begin with definitions. I need this. I cannot understand without it. So we shall begin with definitions.

Drug—That is any substance that has an effect upon the mind or body. Coming back Saturday from Washington, I was offered liquor half a dozen times. These airplanes are flying bars. I said to the stewardess, "Did you know that is a powerful drug you have in your hand?" She said, "What? This wine? It couldn't be." Alcohol is the most widely used drug for evil that is known to humanity. A drug is any substance that has an effect upon the body or mind.

Habituation—The psychological desire to repeat the use of a drug because of emotional reasons, such as escape from tension, dulling of reality, euphoria (getting high, living in an ephemeral world). Habituation refers to the psychological need for a drug.

Addiction—Refers to the physical dependence upon a drug. That brings into play the word tolerance.

Tolerance—Refers to that reaction of the body whereby the body requires a larger and larger amount of the drug to produce the same effect. Addiction also includes in it "withdrawal."

Withdrawal—When the drug is stopped, the "withdrawal" period is characterized by such distressing symptoms as vomiting and convulsions. When you use the word "addiction" you are referring to a physical dependence upon a drug that the human body has more and more tolerance for and needs larger amounts of it to produce the same effect and when it is stopped, the user, the addict, falls into vomiting and convulsions.

Marijuana—Marijuana is an easy to grow hemp plant. It has long, narrow, jagged edged leaves growing like poorly spaced spokes on a wheel. It grows about five feet tall in this country. Here in America it is relatively weak. But in Old Mexico the plants are twice as strong and in India, in the moist warm climate of India, it is four or five times as strong. The flowering pods have a sticky resin which produces a marijuana effect. It is classified as a hallucinogen.

Hashish—Hashish is a dark brown purified resin extract prepared from the dried flowers of the hemp plant, the marijuana plant. It is five times stronger than marijuana. It is placed in brick form and smuggled into America.

Now these are the words the underworld uses for marijuana. It is called "grass," "hay," "jive," "Mary Jane," "pot," "weed." A marijuana cigarette is called a "joint," a "reefer," a "stick," and the stub end of it is called a "roach." They burn it down (because of the high price) to that last little speck.

Hallucinogens—These drugs are capable of provoking changes of sensations. The resulting illusions, hallucinations and delusions may be either minimum or overwhelming, depending on the person and the dose.

LDS—LSD is the most potent of all of the hallucinogens. It comes from a fungus that spoils rye grain. A Swiss chemist, Albert Hoffman, accidentally discovered its mind-altering properties in 1943. The word "psychedelic" is a term invented to describe some of the effects of LSD. In the underworld, LSD is called "acid." A "good trip" is someone taking LSD who has pleasant imageries and emotional feeling. But a bad trip, a "Bummer," results in terrifying images and emotions of dread and horror.

Stimulants—Stimulants are drugs which increase alertness, reduce hunger and provide a feeling of well-being. The amphetamines are stimulants. They have an effect upon the central nervous system and they are the most dangerous of the stimulants. Benzadrine, in

the dark world, is called "beanies," "beans," and "cartwheels." Dexedrine is called "dexies." And metamphetamines, methedrine, is called "speed," "crystals," "crank," "meth."

These stimulants, these amphetamines, down there in that underworld, are called "pep pills," "wake ups," "eye openers," "co-pilots," "drunk drivers," and "uppers."

Sedatives—Sedatives induce sleep. In small doses they reduce tension and anxiety. The barbiturates constitute the largest group of sedatives. Down there in the underworld they are called "goofballs," and "sleepers," and "downers." The tranquilizers calm and relax and diminish anxiety. Both sedatives and tranquilizers can be physically addicting. Withdrawal effects occur when the drug is stopped. The most common mode of suicide with drugs is with these barbiturates, the sleeping pills. Depressants produce impaired judgment, slow reaction timing, slurring of speech, staggering, loss of balance, a quarrelsome disposition, sometimes a coma and death.

Narcotics—Narcotics relieve pain and induce sleep. They are opiates. Narcotics originally came from the opium poppy, a bitter, yellowish brown drug resin prepared from the dry juice of unripe pods of the poppy plant. Morphine is one of the active components in opium. Heroin is morphine chemically altered to make it six times stronger. From opium also comes codeine and paregoric. There are many synthetic chemicals that have morphine-like effects.

Heroin, that one drug heroin, accounts for 90% of the narcotic addiction problem. In the underworld it is called "H," it is called "horse," it is called "junk," it is called "smack."

THE SESSION AT THE WHITE HOUSE

We met in the East Wing of the White House after 9:00 and we stayed in that session until 6 o'clock in the evening. An aide said to me, 98% of all the church members in the United States are represented here in this meeting. There were about 70 leaders. On my right sat Bishop Ziecinski, head of the National Polish Catholic Church. On my left sat the famous Rabbi Kertzer of New York City. And this good old Baptist was right in the middle!

The meeting was opened by Egl Krogh. They all called him "Bud" Krogh, an Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs. In his introductory remarks he said, "The final answer is out of the reach of government."

He introduced Attorney General John N. Mitchell. Because of his wife, Martha, I paid particular attention to his sartorial attire. Attorney General Mitchell is an older man. But he was nattily dressed. In a blue suit, in a white shirt, in a red and blue tie and a handkerchief to match. The Attorney General said that the government has conducted for two years an all out drive against drug abuse. He said that President Nixon had called together the fifty governors to discuss the problem, then the radio and TV executives, and now he has called you. He said that drugs make a user a slave to sensation who asks the question, "Why not?" The drug addict needs the answer the religious leaders of the nation can give to him.

Krogh introduced John Ingersoll, the Director of Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. He started his speech off with a joke. He said that a visiting preacher passed the hat. When the hat came back he looked in it and saw nothing. He bowed his head for the prayer and said, "Dear Lord, I thank you that I got my hat back from this congregation!" John Ingersoll, the Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs said: "The drug problem is as old as civilization. Back in 5000 B.C. there was a drug problem. There existed then, as there is today, a chemical religion with false prophets everywhere presenting its ephemeral bliss." Were you here the Sunday be-

fore? Did you hear me talk about the ancient government of Babylon and the ancient civilization of that far famed city? And do you remember I said a part of that religion that goes back to Babylon is sorcery? The word in Greek is "pharmakela," pharmacy, drugs. Black magic. Always there has been a culture, a religion of drugs, as far back as mankind can search in archaeological records.

Krogh then introduced Miles J. Ambrose, Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs. He spoke on smuggling. He had a display there half as long as this church is wide. I was horrified. A large percentage of that display was religious, Christian objects. They would take a cross and stuff it with heroin. Take a crucifix, a big one, and the back of it, solid heroin. Take a bronze plaque of the Lord's Supper and the back of it, solid heroin. Take candles they burn in cathedrals. The inside of them, solid heroin. I could not believe as I looked at it.

I held in my hand solid hashish. It was in the form of ancient pottery. Solid hashish. You would never guess it in the earth. The only reason the customs official became suspicious of it was because it looked like cheap pottery yet they had an enormous insurance on it. Becoming suspicious, the officials found it was solid hashish. "This problem is compounded," said Miles Ambrose, "because there are 250 million people who come into this country every year. Our citizens go and come and go and come and others come. There are, also, 67 million parcels that are mailed into this country every year." There is no heroin in America. All of it has to be imported. It has to be smuggled in. Is there any medical use for heroin? None at all. It is solely a drug smuggling operation. Yet that drug problem costs America eight billion dollars a year.

There was a hush. Everything stopped. And somebody whispered to me, "The President is coming." He walked in. We all stood and applauded. He is personally one of the finest men you could ever meet. He is warm hearted, very open and very dedicated.

I quote from the President. He said he was surprised that addiction starts at such an early age, even at 12 years of age. We cannot approach the problem, he said, with anger, but with sorrow. We can be angry at the pusher, at the junkie, but not at the addict. We must seek after rehabilitation rather than punishment. Why does a young person, he said, give up on the democratic system to turn to something he thinks leads to a way out, but it doesn't? He has a spiritual need, that young person, the President said. He has a spiritual need that must be filled. If there is an answer, you gentlemen have it, he said. That young person must have something to believe in, to turn to. The worst thing that can happen to a young person is to have no faith and no belief in anything. The heart of the problem is a spiritual vacuum. That is the judgment of the President of the United States.

John Broger, Director, Office of Information, U.S. Armed Forces, introduced a Chaplain who had just come back from Viet Nam. And as I listened to that Chaplain speak, my heart was filled with indescribable sorrow. The men that are sent over there to fight for us in Viet Nam are immediately introduced to the whole world of heroin and drug addiction. Now, the tragedy of the situation in Viet Nam is this: For a salary of \$200 a month, a soldier in Viet Nam can buy the purest heroin uncut and live on it every day. When the soldier comes back to the United States, it takes a minimum of \$1,000 a day to keep up the addictive habit he has acquired in Viet Nam. What happens to the soldier? He disintegrates. And the Chaplain said that only in religious faith is there a hope for the return of that soldier to society. Religious faith, he says, is the cornerstone of rehabilitation.

I read in a book that there are practically no men who become addicted to heroin who ever come back into society and take their place as once they were. The loss of human life in this drug traffic is sorrowful enough to make an angel weep.

Krogh introduced Dr. Bertram S. Brown who is Director of the National Institute of Mental Health. Quoting President Nixon from an earlier address, Dr. Brown said, "The problem has grown from one of local concern to one that threatens the future and well-being of America." Then still quoting the President he said: "College is too late to face the problem. High School is largely too late. We must meet the problem in Junior High and elementary grades." Fear and scare are not enough. They must be told and taught the reasons for refusal to indulge.

At the lunch hour George Romney, three times governor of Michigan and candidate for the GOP nomination for President of the United States, spoke. He is Minister of Housing and Urban Development. He preached a regular sermon. That fellow is fervent. One of the things that he said, and I thought I ought to share it with you, is his appraisal of the present situation in which we live. He said that the Nixon Administration inherited a greater crisis than either Lincoln or Franklin Roosevelt. He said that their crises were capable of explicit definition. In the days of Lincoln it was slavery or freedom. In the days of Franklin Roosevelt it was hunger or jobs. But he said today the crisis is of the spirit and defies definition. And he said, we must have an answer that is spiritual. The drug problem is an illustration of this spiritual vacuum that has swept over America.

THE TRAGEDY OF THE DRUG PROBLEM

Now, my words. Drug addiction is spelled D-E-A-T-H. I hold in my hand a UPI story out of the daily newspaper. It is datelined Tacoma, Washington. I read from the UPI newstory:

"A railroad employee found the well-dressed body of a young man in a corner of an empty boxcar behind the Union Pacific depot. In the jacket pocket were empty pill boxes and a billfold identifying the youth as (then it goes on and tells about the boy). When the body was moved a suicide note was found. It said, 'Dear Dad, Dope ruined my life and took away my happiness forever. I thought I was experiencing life. I found it was death. I hope to God people taking dope find what I found in it sooner than I did. Goodbye, Dad, your son, Love, Ricky.'"

You spell dope addiction D-E-A-T-H.

I went to Haight-Asbury. I was out there two or three times, just looking at it. The Haight-Asbury District in San Francisco originally captured the attention of the world because of the idealistic, flower children who converged there. It looked as if there were appearing on the horizon of American life a new, glorious phenomenon. Young people would travel all over the country to see it. They had vaguely heard about the drug overtone involved but they had no introduction to it. What did Haight-Asbury develop into? A knowledgeable writer spent many weeks with the youngsters on the streets, on the pads and in their rooms. Now I am going to quote from him.

"This is the end of the flower children, the hippie movement." I quote from him, talking about them. "They would share their food, most of which had been panhandled on the streets. They would talk readily about free love but very little about the alarming rise of venereal disease brought on by such practices. They even wore buttons saying 'Syphilis can be fun'. Gradually the idealism of the streets gave way to con artists, thugs, exploiters and hard core pushers and junkies who made the whole community their victim. Peace and love are gone from the streets of the district today. All that remains is

crime and violence and death." Drug addiction is spelled D-E-A-T-H.

Why the drug problem? I have it summarized here so I can briefly present it. But before I do, I can tell you are not going to like it. But I am bound and responsible to declare the truth. Why the drug problem? Two reasons. One is found in our adult world. And the other is found in our young people's world.

First, the adult world. Why the drug problem? It is because of our modern drug culture among adults. For a growing number of adults, drugs are a way of life. They take pep pills to get up, tranquilizers to get out, a cocktail to start the evening. They cannot talk without that liquor. They cannot even carry on a conversation unless they are stimulated by some kind of a drug, a cocktail to start the evening. They take barbiturates to go to sleep. There is an estimated ten billion capsules and dangerous tablets that are produced every year in this country, no small part of which finds its way down into the underworld.

The message of American advertising is, "Cure your pains by chemicals." Adults set up powerful examples. There is the "necessary" cigarette. They cannot last through an evening without nicotine. There is the liquor before dinner. There are the diet pills, the sleeping pills, the tranquilizing pills. When the same parents see their teenagers use drugs, they call them fiends and criminals and degenerates. The young people merely are following in their parents' and society's footsteps. If there ever lived a hypocritical culture and a hypocritical generation, it is the present culture and the present generation of American citizens.

Marijuana is no more intoxicating and no more addictive and no more fraught with overtones of tragedy than alcohol. Let us look at this attitude toward liquor, which is liquid pot. Never, never is it proposed to attack liquor or to oppose it as they do other drugs. We are getting to the place where we are willing to face nicotine and the deadly effects of tobacco. We are beginning to say to the advertising media, "You can't bring that stuff into our living room and present it there before our children. It has death in the package. There is emphysema and lung cancer." We are facing up to the truth of tobacco. But there are no proposals to face and to outlaw the drugs liquor and alcohol. Rather, the turn of our society is in the other direction. Texas is now in the process, legally, to establish what they said they would never establish again in the history of civilization—open saloons. We are talking about marijuana and alcohol. Both of them drugs. One of them is liquid. The other is dry. Now look at this quote. I read from Dr. Donald B. Lourie, in his book entitled *Drug Scene*. Now listen to him. "The proponents for the legalization of marijuana point out that alcohol is a dangerous drug which is perfectly legal in our society." That is right, isn't it? The proponents for the legalization of marijuana point out that alcohol is a dangerous drug which is perfectly legal in our society." They say that marijuana is no more dangerous than alcohol. And that is right. There is not a doctor in the land that will stand up here and deny that. The proponents for the legalization of marijuana say that marijuana is no more dangerous than alcohol is.

Now, it seems to me that we ought to stand up and say that as we oppose marijuana we shall also oppose alcohol. But they don't ever say it. What do they say? Admitting that alcohol is a dangerous drug, they simply ask the question whether we are to add to our alcohol burden another intoxicant. In the United States there is currently a death from automobile accidents every 11 minutes and an injury every 18 seconds. They simply ask shall we add another intoxicant, such as marijuana, and increase the number of in-

ebriated drivers and pedestrians and attain a death rate of one every 5 minutes and an injury every 8 seconds? Never is it proposed that we oppose all of these drugs that have devastating effects upon the mind. Never are we to oppose liquor. Liquor is a sacred cow. We dare not speak of it. We dare not touch it. But the proposal is made that we fight marijuana to the death because we already have one intoxicant drug that is decimating our people, slaughtering them on the highways, breaking up our homes and families. We have already one of them. But do nothing about that one. It is merely that American society and American national life cannot stand another one. Therefore, we oppose the entrance of marijuana. That is the reasoning of the educational and political and economic leadership of present day America. What yellow cowardice!

I said there were two reasons for the drug problem. One is the hypocritical example of the Adults. The whole world of America is sot. It drinks. It is the exception that does not. Then we turn around and look at that teen-ager who is also experimenting with drugs. There is the example of the adult. That is why the drug problem.

Second, in the young people there is a lack of deep, spiritual dedication on the part of youth. Three things about them that lead them into the use of drugs. One is curiosity and experimentation. Another is peer pressure. I run across that phrase all the time, "Peer Pressure." That is, wherever the little boy is, he will have a friend his own age that pushes him into experimentation. If there is a teen-ager he will have a friend his age pushing him into it. If there is a young adult, he has a friend to push him into it. "Peer Pressure." It means a lot to a youngster to be in, to belong.

Why does a young person take drugs? First, curiosity. Second, peer pressure. Third, hedonistic pleasure. To have a good time in it. As Dr. Nolan Estes said to me this morning, they are taught to believe, persuaded to believe, that happiness is just a pill away. They are bored. There is nothing else to do. If worried, pills will make them lose all of their worries. If some of them are failures, pills, drugs will make a way out to forget it.

If the youth is experimenting, he needs to be given the facts. Medically, socially and legally—drugs kill. You spell them D-E-A-T-H. Drugs kill. These boys and girls that are experimenting with them need to be taught those awesome and terrible facts. They kill body and soul. If you use them you face a social problem. You face a medical problem and you also face a legal problem.

Second, if it is peer pressure that leads the youngster to experiment, the youngster needs the strength of the Christian community. Here is a Christian group, belong to them. That is why, years ago, long before I ever faced any problem like this, long years ago before I ever thought of a problem like this, that is why I brought to this church a program to call these young people out of the dens and the dives and the joints and to bring them here where they can have a Christian fellowship and a Christian community. When you are out there I do not think a young person can finally say no. The age groups press and push and suggest, then finally mock and ridicule. Most any young person will succumb. We need a Christian community to which the young person can belong where there are not pushers and junkies and addicts. They can build their homes here at the church. They can fall in love down here. They can marry down here. They can look forward to every triumph in every future in every unfolding year.

Think, if it is hedonistic pleasure that is the reason the youngster uses drugs, if it is because of the kick he gets out of it and the excitement in it. We are dealing there with

a moral and a spiritual vacuum. The boy's life, the girl's life is empty and he or she needs to re-assess the meaning and purpose of life in Christ Jesus. As one boy said: "I was helpless. I was hooked. But I found a Saviour in the Lord. And He saved me and He delivered me and He sees me through." That is the road. Let's walk in it. This is the way. Let's follow it. The Jesus way. The Glory Road. The highway to heaven.

Are you a youngster? Make your friends down here and when you are enticed out there, no, no. Are you a teen-ager? Make your friends down here. And when it is suggested, out there, no, no. If you are an adult, put your life down here in the community of Christ. When you are invited to deny the Lord, no.

You spell drug addiction D-E-A-T-H. You spell Jesus Christ L-I-F-E. He said I am come that they might have L-I-F-E, and have it more abundantly, abounding, overflowing. Ah, my people. Our children. Our teen-agers and young people. And our adults and parents. Let us walk in the way of the Lord. And let God give us those rich benedictory, heavenly blessings that only the riches of God could afford. In His gracious hand: how many precious gifts He has to bestow! And they are ours for the asking, for the having, for the taking and for the receiving.

PRIVATE PENSION PLANS SOMETIMES BESET BY FRAUD AND MISMANAGEMENT

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today, private pension funds cover more than 27 million workers in the United States. Reserve assets held by the pensions amount to \$125 billion and are expected to reach \$200 billion by 1980, yet these plans are virtually unregulated by the Federal Government. At the present time, there are no minimum standards for their establishment or administration and, all too often, no practical means by which a beneficiary can secure his rights.

Some pension plans are beset by fraud and mismanagement. Few can claim to protect employees against the loss or substantial reduction of their benefits because of job transfers, lack of tenure, or plant shutdowns.

Of course, pensions serve a useful and important purpose. Because they are tax free, they release new sources of capital for business investment, thereby stimulating the entire American economy. It would be a mistake to try to replace them.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, Federal regulation is our best, our only, answer to this problem, and that is the purpose of the bill I am offering today.

This legislation, originally introduced by Senator JAVITS, would establish an independent agency in the executive branch to protect the rights of workers covered by pensions. The agency would register all proposed pension plans, establish rules for their conduct, and set minimum funding standards to assure their operation on a sound and solvent basis.

Under this legislation, no pension plan would be allowed to set eligibility rules so high as to deny benefits to all but a few employees. They would be required to follow certain minimum vesting procedures: specifically, after 6 years of employment all workers would have a nonforfeitable right to at least 10 percent of the benefits he had earned up to that time. Each year thereafter an additional 10 percent of his benefits would vest, so that after 15 years he would have a right to full recovery of his plan's earnings.

Under this legislation, workers would be able to transfer from one employer to another without a loss of pension benefits. This provision, termed "portability," would create a central clearinghouse in which all pension plans could participate on a voluntary basis.

Finally, under this legislation, a Federal insurance program would be established to guarantee that pension benefits will be paid, even if an employer goes out of business before the plan is fully funded.

Each of these provisions, Mr. Speaker, seems to me essential, if American workers are to receive fair treatment under their pension plans. For too long, these Americans have looked to their pensions for security in their later years, only to see those expectations cruelly denied. I urge that this bill receive the most careful consideration by my colleagues.

C.A.N. NOISE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at long last, noise is being recognized as a major pollutant. Pollution usually refers to the presence of unwanted physical substances in our environment—chemicals and smoke pouring out of factory chimneys, chemicals and sewage contaminating our rivers and lakes, junked cars cluttering our landscape. Noise is different from these forms of pollution, because it is not a physical substance. But noise is a pollutant nonetheless.

Excessive noise is annoying and irritating. It is a direct hazard to our physical and mental health. It makes our cities and towns far less pleasant places in which to live.

And, as we must with all pollutants, we must make every effort to combat its rising presence. To that end, I have introduced a comprehensive legislative package to meet the problems of noise pollution through Federal action. But if noise is to be combated it will take more than just good laws and stern enforcement. It will take the concern and personal action of each individual.

Today, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues one particular group of individuals that is doing an admirable job in focusing attention on our decaying environment—Consumer Action Now, Inc. This organization is

to be commended for the efforts it has taken to meet the problems of pollution.

At this point, I include in the RECORD the recent C.A.N. newsletter on noise pollution—"Noise: The Sonic Boomerang":

[From the Consumer Action Now, Inc., Newsletter, No. 4]

NOISE: THE SONIC BOOMERANG

MORNING IN MANHATTAN

Whenever it is, it's too early. But your alarm-clock/radio goes into its pre-programmed buzz and someone flushes a toilet somewhere and there you are and it's officially Today.

Very deftly, (down to a science now, do-it-with-your-eyes-closed) you get things switched from Alarm-clock to Radio and lie there admiring the new crack in your ceiling and hoping Gene Klavan will have something funny if not something good to say about the weather or the traffic or the progress in the Strike. (There's always a strike. And it's never progressing.)

Your husband wakes up and lights a cigarette and starts to say something sweet but a truck backfires under your window and he drops the cigarette and almost burns a hole in the electric blanket. (Much activity: Swatting-out of embers.)

For a moment, you indulge in the superb fantasy that your office has been time-bombed during the night and you won't have to get up after all today, but the newscast says that the only casualty was a telephone company in Redwing, Ohio, and then the guy next door starts his electric razor and the radio goes into a spasm of static and it's easier to get up than to lie there and listen.

The bachelor upstairs must be happy today because there's a woman's voice floating down the bathroom pipes and the Cough next door seems worse this morning and you'd think people who can afford to pay \$475 a month rent could afford to buy themselves a bottle of cough medicine.

But then, of course, it's really none of your business.

In the cab downtown, you roll up the windows, not only because the air is Unhealthy again, but because the drills and hammers of 4.3 construction sites are more than you're really ready for yet. And besides, the blasts from the street repair right outside your loudly heated/air-conditioned (all-glass, no windows) office building are going to be with you for the rest of the day. Not all the time. Just at odd moments like when you're about to formulate the single sentence that will awaken all America to the wonders of the New Improved Plastic Soapdish, or to solve the ineffable mysteries of the universe.

A fire engine starts, brakes screech, horns honk and the cabdriver yells some of those words you were 21 before you understood. And a clock chimes.

It's nine o'clock in the morning.

And you say you're not aware of noise pollution?

HOW LOUD IS LOUD

And when does it become Too Loud?

We all could debate the problem forever. And in fact, between "Roger, turn the radio down" and "Lucy, for goodness sakes, stop mumbling", that's exactly what we do.

Because sound is not an objective phenomenon. It isn't a Thing to be measured in inches. Or an Entity that either is or isn't. Sound is merely the sensation of hearing. By definition, a subjective experience.

Now, an inch is an inch, whoever you are. But Loud is more like a matter of taste. So how can we standardize a measurement for sound?

By standardizing our experience of it.

And that's how we get to the Decibel System. One decibel is the smallest unit for measuring sound, simply because one decibel is the smallest sound the human ear can

hear. A perfectly arbitrary whimsical arrangement. And therefore easy to comprehend.

But the Decibel System, once it gets going, isn't as easy as 1-2-3. Because it doesn't make the usual linear progression (wherein "20" is twenty times greater than "1").

The human ear can hear such an immense range of sound, that if we counted things that way, the slam of a door would get rated in millions. And who'd bother counting what a firecracker was?

So the Decibel System is logarithmic. (It keeps multiplying itself by ten.) Which means that, while 10 decibels is ten times louder than 1 (10x1=10) 20 decibels is a hundred times louder than 1 (10x10=100), and 30 decibels is a thousand times louder than 1 (10x10x10) and so on.

While you'd pretty much need a computer to go on from there, try to keep the general theory in mind, when reading a decibel chart.

For instance, when you read that the sound level on a New York City Street is only 17 decibels higher than on a suburban street, it might make you feel like renewing your lease. (Is 17 decibels worth a commute?)

Is it?

Well, sound, as we said, can be highly subjective. But—logarithmically speaking, the New York street is almost 4 times (400%) louder.

How loud is too loud?

Your move.

NOISE IN NEW YORK—OR: YOU KNOW I CAN'T HEAR YOU WHEN THE SUBWAY'S RUNNING

New York is not only the noisiest city in the country, but it vies with Tokyo, Rio and Madrid for the grand slam title of the noisiest city in the world.

Ironically, New Yorkers say they aren't bothered by the general din as much as out-of-towners, and are likely to claim that what really disturbs them is the sound of chirping crickets on a weekend in the country.

Of course we've never heard anyone say that on a subway platform.

But who can hear anything on a subway platform.

What follows is a sampling of some of the decibels we live with* which just may lead you to conclude that the sweetest sounds you'll ever hear are still inside your head.

	Dbs
A gentle breeze	15
A whisper at 5 feet	34
A bedroom you can fall asleep in	35
1968—NYC building code limit on noise coming through apartment walls	45
Falling asleep can take up to an hour-and-a-half	50
An average New York City bedroom	50
A window air-conditioner	53
An office	55
A normal conversation	60
A nine-typewriter typing pool	65
A lunch counter at 12:30	65
A vacuum cleaner (10 feet away)	70
An average New York City street	70
A burst of 70 decibels of noise causes automatic physical reactions; will awaken most people	70
A washing machine	78
Typical heavy traffic	75-80
A ringing alarm clock	80
A front row seat at a musical	82
Beginning of hearing damage with 8 hour daily exposure	85
Legal limit allowed in factories for 8 hour exposure	90
You have to shout to be heard 6 inches away	90
A subway	92-110
Rush hour traffic	92

*The "gentle breeze" is on there strictly for comparison.

	Dbs
Human body cannot adapt, remains on constant "alert"	95
A motorcycle take-off; a lathe	97
A home lawn mower	98
"Inevitable hearing loss" from 8 hour daily exposure	100
A New York City garbage truck	100
An SST, 16 miles away	100
An SST, 8 miles away	106
Construction site—air hammer	107
Construction site air compressor, 3 feet away	110
New York's limit for airplane noise in residential areas near airports	112
A discotheque	110-120
Most people feel physical pain	130
A foundry	130
A minimum estimate of SST "boom" (50 mile radius under plane's path)	124-130
A hand gun	144
A jet plane at take-off	150-160
Heavy artillery	180

These figures have been gathered from a variety of documented sources. Decibel charts often disagree, probably the result of the circumstances and surroundings in which the measurements were taken.

BANG BANG YOU'RE DEAD

A loud explosion can shatter your eardrums. And a constant din can shatter your nerves. But sound can affect you in a hundred other ways, can make you literally, physically ill.

That's not a new-fangled theory. (In fact, the word "noise" comes from the same Latin root as the word "nausea".) And reams of recent scientific tests have proved that noise has definite harmful physical effects.

Nothing ever goes in one ear and out the other. All sound is instantly transmitted to the brain and to almost every nerve, gland, and organ in your body. In fact, sound doesn't only "go in" your ear. It can penetrate directly through your skull and your torso.

The result of any loud sound is to set the body on instant alert, part of our instinctive animal reflexes. To your body, noise means trouble, and it automatically prepares for a fight. (It doesn't know you can't fight city hall.)

So—it releases adrenalin, increases blood pressure, constricts blood vessels, tenses muscles (voluntary and involuntary), speeds the heart, raises cholesterol, dilates the pupils, disrupts your previous thoughts, and stops doing irrelevant things (like, for instance, digesting foods). If the noise were a gunshot and you had to defend yourself, all those reactions would be useful things.

But since the noise is usually a jet or a jackhammer (or typewriters, traffic or a factory machine) it really isn't helpful at all. In fact, depending on your general health, constant noise can be very harmful.

Start with that increase in adrenalin. It can lead to hypertension and heart disease. It can influence other glands like your hormones. It can actually exhaust your adrenalin supply, which can cause a gamut of awful results.

All that confusion of blood pressure and blood vessels can contribute to heart and circulatory problems. It can also cause headaches—migraine (or yours).

Muscle tension can lead to cricks and aches, to a general state of tension and fatigue. And stomach-muscle tension can lead to ulcers.

Constantly responding to these "false alarms" can weaken the body's defense against disease, which can make it easier to catch a virus. And also harder to shake it off.

And yes, the body does respond. Constantly.

Studies show no one ever gets "used to"

noise, even when you think you no longer hear it. A sudden sound of 70 decibels triggers the whole "alert" mechanism. Exposed to a constant level of 95 decibels, the body does not and cannot adapt. It remains in a constant Emergency State. (Think about that if you live near an airport.)

None of these connections or symptoms are theoretical. They're all the results of careful tests, using noise as a stimulus.

How many people have died from noise is harder to determine. Certainly those with pre-existing weaknesses have been further weakened by all that stress.

It's especially bad for post-operative patients. Which is why Philip Blalberg's phones were muffled when he returned home from his famous heart transplant.

It has also been estimated that the SST's sonic boom may trigger some final heart attacks in people with less spectacular heart trouble. And for some, at least, the world will end not with a whimper, but a bang.

BANG BANG YOU'RE DEAF

Our eyes can close, our mind can wander, but our ears "hear" 24 hours a day. And people who are subjected to constant loud noise can—and do—go deaf from it.

Repeated loud noise builds up to produce the same effect as a single shattering explosion. It simply does it over a longer period of time. The effect of noise on hearing is cumulative.

While factory workers experience a high percentage of hearing loss and occupational deafness, studies have also shown that a 70 year old Maabian tribesman has the same hearing capacity as a 20 year old New Yorker. (Just living with noise can take its toll.)

Discotheque deafness is one of the diseases we invented in the '60's. An Australian study showed that people who spent one night a week in a discotheque for a period of six months, had already damaged their ears. And a "fairly significant" temporary hearing loss followed a single disco evening and lasted for up to 12 hours in a group of Florida students.

A hearing aid, incidentally, may not help people with noise-induced hearing loss. It may simply make loud or sudden noises all the more painful.

AND OTHER SOUND EFFECTS

Noise annoys.

It also frightens, confuses, and demoralizes. Which is why the Indians had a War Cry and the Japanese went around yelling "Banzai!"

Noise also depresses and disrupts. It can ruin your mood, your work and your sex life. And if that's not depressing, what is? In extreme cases, it can even drive you crazy.

It can bring on epileptic fits, paranoid phases, and outbursts of violence. In unstable people it can be the final straw that pushes them to murder.

The 1967 Detroit Riot Studies implicate the constant ghetto noise as a factor contributing to riot behavior.

Noise can disturb or prevent sleep. And if you've read any of the many studies on sleep-disturbance and dream-deprivation, you know the damage it can do to even the most stable personalities. (Irritability, depression, extreme fatigue, mental fogginess, tension and even mild to severe psychotic symptoms.)

Experiments have also shown that you don't have to be actually awakened for noise to disturb your sleep. The brainwave patterns of sleepers can be radically altered through noise without awakening them.

If you've always suspected there was scientific truth to the idea that there are "Day People" and "Night People", you may be right. Tests are showing there are indeed two basic metabolic types, requiring rest at different times of day. And to waken a night

person at 7 a.m. (the official starting time for construction work) may produce the sleep-deprivation syndrome.

In fact, waking anyone up even an hour earlier than his personal sleep-rhythm dictates, may produce the same effects.

Exposure to nerve-jarring factory noise is responsible for many accidents, and probably for badly-made factory goods.

But even office work can be affected.

A World Health Organization report says that office noise costs American business a 4 million dollar-a-day loss through inefficient work.

Children learn less in noisy schools, and studies have shown that ghetto children exposed to constant noise may simply "tune out" in self-defense and may have to be educated to listen to verbal communication.

The pattern of a noise may determine how much it bothers you. Constant noise and illogically intermittent sounds are the most disruptive and tension-producing; like waiting for the other shoe to drop.

Some people are more affected by noise than others. But which people is still open to discussion.

Our own casual observations lead us to conclude that we're most bothered by noise when we're bothered by something else first. The subway is louder when we're tired, the children's shouts are awful when we're sick, and the music is unbearable when we're not dancing.

BUSINESS IS FUNDAMENTALLY SOUND

Eighty percent of all Americans who work, work in factories.

Hearing loss is America's biggest non-fatal health problem.

Somewhere, there's a connection to be made.

Could it be in the fact that a decibel count on standard factory machines shows most of them register between 90 and 130 decibels . . . and that accoustical experts seem to agree that some people will suffer hearing damage when exposed to 80 decibels for a 40 hour work-week . . . still more at 85 decibels . . . and that "the risk becomes significant at 90 dB(A) and hearing losses are nearly inevitable . . . at 100 dB(A)".

Given this widely recognized information, you'd think industry would do something, wouldn't you?

Well, after they didn't, Uncle Sam did.

"In May 1969, a new regulation required that industry doing more than \$10,000 worth of business with the Federal Government reduce noise levels (to 90 decibels) so as not to deafen more than 10% of its workers".*

With an Uncle like that, who needs an enemy?

Needless to say, there are a lot of factories that don't do any business with the government. And even those who do, are—at 90 decibels—exposing their workers to "significant risk". But as we read, the industry viewpoint is that "It isn't practical to protect everyone."

What happens to the guy who loses his hearing because it wasn't "practical" to protect him?

Well, he can collect workman's compensation. If, that is, he lives in a state that considers deafness a disability. Believe it or not, some states don't.

And of those who do, Michigan pays a maximum of \$28,000 compensation for total hearing loss, while Nebraska reckons being deaf is only worth \$1,850 per ear. If you go deaf in New York, you have to quit your job for six months before you can collect. Then they'll pay you \$80 a week for 150 weeks. After that, you're on your own.

You might, however, try getting a job at the First National City Bank. They have a special program for hiring the deaf.

*"The Tyranny of Noise," Barron.

SST vs. SSH!

Sound travels at a speed of 738 miles per hour. The Super-Sonic Transport travels faster than that.

The result of breaking the sound barrier is a sonic boom. There's nothing obscure about the term "boom"—it's just that: a great big 130-or-more-decibel BOOM! It sounds like a twelve gauge shotgun in the next room, and has a radius of 50 miles under the plane's path. And that's just an average boom. Many may be much, much louder.

Those are called "Superbooms". And whether an SST goes Boom or Superboom can depend on the wind, the weather or the land it's passing over. Skyscrapers, we're told, can reflect the shock waves and double their intensity. So big cities are more likely to get big booms.

Big cities are also more likely to have airports equipped to take-off and land the supersonic planes. And that's even more noise. Richard Garwin, of President Nixon's Science Advisory Committee, says it would be like fifty jets taking off at once. So that even 13 miles away, it would register 100 decibels.

It has also been suggested that the cockpit noise may be dangerous to the pilot.

But just because you're not a pilot and you don't live within 13 miles of Kennedy, don't relax, and think you're safe.

The "Boom Zone" of the SST would be a corridor 20 to 30 miles on either side of the ground under the plane's path. A transcontinental flight would affect an area of 100,000 square miles or 10 million people. Another estimate has it that when both the American SST and the French CONCORDE are operating, 65 million people in the United States will be exposed to about 10 booms a day. And another 39 million will get anywhere from 1 to 9 of them.

A special report to the Secretary of the Interior estimates that by the late 70's, 125 million people would be affected.

Affected how?

Re-read chapter on the physical effects of noise, for openers. Now keep in mind the "startle reaction". A loud noise makes you jump and start. And then go on to imagine what would happen to a surgeon in the middle of a delicate operation, or a window washer on a scaffold, or a driver on a mountain road.

And if you happened to be watching a game in the Astrodome, you might like to know that the boom has already ripped off roofs, caused an airport control tower to explode, and otherwise shattered windows and made general mischief with property.

You think things are noisy now? If the SST goes through, these are going to be the *Good Old Days*.

SST vs. USA?

It seems to us that most of the reasons for building the Super-Sonic Transport have little to do with any tangible benefits to come from the plane itself.

Sure, Someone is going to be able to move his merchandise from here to there a little faster. And Someone will make or save a few bucks. And Someone will also sell a few planes.

And that's all there is to the SST.

A positive value? Maybe. But what is America going for? The short trip or the long run? Saving Forever? Or a few hours?

We've been told it's a question of National Pride. And America's pride comes from Being First. So much, that we've stopped asking "First at what?"

We're the first country to land on the moon. And the first country to drop an atom bomb. And it almost seems that we don't know the difference. All we know is that we were the First.

Well, there's something that some of us would like to be first at. We'd like to be the first country whose government valued its

environment over its technology. And valued its people more than its profits.

The Nixon Administration is obviously not ready for that one. Despite the Senate's encouraging 52 to 41 vote against it, Mr. Nixon keeps insisting that not building the SST is even worse than building it. He points to the fact that 150,000 jobs would be lost if the SST were dropped.

Now, perhaps our solution is simple-minded. But we don't think there has to be that unemployment. When America is suffering a transportation crisis (the cities losing money through dying commuter lines, the country being choked with runaway traffic) we think this same engineering talent could be put to work where the real problems are.

And where finding solutions would improve all our lives.

As well as our environment.

And be of greater benefit to the economy—the nation's, the City's, and the citizens' economy—than any fleet of SSTs.

And as we see it, the phrase should be updated to read: What's good for *Americans* is good for the country.

THE POLITICS OF NOISE

1. THE SILENT MAJORITY

Most laws regulating noise today are based on the old English Common Law Doctrine of Nuisance, whose precedents were set in the 13th century. An if you've ever asked to use the term "cultural lag" in a sentence, we'd like you to feel free to use it in that one.

Our Constitution provides many nice points which could be used in a case against noise, but have rarely been used with much success.

For instance, the Preamble assures us of our "domestic tranquillity" and "Tranquillity" is legally defined as a state of quietness.

But in test cases, judges have ruled that when you agree to live in a city, you agree to accept any and all noises that go with it. (Which means you can't win a case against your next-door construction site.)

Then too, under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution, Common law holds the right of habitation to be superior to that of commerce; the Fourteenth amendment says that no state can deny equal protection under the law; and the "Balance of Rights" Doctrine holds that the individual and Society (or commerce) are to be equal.

Yet Detroit (or "commerce") is favored in our battle against air pollution as well as noise pollution, and Hempstead, Long Island lost its case to limit aircraft noise from Kennedy.

Last September the city of Boston filed claims against 19 airlines and the Massachusetts Port Authority, asking they pay costs for soundproofing fifteen schools near Logan Airport, and reimburse the city for property depreciation caused by the noise pollution.

We admire their spirit but we don't like their chances.

Constitutional or not, the law protects commerce and is most often built around the realities of current technology rather than the requirements of human existence.

So while 200 million Americans are simply forced to suffer in silence, the SST may get a sympathetic ear.

2. THERE OUGHT TO BE A LAW

New York City, believe it or not, does have some anti-noise laws. A loud party or a barking dog can still bring the cops to your door. And, technically at least, blowing your car horn is illegal.

All other laws so far, cover only the realm of "Nuisance noise" and leave what's a nuisance open to interpretation. No actual decibel levels are set. And the laws are made even more useless by a list of qualifiers.

A noise doesn't count as a Nuisance if, for instance, it's "mobile" (a train, plane, garbage truck, fuel or loud-speaker truck, etc.);

"temporary" (The Saint Patrick's Day parade, or any construction site—"temporary" being interpreted as up to five years); or "socially useful" (which may apply to all repairs or construction).

Daytime construction is specifically exempt from all regulation between 7 AM and 6 PM—six days a week. And if that makes you wonder how come Third Avenue was being drilled on at 8 PM last month, it's because over-time permits are easy to get. All the contractor has to say is that he'll suffer "loss or inconvenience" by quitting at six. And from then on it's your loss (or inconvenience).

New York also has noise provisions in its 1968 Building Code. And while we're the first city in the country to have them, our standards are lower than the lowest set in Europe; and are limited to regulating walls, floors, ceilings, and noise from outside equipment. No regulations are set for interior walls, ventilating ducts, plumbing pipes, electrical boxes, or a list of other noise conductors found in most apartments. Yet. However . . .

3. THERE MAY BE

Sometime in February a noise code will be presented to the New York City Council by Mayor Lindsay.

The code was prepared by the Bureau of Noise Abatement (a part of the Mayor's Environmental Protection Agency) and will set specific standards against noise. And—provide stiff fines for violators.

The areas the code covers include:

The establishment of specific sound levels for motor vehicles, air compressors, refuse compactors, air conditioning systems, and construction apparatus. It will apparently expand on the "unnecessary noise" standards and establish "quiet zones". The plan is to hire twenty-two noise pollution inspectors to watch for violations.

Further, if the E.P.A. is indeed allowed to prosecute violators in a special Environmental Court (another proposal up before the city council), we might really begin to see great improvements in New York.

And if Mayor Lindsay's noise code goes through, it will be the first such code in the country.

On the State level, Assemblyman Andrew Stein introduced a bill to set a state-wide noise limit of 108 PNdb*, which would ban the SST from New York State airports.

SOUND AND FURY

Perhaps one of the most interesting things to be learned from Robert Alex Baron's book "The Tyranny of Noise" (St. Martin's Press, 1970) is how much one person can really accomplish, if sufficiently enraged.

Anger is the operative word. We all care about The Awful Things That Are Happening, but human nature as it is—most of us don't get involved in the burning issues of the day until we've been burned.

Mr. Baron got burned.

By a 1964 subway construction project that began right across the street from his apartment. That began at 7 a.m. every morning, to be precise, and lasted for several years.

Since just passing a construction site is enough to make most of us temporarily insane, the idea of having to live with one is a torture no man should endure. (In fact, Mr. Baron reminds us, noise has been used as a form of torture as far back as ancient China, and despite the many advances in the field, it remains a standard practice in Brainwashing.)

What Mr. Baron learned in his rounds of complaint was that the citizen has no recourse and no escape from the tyranny of noise. The constitution doesn't protect him from this particular invasion of privacy. The few laws that exist are (as so many "anti-pollution" laws) designed to protect Indus-

*PNdb are perceived noise decibels.

try and the status quo of industrial technology. And such laws, far from helping the citizen, render him even more helpless by actually legalizing the excessive noise.

What Mr. Baron did about it constitutes our sermon for the day.

After meeting with the police, the Transit Authority, the construction company, the Board of Health, the Governor, and (even with the help of then-city-councilman Theodore Kupferman) getting precisely nowhere, he did, first of all, not give up.

He began to study the whole problem of noise pollution. And in 1965 formed his own neighborhood into an action group: The Upper Sixth Avenue Noise Abatement Association. They continued to fight (and lose) their local problem, but at the same time created national awareness of the losing battle against noise.

This small group eventually grew into the larger Citizens for a Quieter City, Inc. whose accomplishments have included introducing the Quiet Garbage Truck to New York (the city now owns 10 and has plans for 200 more) importing and demonstrating "silenced" construction tools (which have now been produced by American companies) and developing the current "Project Quiet City," a neighborhood experiment in noise abatement.

The lucky experimental neighborhood is the Lincoln Center area, West of Central Park, from 59th to 74th streets. The area will be treated to the silenced construction equipment, reduced night time traffic, enforcement of horn-blowing laws, and special "Quiet Zones" around its schools and hospitals.

CQC hopes to prove through this Before-and-After study that New York can be quieter, and that New Yorkers will want to keep it that way.

While Mr. Baron points out that little has been done to really control noise pollution, his own accomplishments also point to the fact that a few strong, stubborn people can get together and get things done.

Most of the crises in America today seem to come down to the same thing. A battle of the Individual vs. Society. A society that seems to take our needs and desires as individuals into ever-diminishing account. The irony is that if, as individuals, we lose—then, in fact, our society is lost. And that truly perfect concept—a government of the people, by the people and for the people—shall indeed have perished from the earth.

CAN-DO

You can try complaining, if the noise gets too bad. Try the Department of Noise Abatement (277-1400) and if they can't help, call Citizens for a Quieter City (355-6206) and join the fight.

Protect yourself. When looking for a new apartment, try to be in it once on a weekday (to see how noisy the traffic sounds are) and once at night (to see how noisy your neighbors are). On the very first night in their new apartment, some friends of ours found they were living below three stewardesses who kept strange hours and couldn't afford carpeting because they'd obviously spent all their money on high-heeled bedroom slippers.

Some general tips for keeping things quiet that you also might pass on to the folks upstairs. Keep your TV, hi-fi, etc. off the floor and away from connecting walls. By the 11 o'clock news the volume should be low. . . . Use rugs or carpets wherever possible, especially in children's bedrooms or playrooms. . . . Keep your dog's toenails clipped. The patter of little feet gets amplified a lot when it travels through your floor. . . . And so does the clatter of most women's shoes.

If outside noise is a problem, acoustical ceiling or wall tile may help. But then again, it may not. So get an expert to survey your house before you invest a lot of money. . . . A row of bookshelves against the offending wall may help, and so might heavy drapes.

And if you'd like to redecorate King Arthur style, tapestries on the wall can soak up sound . . . If you're really going crazy from street noise, you can build a special sound-trap wall which, we understand, is very expensive. And which leads us to amend that "Silence is Gold."

Those plastic and paper garbage bags we mentioned last month can help eliminate the 5 AM clatter of metal cans.

AND SO TO BEDLAM

Having discovered that most of our bedrooms are at least fifteen decibels too loud to fall asleep in, we visited the *Sleep Shop* at *Hammacher Schlemmer* to find out what remedies New York's most imaginative grown-up toy store had to offer. And here we found:

1. A box of Nods. Ear stopples. Made of wax and looking like gumdrops, ear plugs that "comfortably conform to shut out noise and water." \$5 for what looks like a few month's supply.

2. The "Invento" Sleep Sound Machines. Made to fit neatly on a night table and make, as the salesman told us, "nice noise." (And maybe drown out the traffic below?) The first model (\$19.95) made one sound. A low whirr (which sounded to us like the air conditioner that keeps us awake on August nights). The \$25 one has two sounds. A High Whirr and a Low Whirr. (Actually, they probably do mask sounds, and are less distracting than the television set. Although it depends on what programs you watch) . . . But the third machine—the \$65 third machine—does imitations of rolling surf and the pitter-patter of gentle rain, and then, rather prosaically, of something called "white sound" (like a radio when the station has gone off the air). Which sound, if you go to bed late enough, you can get from your radio absolutely free.

3. If the noise pollution comes from within, you might try the Winko Anti-Snore Mask. ("For Him or For Her") "Subdues and helps control harsh snoring or sleep talking." All that for \$2.50.

4. Lastly, if the local noise is too loud to fight, you might attack insomnia from another angle. With *Magic Fingers* (\$45). A self-timing vibrator that fits under the mattress and jiggles. Either that, or just think about it and laugh yourself to sleep.

LETTERS TO C.A.N.

DEAR CAN: I loved the recycling issue and thought you might be interested in a few memories from my European childhood. We'd never heard of "recycling." We were simply taught that wastefulness is a sin: ("waste not, want not" is a phrase that every English child is heartily sick of hearing).

We saved every paper clip, rubber band and paper bag that came into the house. Parcels were untied carefully, the brown paper saved to be wrapped around the next package leaving the house; all those knots were untangled, with total disregard for broken nails, and every piece of string stored in a kitchen drawer.

Groceries were brought home in a shopping cart or a string bag: there was very little excess packaging, in fact even eggs were protected only by the flimsiest of paper bags. All our food leftovers went to the dogs or the hens or the compost heap.

As for our clothes, shirt collars and cuffs were turned, socks were darned, (even torn sheets were darned and turned sides to middle). Once a dress had passed through its last hand-me-down, the material would quite likely turn up as a cushion cover or a stuffed toy. German housewives used to use their soapy wash water for several loads of laundry, from light clothes to dark clothes to really dirty clothes, and then use the suds to wash the kitchen floor! Today German washing machine manufacturers still provide housewives with this option.

So we re-used things—not so much for necessity, but the feeling that to waste anything was wrong and stupid. It's an attitude that persists to this day—my seventy-year old Aunt recently arrived to visit us in New York bringing her own supply of the backs of used envelopes!

With all good wishes for your success in educating us all and hopefully teaching us to change our attitudes.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. D. HEATH.

DEAR CAN: I'm glad you don't disapprove of disposable diapers. I don't know if I could cope without them. But you said it was important to follow directions on the box about disposal. And there are no directions to speak of on the brand I use. Is there something I should know?

Mrs. R. L.

First choice: the incinerator. Second best: trash can. Fold so that plastic lining is on the outside, and if the diaper has tapes, tape is closed. If possible, use a plastic bag for the day's collection. If you must flush, first remove plastic lining—it can clog your plumbing and the city's sewage system—and throw that part in the trash can. Swish the inner lining in the john so it falls apart before flushing. Never flush if you have a cesspool or septic tank system.

CAN, Inc.

Co-chairmen: Ilene Goldman, Lola Redford.

Treasurer: Arlene Weltman.

Secretary: Barbara Niles.

Publicity-PR: Carlin Masterson.

Newsletter: Hildy Johnson.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it has been written that the history of man is a history of weeping. Perhaps no nation better exemplifies this than Poland. There, a people devoted to freedom has been forced to bear the yoke of slavery. The entire history of the Polish nation has been a struggle against foreign tyranny and oppression.

Today, May 3, we celebrate the 180th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. One hundred and eighty years ago the light of freedom again appeared in that brave land, as it has so often through the years. On that day, the King of Poland with the leaders of the people, Stanislaw Malachowski and Ignacy Potocki, presented a new constitution to the Polish Diet. It was accepted by acclamation, and the people celebrated throughout the land.

The new constitution was based on the English model. Not only did it create greater freedom and order at home, but it also served as a declaration of independence from foreign domination. The new Polish Constitution was praised by freedom loving people everywhere. Edmund Burke praised Poland's actions and George Washington publicly acclaimed Poland's new found liberty.

One foreign government was not pleased, however. It was to Russia's interest have a weak, subservient Poland.

And Russia quickly moved to crush the new government. Aided by several Polish traitors, Russia invaded Poland in April 1792. In spite of the brave efforts of men like Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who had so recently helped defend the freedom of America, the new Polish Government fell. Russia had its way. Poland was once again enslaved.

Today, our hearts go out to our Polish brothers and sisters. They are a people who have fought long and hard for liberty.

Let Poland stand as an example to all who hold liberty dear. The Polish people have never given up the struggle. Some day, with the grace of God, Poland will again be free to fulfill the hopes expressed so well on May 3, 1791. Never has a people fought so long and so consistently for personal liberty. May we never forget their devotion to freedom and their willingness to defend it.

JOHN KERRY'S STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE VIETNAM VETERANS AGAINST THE WAR

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith a statement which might well become an historic document made by a very articulate young veteran, Lt. John F. Kerry, who, like so many others of the two and a half million American men who have served in Vietnam, now feel that this war is immoral, illegal and tragic beyond description.

I am honored to have Lt. John F. Kerry as one of my constituents in Waltham, Mass. I cannot describe the tremendous pride which the people of Massachusetts have in this courageous officer of the U.S. Navy who is now expressing his convictions and his conscience on a national scale with regard to the war in Southeast Asia.

I have stated on several occasions in the past few weeks that I have the hope that, just as Selma led to the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, so also the activities on behalf of peace by the Vietnam Veterans Against the War in April 1971 may lead to a prompt cessation of all hostilities in Indochina.

The text of the statement given by Navy Lt. (j.g.) John F. Kerry before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 22, 1971 is as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN KERRY, REPRESENTING THE VIETNAM VETERANS AGAINST THE WAR

Mr. KERRY. Thank you very much, Senator Fulbright, Senator Javits, Senator Symington, Senator Pell. I would like to say for the record, and also for the men behind me who are also wearing the uniform and their medals, that my sitting here is really symbolic. I am not here as John Kerry. I am here as one member of the group of 1,000, which is a small representation of a very much larger group of veterans in this country, and were it possible for all of them to sit at this table they would be here and have the same kind of testimony.

I would simply like to speak in very gen-

eral terms I apologize if my statement is general because I received notification yesterday you would hear me and I am afraid that because of the court injunction I was up most of the night and haven't had a great deal of time to prepare for this hearing.

I would like to talk on behalf of all those veterans and say that several months ago in Detroit we had an investigation at which over 150 honorably discharged, and many very highly decorated, veterans testified to war crimes committed in Southeast Asia. These were not isolated incidents but crimes committed on a day to day basis with the full awareness of officers at all levels of command.

It is impossible to describe to you exactly what did happen in Detroit—the emotions in the room and the feelings of the men who were reliving their experiences in Vietnam. They relived the absolute horror of what this country, in a sense, made them do.

They told stories that at times they had personally raped, cut off ears, cut off heads, taped wires from portable telephones to human genitals and turned up the power, cut off limbs, blown up bodies, randomly shot at civilians, razed villages in fashion reminiscent of Genghis Khan, shot cattle and dogs for fun, poisoned food stocks, and generally ravaged the countryside of South Vietnam in addition to the normal ravage of war and the normal and very particular ravaging which is done by the applied bombing power of this country.

We call this investigation the Winter Soldier Investigation. The term Winter Soldier is a play on words of Thomas Paine's in 1776 when he spoke of the Sunshine Patriot and summer time soldiers who deserted at Valley Forge because the going was rough.

We who have come here to Washington have come here because we feel we have to be winter soldiers now. We could come back to this country, we could be quiet, we could hold our silence, we could not tell what went on in Vietnam, but we feel because of what threatens this country, not the reds, but the crimes which we are committing that threaten it, that we have to speak out.

I would like to talk to you a little bit about what the result is of the feelings these men carry with them after coming back from Vietnam. The country doesn't know it yet but it has created a monster, a monster in the form of millions of men who have been taught to deal and to trade in violence and who are given the chance to die for the biggest nothing in history; men who have returned with a sense of anger and a sense of betrayal which no one has yet grasped.

As a veteran and one who feels this anger I would like to talk about it. We are angry because we feel we have been used in the worst fashion by the administration of this country.

In 1970 at West Point Vice President Agnew said "some glamorize the criminal misfits of society while our best men die in Asian rice paddies to preserve the freedom which most of those misfits abuse," and this was used as a rallying point for our effort in Vietnam.

But for us, as boys in Asia whom the country was supposed to support, his statement is a terrible distortion from which we can only draw a very deep sense of revulsion, and hence the anger of some of the men who are here in Washington today. It is a distortion because we in no way consider ourselves the best men of this country; because those he calls misfits were standing up for us in a way that nobody else in this country dared to; because so many who have died would have returned to this country to join the misfits in their efforts to ask for an immediate withdrawal from South Vietnam; because so many of those best men have returned as quadriplegics and amputees—and they lie forgotten in Veterans Administration Hospitals in this country which fly the flag which so many have chosen as their own personal symbol—and we cannot consider

ourselves Americas best men when we are ashamed of and hated for what we were called on to do in Southeast Asia.

In our opinion, and from our experience, there is nothing in South Vietnam which could happen that realistically threatens the United States of America. And to attempt to justify the loss of one American life in Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos by linking such loss to the preservation of freedom, which those misfits supposedly abuse, is to us the height of criminal hypocrisy, and it is that kind of hypocrisy which we feel has torn this country apart.

We are probably much more angry than that, but I don't want to go into the foreign policy aspects because I am outclassed here. I know that all of you talk about every possible alternative to getting out of Vietnam. We understand that. We know you have considered the seriousness of the aspects to the utmost level and I am not going to try to dwell on that. But I want to relate to you the feeling that many of the men who have returned to this country express because we are probably angriest about all that we were told about Vietnam and about the mystical war against communism.

We found that not only was it a civil war, an effort by a people who had for years been seeking their liberation from any colonial influence whatsoever, but also we found that the Vietnamese whom we had enthusiastically molded after our own image were hard put to take up the fight against the threat we were supposedly saving them from.

We found most people didn't even know the difference between communism and democracy. They only wanted to work in rice paddies without helicopters strafing them and bombs with napalm burning their villages and tearing their country apart. They wanted everything to do with the war, particularly with this foreign presence of the United States of America, to leave them alone in peace, and they practiced the art of survival by siding with whichever military force was present at a particular time, be it Viet Cong, North Vietnamese or American.

We found also that all too often American men were dying in those rice paddies for want of support from their allies. We saw first hand how monies from American taxes was used for a corrupt dictatorial regime. We saw that many people in this country had a one-sided idea of who was kept free by our flag, and blacks provided the highest percentage of casualties. We saw Vietnam ravaged equally by American bombs and search and destroy missions, as well as by Viet Cong terrorism, and yet we listened while this country tried to blame all of the havoc on the Viet Cong.

We rationalized destroying villages in order to save them. We saw America lose her sense of morality as she accepted very coolly a My Lai and refused to give up the image of American soldiers who hand out chocolate bars and chewing gum.

We learned the meaning of free fire zones, shooting anything that moves, and we watched while America placed a cheapness on the lives of orientals.

We watched the United States falsification of body counts, in fact the glorification of body counts. We listened while month after month we were told the back of the enemy was about to break. We fought using weapons against "oriental human beings." We fought using weapons against those people which I do not believe this country would dream of using were we fighting in the European theater. We watched while men charged up hills because a general said that hill has to be taken, and after losing one platoon or two platoons they marched away to leave the hill for re-occupation by the North Vietnamese. We watched pride allow the most unimportant battles to be blown into extravaganzas, because we couldn't lose, and we couldn't

retreat, and because it didn't matter how many American bodies were lost to prove that point, and so there were Hamburger Hills and Khe Sahns and Hill 81s and Fire Base 6s, and so many others.

Now we are told that the men who fought there must watch quietly while American lives are lost so that we can exercise the incredible arrogance of Vietnamizing the Vietnamese.

Each day to facilitate the process by which the United States washes her hands of Vietnam someone has to give up his life so that the United States doesn't have to admit something that the entire world already knows, so that we can't say that we have made a mistake. Someone has to die so that President Nixon won't be, and these are his words, "the first President to lose a war."

We are asking Americans to think about that because how do you ask a man to be the last man to die in Vietnam? How do you ask a man to be the last man to die for a mistake? But we are trying to do that, and we are doing it with thousands of rationalizations, and if you read carefully the President's last speech to the people of this country, you can see that he says, and says clearly, "but the issue, gentlemen, the issue, is communism, and the question is whether or not we will leave that country to the communists or whether or not we will try to give it hope to be a free people." But the point is they are not a free people now under us. They are not a free people, and we cannot fight communism all over the world. I think we should have learned that lesson by now.

But the problem of veterans goes beyond this personal problem, because you think about a poster in this country with a picture of Uncle Sam and the picture says "I want you." And a young man comes out of high school and says, "that is fine, I am going to serve my country," and he goes to Vietnam and he shoots and he kills and he does his job. Or maybe he doesn't kill. Maybe he just goes and he comes back, and when he gets back to this country he finds that he isn't really wanted, because the largest corps of unemployed in the country—it varies depending on who you get it from, the Veterans Administration says 15 percent and various other sources 22 percent—but the largest corps of unemployed in this country are Veterans of this war, and of those veterans 33 percent of the unemployed are black. That means one out of every ten of the nation's unemployed is a veteran of Vietnam.

The hospitals across the country won't, or can't meet their demands. It is not a question of not trying; they haven't got the appropriations. A man recently died after he had a tracheotomy in California, not because of the operation but because there weren't enough personnel to clean the mucus out of his tube and he suffocated to death.

Another young man just died in a New York VA Hospital the other day. A friend of mine was lying in a bed two beds away and tried to help him but he couldn't. He rang a bell and there was nobody there to service that man and so he died of convulsions.

I understand 57 percent of all those entering the VA hospitals talk about suicide. Some 27 percent have tried, and they try because they come back to this country and they have to face what they did in Vietnam, and then they come back and find the indifference of a country that doesn't really care.

Suddenly we are faced with a very sickening situation in this country, because there is no moral indignation and, if there is, it comes from people who are almost exhausted by their past indignations, and I know that many of them are sitting in front of me. The country seems to have lain down and shrugged off something as serious as Laos, just as we calmly shrugged off the loss of 700,000 lives in Pakistan, the so-called greatest disaster of all times.

But we are here as veterans to say we think we are in the midst of the greatest disaster of all times now because they are still dying over there—not just Americans, but Vietnamese—and we are rationalizing leaving that country so that those people can go on killing each other for years to come.

Americans seem to have accepted the idea that the war is winding down, at least for Americans, and they have also allowed the bodies which were once used by a President for statistics to prove that we were winning that war, to be used as evidence against a man who followed orders and who interpreted those orders no differently than hundreds of other men in Vietnam.

We veterans can only look with amazement on the fact that this country has been unable to see there is absolutely no difference between ground troops and a helicopter crew, and yet people have accepted a differentiation fed them by the administration.

No ground troops are in Laos so it is all right to kill Laotians by remote control. But believe me the helicopter crews fill the same body bags and they wreak the same kind of damage on the Vietnamese and Laotian countryside as anybody else, and the President is talking about allowing that to go on for many years to come. One can only ask if we will really be satisfied only when the troops march into Hanoi.

We are asking here in Washington for some action; action from the Congress of the United States of America which has the power to raise and maintain armies, and which by the Constitution also has the power to declare war.

We have come here, not to the President, because we believe that this body can be responsive to the will of the people, and we believe that the will of the people says that we should be out of Vietnam now.

We are here in Washington also to say that the problem of this war is not just a question of war and diplomacy. It is part and parcel of everything that we are trying as human beings to communicate to people in this country—the question of racism, which is rampant in the military, and so many other questions such as the use of weapons; the hypocrisy in our taking umbrage in the Geneva Conventions and using that as justification for a continuation of this war when we are more guilty than any other body of violations of those Geneva Conventions; in the use of free fire zones, harassment interdiction fire, search and destroy missions, the bombings, the torture of prisoners, the killing of prisoners, all accepted policy by many units in South Vietnam. That is what we are trying to say. It is part and parcel of everything.

An American Indian friend of mine who lives in the Indian Nation of Alcatraz put it to me very succinctly. He told me how as a boy on an Indian reservation he had watched television and he used to cheer the cowboys when they came in and shot the Indians, and then suddenly one day he stopped in Vietnam and he said "my God, I am doing to these people the very same thing that was done to my people," and he stopped. And that is what we are trying to say, that we think this thing has to end.

We are also here to ask, and we are here to ask vehemently, where are the leaders of our country? Where is the leadership? We are here to ask where are McNamara, Rostow, Bundy, Gilpatric and so many others? Where are they now that we, the men whom they sent off to war, have returned? These are commanders who have deserted their troops, and there is no more serious crime in the law of war. The Army says they never leave their wounded. The Marines say they never leave even their dead. These men have left all the casualties and retreated behind a pious shield of public rectitude. They have left the real stuff of their reputations bleaching behind them in the sun in this country.

Finally, this administration has done us the ultimate dishonor. They have attempted to disown us and the sacrifices we made for this country. In their blindness and fear they have tried to deny that we are veterans or that we served in Nam. We do not need their testimony. Our own scars and stumps of limbs are witness enough for others and for ourselves.

We wish that a merciful God could wipe away our own memories of that service as easily as this administration has wiped away their memories of us. But all that they have done and all that they can do by this denial is to make more clear than ever our own determination to undertake one last mission—to search out and destroy the last vestige of this barbaric war, to pacify our own hearts, to conquer the hate and the fear that have driven this country these last ten years and more, so when 30 years from now our brothers go down the street without a leg, without an arm, or a face, and small boys ask why, we will be able to say: "Vietnam" and not mean a desert, not a filthy obscene memory, but mean instead the place where America finally turned and where soldiers like us helped it in the turning.

Thank you.

THE WABASH CANNONBALL—
WE LOVED YOU

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 30, the legendary Wabash Cannonball made its last run between Detroit and St. Louis. Many have traveled on this famous train while many others have fond memories of this once great American train.

My family and I joined our colleague, Representative J. EDWARD ROUSH, in Fort Wayne to make this historic last trip. The train pulled out of the Fort Wayne station at 9:25 a.m., its three coaches packed with train enthusiasts as well as many schoolchildren.

At each stop as it headed southwest through Indiana, schoolchildren got on with their teachers and rode to the next station where schoolbuses were waiting to return them to their classes. Many had sack lunches, candy bars and bananas to make their journey more pleasurable. Most were riding a train for their first time and probably their last.

Just outside of Fort Wayne, the teachers and students of the Indian Village Grade School stood along the fence dividing the track from the school playground. All were waving and shouting as the train slowed down by previous arrangement. Many were holding up signs they had designed and painted. Typical were: "Goodby Cannonball, we will miss you;" "Cannonball, we loved you." Others just said "Cannonball" in large black lettering. This was a great event for those children, but their expressions and signs brought more than one tear from the passengers on board the Cannonball.

At Lafayette, the city fathers were out in force including Mayor Don Blue, of Lafayette, and Maj. James Williamson, of West Lafayette. They bid official fare-

well to the Cannonball with a bottle of champagne across the cow catcher.

The Wabash railroad has always been "the railroad" for the Myers family. My uncle, Tom Edwards, now deceased, of Decatur, Ill., was once an engineer on the famous train. His son and my cousin, Don Edwards, lost his life on the Cannonball on April 8, 1945, when the train hit an open switch at Palmer, Ill.

Conductor W. C. Kindlespaker, Perrysville, Ind., had a tear in his eye as he left the train at Danville, Ill., for the last time. Other crewmembers on this final run were engineer Joseph Blackburn, Peru, Ind.; fireman T. Spencer, Peru; porter H. I. Williams, St. Louis; brakeman K. E. Walter, Denver, Ind.; cook Cha Barnes and waiter Wardell Price, both of St. Louis.

Now silenced is the jingle, the rumble, and the roar as she glides along the woodlands, through the hills and by the shore. She was mighty tall and handsome. She was known quite well by all. She was the combination in the Wabash Cannonball.

ADDRESS BY JAMES M. ROCHE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in our concern to cleanse our environment and to protect the consumer, we also have a duty to listen to the advice of industry. Mr. James M. Roche, the chairman of General Motors Corp. and a resident of my congressional district, outlined some of the problems which confront the auto industry in a speech delivered March 25 in Chicago. I commend Mr. Roche's remarks to my colleagues:

AN ADDRESS BY JAMES M. ROCHE, CHAIRMAN,
GENERAL MOTORS

I was very pleased to receive Bill Clark's invitation to address the Executive Club of Chicago. It is always pleasant to return to where I have so many fond memories and pleasant associations.

Your Club has a well-earned reputation. Your membership reflects a great diversity of interests and a fine record of accomplishments. The Club is known as an excellent forum for frank and thoughtful discussion. Here is a place to raise issues that should concern all of us who care about the well-being of our country and its economy.

Today, then, let me call your attention to a serious, yet subtle, threat to our American system of free enterprise. I would like to discuss this threat, and the personal responsibility it places upon us, as businessmen, to help counter it.

There are two premises on which I think we can all agree. The first is that our country—by almost any measure—is preeminent in the world. To assert this is not to deny our faults. We are still short of achieving many of our national ideas. But neither should we deny the blessings we enjoy as a nation. Most apparent perhaps is our unmatched material well-being. More important, though, are our high levels of education, health, and individual opportunity, and of course our freedoms, the priceless heritage our history has served to enlarge.

A second premise, like the first, is also too little acknowledged. It is that our free competitive economic system has been essential to the achievement and the preservation of these national endowments.

These beliefs may seem fundamental to us. Nevertheless, they are questioned by some people in our society today. Notwithstanding that America is the envy and the aspiration of the world, there are those who maintain our economic system is not the best, and ask is there not a better way. Some who question our society and its achievements are young. Some are well-intentioned. Some are sincere.

But there are others. Their final objectives are not what they first profess. Their beliefs, their purposes, run contrary to the principles of the majority of our people. They question many of our institutions, including our economic system. They crusade for radical changes in our system of corporate ownership, changes so drastic that they would all but destroy free enterprise as we know it. Deliberately or not, they are also weakening our free competitive system.

AN IDEA DIMINISHED

Many observers have noted the recent growth of a group of critics who have launched, and have pressed, an assault on the reputation of America. It has already diminished the idea of America in the eyes of many people, at home and abroad. The damage they do is greatest among our young, who are no longer even given the time to judge our system by their own experience. Instead, their ideals are aborted, at an age and often in a place—in our schools—where ideals ought to be instilled rather than destroyed.

The current disparagement of America holds many ironies. One is that the country is criticized for the relatively narrow area of shortcoming without credit for the broad range of achievement. For example, the nation is credited less with a superior system of public higher education than it is criticized for not making it freely available to all, even the unqualified. The nation is credited less with an incomparable transportation system than it is faulted for its traffic jams. The nation is credited less with having two-thirds of its families own their own homes than it is condemned for its slums.

Another irony is that many of today's problems are an outgrowth of yesterday's progress. They are marks of a society that, on the whole, has had extraordinary success in meeting the aspirations of earlier generations. Yet some who criticize our system would substitute other systems which have fallen far short of ours. In most other countries, the quality of our daily life is still no more than a hopeful vision. In those places, such criticisms as we hear would be mere frivolities, idle pastimes of the academic. Where there are no roofs, there are no leaks.

Nevertheless, in our country this climate of disparagement and doubt is real. Its depressing impact upon the national mood is affecting the attitudes and values of our younger generation. All of us with a concern for our society's future must recognize and deal with what is really a kind of national malaise.

To the extent that doubt and disparagement are directed toward free enterprise, they are of direct and immediate concern to us as businessmen. And it is all too evident that, in too many cases, the climate of criticism is highly adverse to free enterprise. The equating of profit with immorality is spreading a cloud of suspicion and distrust over all we have achieved and hope to achieve.

To those of us in business, progress is both our goal and our habit. We understand that progress means change. We never expect nor want things to stay as they are, much less to turn back to simpler days. Progressive change has brought our coun-

try to its present high position. Competitive enterprise has been a principal engine of change and progress. Business has not only responded to change, but has caused change. Out of this process of competitive innovation comes progress.

STEWARDS OF PROGRESS

From here, we must go forward. There is more, much more to do. For us, tomorrow is today's responsibility. We are stewards, committed to progress, duty-bound to leave things better than we found them. This is the way of free enterprise. Just as it has made possible our past progress, so is it essential for the accomplishment of the future objective of our society.

American business today has no lack of challenges. The list is long and familiar to all of you. It includes inflation, foreign competition, unsatisfactory productivity, urban rebuilding, minority opportunity, pollution control, and in many areas, increasing government regulation.

Some of these challenges—inflation, foreign competition, unsatisfactory productivity—are tied together. Our rising costs and lagging productivity have damaged our country's competitive position. They have lessened the ability of many industries to compete in world markets. They have also resulted in an influx of imported merchandise never before experienced in the United States.

American business, from the perspective of the world, is plainly in trouble. There is much we must do to bolster our ability to compete against others, and to strengthen our essential contributions to the continued progress of our society here at home.

Many of those who seek change do not share the businessman's obligation to progress. Their goal and their habit is to criticize. They thrive on the sensational accusation and the publicity it gains. At a time when our system is so challenged, all of us—not just some of us—should work to improve free enterprise. None of us can afford to impair it.

THE PLACE FOR DOUBT AND DISSENT

This is not to say that any institution in our society should be above criticism, nor that there is no need for criticism. But criticism should be constructive, and doubt should be honest. Doubt truly is the beginning of wisdom, and if the freedom of dissent cannot survive in America, then it can survive no place at all.

Some of today's disparagers, however, lay a false claim to follow the noble American tradition of outspoken criticism. This criticism, however, was for the most part constructive. At heart, these earlier men and women were builders. They were doers, as well as doubters.

Yet too many today seek less to correct a wrong than to condemn a system. Too many critics focus on a particular fault for no more than a moment, and offer few if any solutions. They jump from cause to cause, going wherever popularity or expediency leads, using whatever means are at hand, inflaming any issue that promises attention.

Each of their criticisms may seem inconsequential by itself. Yet taken together, these criticisms, in their number and in their intensity, are an indictment of economic America that can do lasting damage to our system. The criticisms themselves are a form of harassment unknown to businessmen in other times. They tend to mislead the courts and government into other forms of business harassment. This unjustified harassment—and much of it is unjustified—is a covert danger we can no longer ignore.

Much of the modern criticism of free enterprise is by no means idle, nor is it intended to be. Many of the critics have the professed aim to alter "the role and influence of corporations and corporate management in and upon American society." Their philosophy is antagonistic to our American ideas of private property and in-

dividual responsibility. Henry G. Manne is Kenan Professor of Law and Political Science at the University of Rochester. He has observed that these critics would like to carry corporate decisions into the streets, where they have already taken many of the decisions of some universities and other institutions.

Those critics whose aim is destructive are following a basic tactic of divisiveness—and with considerable success. They are endeavoring to turn various segments of our society—government, labor, and universities—against business. They are trying to make America in the 1970's a society at war with itself.

Their ultimate aim is to alienate the American consumer from business, to tear down long-established relationships which have served both so well. They tell the consumer he is being victimized. New products are being foisted upon him, whether he wants them or not. These products are not as good as they should be—that is, they are less than perfect. Businessmen are greedy and uncaring. Corporations are beyond reach and above response to the consumer's needs. Advertising is false. Prices are padded. Labels are inaccurate. Therefore, the consumer, many would have us believe, is helpless and unprotected when he shops, and is really not responsible for what he buys.

THE NEED FOR CONSUMER SUPREMACY

This delusion—that the consumer cannot trust his own free choice—strikes at the very heart of our free competitive system. The system is founded on the conviction that in the long run the consumer is the best judge of his own welfare. The entire success of free enterprise can be traced to the vitality it gains by competitive striving to satisfy the discriminating customer. To destroy the concept of consumer supremacy is to destroy free enterprise. If the consumer can be convinced that he really does not know what is good for him—and this is what the critics try to do—then freedom leaves free enterprise.

In other words, if the consumer cannot protect his own interest, then someone else must do it. That someone else will then dictate what can be made, what can be sold, and at what price. That will surely mark the end of free enterprise. The greatest of our economic freedoms—the freedom to decide our purchase—will be gone.

This cannot happen, many will say. To them we should reply, look back. Look back at only the past decade to see how rapidly we have expanded the role of government in the marketplace.

To protect the consumer, a new aspect of bureaucracy, "consumer affairs," has been created, not only in Washington, but in state capitals, and local communities. Since 1900, Congress has passed 69 major consumer laws, but two-thirds of these have been enacted in only the last eight years. To the extent that new laws and new officials do protect the consumer against fraud and deception, and safeguard his health and safety, they are good. But too much of this new development is unnecessary, and does not deliver a value to the consumer commensurate with the potential cost in higher taxes and higher prices.

Also to protect the consumer, it has been mandated that many of the products he buys be altered. In this way too, consumer choice is sometimes unnecessarily reduced, and costs are added without equivalent increase in value. For these unwanted products as well, it is the consumer who pays.

THE COST OF HARASSMENT

Make no mistake, the results of irresponsible harassment have added significantly to the cost of doing business. The higher taxes are costly. Adapting products to new regulations is costly. Meeting daily harassments, answering criticism, defending against public attack, all these carry costs—in time and energy as well as dollars.

Yet, the fashion is still to call for these new controls of business. The regulations and inspections of administrative agencies have their harassing counterpart in the legislative halls where there are also those who seek to devise new means to impair the free workings of our economic system.

Individuals and agencies have competed—sometimes blindly—to be on the crest of the wave of consumer protection. In the 1960's consumer legislation came into political vogue. Much of this was necessary, and serves our society well. Yet the short-term political advantage offered by spectacular but unsound consumer legislation can do lasting damage to the very consumer it purports to help.

The consumer—that is, all of us—is the loser when irresponsible criticism and ill-conceived legislation break down faith in our economic system, when harassment distracts us from our modern challenges, when the very idea of free enterprise is diminished in the eyes of the young people who must one day manage our businesses.

Every unwise impairment of free enterprise carries some additional costs to 200 million individual Americans. It carries other great collective costs to the extent that it further reduces the ability of American industry to compete in the markets of the world.

America no longer enjoys the technological edge over other advanced countries that we once did. This is especially true in the case of such industrialized nations as Germany, Japan, France, and Italy. They are enjoying substantial annual increases in productivity as opposed to the slower rate of increase in our own economy. They too are experiencing inflation but, because we start from a higher base, the gap in dollars-and-cents costs is widening in many industries. This growing competition disadvantage against America is an important fact of international economic life. Yet it is little acknowledged by some of the critics. They demand that American business be more socially responsible, but give too little consideration to the costs of meeting social aspirations.

Yet the costs must be considered when business is directed to achieve the social as well as the economic aspirations of a society. The costs of meeting these social aspirations are superimposed upon our present very high cost base. They simply compound the difficulty of competing with foreign manufacturers whose economies have not yet lifted their societies to the level of ours, and consequently have not experienced the same demands for still further social advances.

AN ADVERSARY CULTURE

Corporate responsibility is a catchword of the adversary culture that is so evident today. If something is wrong with American society, blame business. Business did not create discrimination in America, but business is expected to eliminate it. Business did not bring about the deterioration of our cities, but business is expected to rebuild them. Business did not create poverty and hunger in our land, but business is expected to eliminate them.

As citizens and Americans, we heartily endorse all these objectives. No thoughtful American can be opposed to equal opportunity, to better housing and education, and to the elimination of poverty from our land. But every thoughtful American must face the fact that new aspirations entail new costs.

We should also recognize that business is not always the best vehicle for their accomplishment, although there is much business can contribute. Business nevertheless is often a convenient scapegoat. But blaming business, or government for that matter, does not excuse us from our own personal responsibility as citizens, as parents, as teachers.

These considerations pose questions which should be much on the mind of every American. Because if our society does not give them a satisfactory answer—and soon—

whatever capacity American business does have to influence social change for the better may be severely impaired. Business, burdened by new and unnecessary social costs, may find itself hard-pressed to maintain the economic progress that has so distinguished our history.

The climate of criticism and disparagement has dulled the reputation of business. We read and hear very little that is good about business. Seldom, if ever, is business credited with meeting its basic corporate responsibilities. I submit that American business is fulfilling vital social responsibilities every day—and with great success.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BUSINESS

Business does its job when it provides useful jobs at high wages, when it provides useful products at fair prices, when it provides economic growth that produces taxes for government and earnings for stockholders. These are the long-standing social responsibilities of business. Their fulfillment by American business over two centuries has made our America what it is. It is an achievement to be proud of—an achievement to talk about.

Earlier, I said we must be ready to accept change. And business today is expected to respond to the new aspirations of the society it serves. This broad public expectation must be recognized, and these new challenges must be accepted. The costs of many are non prohibitive. For example, the cost of providing greater job opportunities, particularly for minorities, can usually be absorbed in the normal course of business. The same is true of the cost of supporting community and educational activities—business' traditional citizenship role. And for these, we do get value. However, in other areas, for example in the control of pollution, costs are usually substantial. To the extent that they cannot be absorbed, they will raise the price of the product and in turn the overall level of prices in our economy.

ASPIRATIONS AND THEIR COST

As a Nation we must be mature enough to face up to the costs involved in meeting our new aspirations. It can mean a weakened competitive position in the world. It can mean higher prices for the consumer, and higher taxes for the citizens. This is no dire forecast. This is already a fact. We are weaker abroad. We have experienced higher prices and higher taxes.

Yet we must not allow this to slow our nation's progress toward the fulfillment of our social aspirations. Our task is to achieve our national social objectives at the least possible cost to our society, to assure full value for the dollars that must be spent, to mount an efficient effort. This is clearly a job where business, and businessmen, have much to contribute. Society must define its objectives and establish priorities.

President Nixon, in his recent Budget message, has pointed the way. He has committed the nation to far-reaching programs to improve the quality of American life. To help accomplish these ends he has proposed sharing \$16 billion of Federal revenue with state and local governments. This is one way, as he put it, to give people "the opportunity to become more involved in the decisions that affect their lives."

As businessmen, we should follow the President's lead, again in his words, "to harness the powerful mechanism of the marketplace . . . to encourage improvement in the quality of life." We strengthen the roots of America every time we strengthen individual responsibility. Whether this is revenue sharing, which gives more responsibility to local taxpayers, or efforts to assure greater consumer choice in the marketplace, the benefit is the same: an increase in the free exercise of responsibility, which is the essence of our democracy.

It is not enough that management should

be aware of what benefits—and what costs—are involved in fulfilling social objectives. The owners of American business—and virtually every American has a direct or indirect stake in business—must make the ultimate decision.

In the end, management must be responsive to the wishes of the stockholders. Management is obliged to inform stockholders as to the problems and the short-term costs as well as the potential long-range benefits of a greater and more direct involvement in social objectives. Then, management must abide by the owners' decision. Through his proxy, every stockholder has that right to decide and must exercise it. After that has been done, management has the responsibility to manage, to preserve and protect the business while leading it in the directions pointed by the stockholders.

A TIME FOR DECISION

Free enterprise has come to a crisis—a crisis in the sense of a time for decision. Tough decisions must be made, by all of us, and soon. Society expects much of us. Yet if we are to be effective, we must work together with the other segments of our society. Instead, at this very time when free enterprise needs support, it finds itself the target of much irresponsible criticism that causes disunity in our society.

Having pitted consumer against producer, some critics are now busy eroding another support of free enterprise—the loyalty of a management team, with its unifying values of cooperative work. Some of the enemies of business now encourage an employee to be disloyal to the enterprise. They want to create suspicion and disharmony, and pry into the proprietary interests of the business. However this is labeled—industrial espionage, whistle blowing, or professional responsibility—it is another tactic for spreading disunity and creating conflict.

The dull cloud of pessimism and distrust which some have cast over free enterprise is impairing the ability of business to meet its basic economic responsibilities—not to mention its capacity to take on newer ones. This, as much as any other factor, makes it urgent that those of us who are in business, who have made business our career, who are justifiably proud of our profession, that we stand up and be counted. It is up to us in the business community to reaffirm our belief in free enterprise.

Business has high goals, large responsibilities, and every incentive to fulfill them. In a climate of understanding, it can continue to provide rising standards of well-being for ourselves and our families. In a climate of encouragement, business can continue to expand job opportunities for the millions of new workers who are entering the labor force. In a climate of confidence, business can continue to offer the wide variety of quality products which consumers demand. In a climate of growth, business can continue to generate the earnings and pay the dividends on which investors, large and small, depend.

This competitive system of ours has achieved results beyond man's imagining. Its potential for further advance is greater than even the achievements in the past. It is time to tell this story with the enthusiasm and strength to match our conviction.

THE ENLARGEMENT OF FREEDOM

Where the disparagers would diminish freedom, let us enlarge it. Where they would turn other segments of society against us, let us go out and work with government, with the universities, with the press. Let us work together to create a better understanding of what must be done, and how it can best be done. Then let us all join together to get it done—to build the better America to which we all aspire.

This is a job for us in business. We, more than others, appreciate the importance of free enterprise. We, more than others, should

therefore feel obligated to work to preserve and protect it.

Let us take this as our mission, as our personal responsibility. For only if we give of ourselves to the fullest, will we draw the full measure of personal satisfaction from the success and the continued progress that I am sure await our nation.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SEARCH FOR PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA DESERVES THE NATION'S HELP

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune and I wish all Americans could read it. The commentary focuses attention on President Nixon's avid search for peace on Southeast Asia and calls upon the Nation to understand and support his efforts.

The full text of the editorial follows:

MR. NIXON DESERVES THE NATION'S HELP AS CRUCIAL VIETNAM WAR POINT NEARS

There was disappointment in President Nixon's Wednesday night announcement concerning U.S. troop withdrawals from Southeast Asia. But to also indulge deep despondency would be a great mistake. The President is displaying a measure of fortitude that deserves the public support he has, in fact, openly requested.

It is true his latest report on the Vietnam war did not, except for a modest 1,700-man increase in the monthly U.S. combat force pullout, carry any dramatic new development indicating an early end to America's Indochinese involvement. Mr. Nixon, as much as anyone, would have preferred such an announcement. It simply, based on essential considerations, was not possible.

The President's report, for its challenging frankness, was important. He talked, not so much to the world, as is often his purpose when dealing with Vietnam policy, but more directly to the American people. And he said that his overriding concern continues to be for a world at peace, reiterating that how the U.S. fulfills its responsibility in Southeast Asia will determine whether that goal is achievable.

On this crucial point he said: "... it is important how we end this war. By our decision we will demonstrate the kind of people we are, and the kind of country we will become." His chosen course, he stressed, is "to end this war—but to end it in a way that will strengthen trust for America around the world, not undermine it; in a way that will redeem the sacrifices that have been made, not insult them; in a way that will heal this nation, not tear it apart."

The President asked for the understanding that he cannot, as leader of a country on which other nations depend for mutual protection against future aggression, suddenly deprive South Vietnam of the military help previously pledged and provided. And he clearly intimated that "running out" now would cause a domestic upheaval every bit as disturbing as international repercussions.

The fact remains that Mr. Nixon's Administration has reversed the U.S. role in Vietnam. Total American troop strength has been cut by 265,000 men, casualty rates have dropped and the South Vietnamese are continually taking on the burden of their own defense.

In a way that was characteristic of the entire report, Mr. Nixon acknowledged public doubt, admitting that repeated assurances from Washington, on the prolonged war's imminent settlement have proven false. And he asked to be judged on the record, to be held politically accountable if he does not conclude the U.S. involvement in the war honorably and timely.

President Nixon is avid in his search for peace. He is also well aware there is seldom a quick and easy way through major international conflict. The process usually requires a combination of resiliant toughness and conciliatory attitude poised on a foundation of enduring patience.

He has asked the nation to be resolute and patient a little longer, to show the world once more that the United States is an ally that can be trusted in adversity, but more than that, a country dedicated to ways of peace, not war. He should have that help.

HOW WE CAN WITHDRAW WITH HONOR AND SAFETY FROM VIETNAM

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said, and much has been written about our involvement in the Vietnam conflict and how we can withdraw with honor and with safety for the people over there.

I was impressed by the words of Editor Harold Schoelkopf, of the St. Cloud Daily Times, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and for the edification of my colleagues and all the others who read it, I hereby enter Editor Schoelkopf's column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By Harold Schoelkopf)

The huge anti-war demonstrations in Washington put additional emphasis on the fact that the American people have had their fill of the Viet war and want it to end—quickly. It is without doubt the most unpopular war in which this country has engaged—a war that apparently was never intended to be won, but which could have been won in the first six months had America unleashed its full power.

It was a war started by the Kennedy administration, escalated during the Johnson regime to full-grown size, and inherited by President Nixon. He now faces the fearful task of withdrawal—always one of war's most hazardous challenges. Immediate withdrawal could expose our remaining forces to another Dunkirk, followed by a massive invasion of South Vietnam by the communists hordes and the threat of one of the world's greatest bloodbaths and massacres.

After the demonstrations in Washington with probably more to come, the "peace delegates" in Paris might as well fold up their tables and chairs and go home. Nothing will be accomplished there now.

Two crucial differences separate the North Vietnamese and American negotiating positions: the question of prisoners of war, and the announcement of a date for United States withdrawal. Mr. Nixon contends that a firm troop withdrawal date would provide crucial information to the enemy, and has made the fixing of a date contingent upon the release of American prisoners. The North Vietnamese

perceive the American refusal to set a withdrawal date as the only hindrance to a negotiated settlement. A flat offer has been made to release U.S. POWs once such a date is established.

We could call Hanoi's bluff, offer a fixed withdrawal date, and force the North Vietnamese to respond in turn by moving immediately to release the prisoners.

This course, although diplomatically daring, has the advantage of putting the North Vietnamese on the defensive. The next move would be theirs. Besides, it might actually bring at least a phased POW release. Finally, it might shorten the war, or at any rate American participation in it.

Success in such a maneuver is far from certain. However, the alternative is a continuation of the present sparring about withdrawal dates and the release of prisoners, and a continuation of the war. We think the chance is worth taking.

FORMER MEMBER E. Y. BERRY SENDS EDITORIAL

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, from January 1963, until his retirement last December, our former colleague the Honorable E. Y. Berry served with distinction on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The following editorial from the McLaughlin, S. Dak., Messenger, which E. Y. just sent me, should therefore be of great interest to this House. Its message embodies many of the concepts which E. Y. practiced during his 20 years of service to this body. His many friends in this Chamber will be pleased to know that he is enjoying his retirement out in the Black Hills and still maintains his active interest in current affairs.

I include the article as follows:

CHINESE PING-PONG

A ping-pong team from the United States played in Red China last week. American news men were permitted to go along with the players and TV cameras recorded part of the play. Then the ping-pong team was given a carefully guided tour around a small part of China. The Chinese smiled at the Ping-pong players.

To hear some of the news broadcasters talk about the event one would think the Chinese had torn down their gun factories, thrown their atomic weapons in the ocean and Chou had eloped with Kate Smith.

Perish the thought that such pleasantries were partly because Red China thinks it has a chance of getting into the United Nations this summer.

Let us also forget that thousands of innocent Chinese have been killed in the Communist take-over of that country.

It would also be bad manners to bring up the fact that Red China was the aggressor in Korea where we lost a lot of men. Or that Red China is furnishing weapons to the North Koreans. Or that on the same day the Chinese were hosting the ping-pong players they were telling the black people in the United States they should stage a revolution.

There are many the way it is who think Red China should be admitted to the United Nations. South Dakota Senator George McGovern has been in favor of admitting Communist China to the United Nations off and on since he was a professor at Mitchell.

The United Nations was started after the Second World War as an agency to keep the peace. It is supposed to be the police force of the world.

The United Nations was going to be the court before which the peace-loving nations could haul the aggressors and have justice done.

If the court and the police are controlled by the crooks the other citizens aren't going to get much justice. We already have Soviet Russia and her henchmen sitting on the United Nations.

The Communist government, was forced on the Chinese people. The government of Red China has tried to enslave the other people of southeast Asia.

Letting Communist China into the United Nations is putting another vote in that world court on the side of the aggressors—ping-pong parties notwithstanding.

SPEAKING OF WELFARE, CONGRESS HAD BETTER GET TO WORK, TOO

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to a recent editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer citing President Nixon's leadership in advocating long needed welfare reforms and recommending that the Congress should get to work, too, since every day the welfare problem has grown worse.

The editorial follows in full:

SPEAKING OF WELFARE, CONGRESS HAD BETTER GET TO WORK, TOO

President Nixon, addressing the Republican governors in Williamsburg, made some praiseworthy remarks about the dignity of work and the desirability of requiring welfare recipients to accept available jobs they are able to perform.

"If a job puts bread on the table and gives you the satisfaction of providing for your children and lets you look everyone else in the eye," he said, "I do not think that is menial . . . Scrubbing floors or emptying bedpans—my mother used to do that—is not enjoyable work, but a lot of people do it, and there is as much dignity in that as there is in any other work to be done in this country."

That is an appropriate response to those who say they can accept only "meaningful" jobs, and where applicable the President's statements should be taken to heart.

To keep the welfare problem in perspective, however, it must be recognized that his work-or-else comments have no application to the overwhelming majority of people on welfare—who are not candidates for the labor market because they are elderly or disabled or children.

As an example of the limitations of work requirements, consider the figures in a Pennsylvania Department of Welfare report just issued.

Nearly three quarters of the welfare recipients in this state are in the Aid to Dependent Children category—including the children themselves and mothers taking care of small children. Seven percent are on old-age assistance. Six percent are blind or otherwise disabled. About 13 percent are in the general assistance classification and it is in this group, numbering more than 105,000 in Pennsylvania, that work requirements could be most effective if the work could be made available.

With welfare recipients in Pennsylvania now totaling more than 800,000, the highest number since 1940 in the latter stages of the

Great Depression, the magnitude of the problem hardly can be denied.

Mr. Nixon's welfare proposals include not only work requirements for the able-bodied but benefits for the working poor and other enlightened changes that would help to strengthen rather than weaken family ties among poverty victims and would reward rather than penalize those who strive to support themselves and their families to the best of their abilities.

Speaking of work, then, Congress should proceed with its own on this reform program. It has now been two years since the President proposed it—and every day since then the problem has grown worse.

CAPT. SAMUEL L. GRAVELY, JR., USN

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute today to Capt. Samuel L. Gravely, Jr., USN, of Richmond, Va., who has recently been selected for the rank of rear admiral.

During his 29 years in the Navy, he has distinguished himself on many occasions and has had command of several ships.

That Captain Gravely is the first of his race to be selected for rear admiral is in itself newsworthy; that he has accepted this honor with such modesty and dignity is typical of his devotion to the service of his country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial, entitled "The First Negro Admiral," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Friday, April 30, 1971. The editor of the Times-Dispatch editorial page is Mr. Edward Grimley.

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

THE FIRST NEGRO ADMIRAL

It is a distinct pleasure to pay tribute to the first Negro appointed to star rank in the United States Navy, especially when the appointee achieving this distinction is a native Richmonder and a former carrier of The Times-Dispatch.

Samuel L. Gravely Jr.'s selection as the first person of his race to be an admiral in the Navy appears to have been a highly popular one with associates of all ranks who know him.

"They picked the right man," said another Negro officer, Dennis D. Nelson, a retired lieutenant commander. He called Gravely "an extremely modest guy," and added: "That accounts for his success. The rest of us talked too much."

The Samuel L. Gravely Jr. file in our library contains a score of news stories that have appeared over the years recounting the "firsts" achieved by the Richmonder—first of his race to graduate from a midshipman's school, first Negro officer assigned to a fighting ship, first to command such a ship, first to achieve the rank of commander, first to become a line officer captain. In many of these stories there are tributes not only from fellow officers but also from enlisted men who served on ships commanded by Gravely.

"You get all the workings of the ship in the barber shop," commented the barber in one of Gravely's crews, "and the sailors know the captain better than he knows himself. They all like him." Another sailor remarked that it takes the enlisted men four or five

days under a new captain to determine whether he is "the captain" or "just another four-striper," Capt. Gravely, he added, "is definitely 'the captain'."

Admiral Gravely was born on State Street in Fulton on June 4, 1922, attended Webster Davis elementary school and Armstrong High, and then went to Virginia Union University for two years before entering the Navy as an enlisted man in 1942. Commissioned an ensign in 1944, he remained in the Navy until 1946, when he returned to Virginia Union and subsequently was graduated with a bachelor of arts degree in history. Because of the Korean War, he was recalled to duty in 1949, and the rest of the story is not only his personal history but a significant part of the Navy's history as well.

SPEECH BY ROBERT E. HARTNESS, YORK COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL, S.C.

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this week's activities in Washington may tend to give the impression that many of our youth have defected to the cause of our Nation's enemies. It is useful, therefore, to keep a true perspective on the loyalty of young Americans, and not be misled by the sensationalist attacks upon the internal security of our country. We must keep our eye upon the millions of young Americans who stand foursquare for our Nation's principles.

A good example of this steadfastness has recently come to my attention in the form of a wonderful speech by a high school senior at York High School, in York County, S.C. The author of this speech, Robert E. Hartness, obviously shows himself to be a true patriot and a fine American. He shows a maturity and a grasp of reality which would put many adults to shame.

In this speech, Robert perceives the dedication of the Communists to their cause—a dedication which, incidentally, is being demonstrated in the so-called May Day activities. But more important than that, Robert pits the Communist commitment against his own greater dedication to the American cause. As long as we have young Americans with his devotion and understanding, our future will rest secure. Robert is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John Hartness, of Sharon, S.C., and they are to be congratulated for instilling in him the basic principles of Americanism and citizenship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Robert E. Hartness, entitled "Communism: A Threat to the Constitution," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

COMMUNISM: A THREAT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Our Constitution is being threatened by the communists, who are waging war on many fronts to win the world. These communists are trying to corrupt the youth of our country. We Americans have been warned by F.B.I. Chief, J. Edgar Hoover, who said: "We are at war with communism, and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this, the safer we will be." We must not be

apathetic citizens; we must face the fact that communism is threatening our Constitution. Otherwise, this great document, with its rights and privileges, will not survive.

That the communists are succeeding is shown by this letter written by a college student to his fiancée breaking off their engagement:

"We Communists have a high casualty rate. We're the ones who get shot and hung and lynched and tarred and feathered and jailed and slandered and ridiculed and fired from our jobs, and in every other way made as uncomfortable as possible. A certain percentage of us get killed or imprisoned. We live in virtual poverty. We turn back to the party every penny we make above what is absolutely necessary to keep us alive.

"We Communists don't have the time or the money for many movies or concerts or T. bone steaks or decent homes or new cars. We've been described as fanatics. We are fanatics. Our lives are dominated by one great overshadowing factor: the struggle for world Communism. We Communists have a philosophy of life, which no amount of money could buy. We have a cause to fight for a definite purpose in life. We subordinate our petty, personal selves into a great movement of humanity. If our personal lives seem hard or our egos appear to suffer through subordination to the Party, then we are adequately compensated by the thought that each of us in his small way is contributing to something new and true and better for mankind.

"There is one thing in which I am dead in earnest about and that is the Communist cause. It is my life, my business, my religion, my hobby, my sweetheart, my wife and my mistress, my bread and meat. I work at it in the daytime and dream of it at night. Its hold grows on me, not lessens, as time goes on. Therefore, I cannot carry on a friendship, a love affair, or even a conversation without relating it to this force which both drives and guides my life. I evaluate people, books, ideas, and actions according to how they affect the Communist cause and by their attitude toward it. I've already been in jail because of my ideas, and, if necessary, I'm ready to go before a firing squad."

Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard the words of a self-confessed communist. This young man, together with many others, is dedicated to the downfall of America, the country which allows them to operate due to its passionate love and desire to give everyone equal rights. But these men are not paving the way for an invasion by professional Soviet troops. Their objective seems, instead, to be to sow the seeds of doubt and dissension in the minds of Americans. In 1924, Lenin delivered his plan for world conquest when he stated:

"First, we will take eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia; then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

Let us delve into this plan further. Since World War II, it has been increasingly alarming to observe the Soviets following this plan. Vital decisions were made concerning the fates of Germany and Japan at the Yalta Conference. Those decisions were made invariably in favor of the communists. At this conference, Roosevelt was advised by, among others, Alger Hiss. In 1952, Elizabeth Bentley exposed two spy rings in which Hiss and other prominent government officials had participated. It is reasonable to assume that these men were prominent in Roosevelt's decisions which turned over all of Eastern Europe to Communist Russia.

As Americans became less demanding on the Soviets, they showed no tendency to mellow. This evidenced by the successful completion of the second stage of Lenin's plan for world conquest, that of taking "the

masses of Asia." This was accomplished by taking control of the mainland of China. This occurrence was foreshadowed when Chiang Kai-shek was excluded from the conference at Yalta and when, at the end of the war, the United States demanded that the communists be given representation in the government of China. When the Chinese failed to meet these demands, we placed an embargo against exports to China; and Russian-supplied Communists overran the country. Chiang Kai-shek was forced to withdraw his Nationalist Army to the island of Taiwan and leave the mainland to the communists.

The third step in Lenin's plan, that of "encircling the United States", has been more subtle and harder to follow than the two previously mentioned steps. A major step in this phase of the plan was the setting up of Castro as a communist dictator in Cuba, only ninety miles south of Florida. Instead of isolating Cuba in an effort to drive Castro out of office, the government of the United States has pumped millions of dollars into Cuba's faltering economy, enabling Castro to stay in office. Each day, Cuba becomes more of a threat to the safety of Americans.

I have attempted to diagram the Soviet plan for world conquest as delivered by Lenin in 1924. This plan which Lenin designed has been rigidly followed, as we can readily see by a statement made by Khrushchev in 1962: "The United States will eventually fly the communist Red Flag . . . they will hoist it themselves." Lenin left room for open war in his plan, but there has not been a declared war because the Soviets have not needed one. If situations continue to regress in the next ten years as they have in the past decade, America, as we know it, will cease to exist.

But this need not happen. When our forefathers assembled to revise the Articles of Confederation, they eventually drew up a completely new theory of government, known as the Constitution of the United States of America. In describing the American form of government, Thomas Jefferson once said:

"Yes, we did produce a near perfect Republic. But will they keep it, or will they, in the enjoyment of plenty, lose the memory of freedom? Material abundance without character is the surest way to destruction."

But, the Constitution has not stood for one hundred and eighty-two years because intelligent men such as Jefferson have supported it. It has lived because the American people have defended it in all crises. Now faced with the threat of communism, our Constitution needs each one of us more than ever before. It is not the job of a few select individuals to support our Constitution; it is the duty of all Americans to support our barrier against tyranny. But we must not tarry, for in the words of Senator Thomas Dodd, "We have no more ground to give, no time to lose, no margin for error."

TRIBUTE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROTECTING THE NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, no tribute is too great to pay to those members of our law enforcement agencies who at this moment are protecting the Nation's Capital against the destructive forces which are attempting to institute a reign of terror in this city.

The patient determination of Chief Wilson and his Metropolitan Police Department, and the Federal Bureau of In-

vestigation, and the members of the Armed Forces to maintain order with the least possible force is one of the most magnificent demonstrations of maintaining the law that I have ever witnessed.

Those misguided young rebels who shout so loudly against the land of their birth should consider the treatment they are receiving here, in the face of the strongest provocation, against how they they would be treated in the countries whose slogans they shout and whose aggression they applaud.

I know that every decent American who holds the privileges of liberty as sacred and precious things join me in saying a most heartfelt "thank you" to all the law enforcement officers engaged in this tragic week's affairs.

SEX, NUDITY, AND OBSCENITY IN MOVIES ARE NOT THE MONEY-MAKERS FOR THE INDUSTRY—NOT DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND WHY INDUSTRY IS EXPERIENCING FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY—RETURN TO FAMILY MOVIES NEEDED

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the pendulum is changing, and the sex exploitation films may be on their way out. Exhibitors are complaining and box office receipts are down as a result of the permissiveness and in many cases the "trash" which has found its way to the screens of our community theaters.

I have voiced strong objection to Jack Valenti, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., over movies I thought to be in very poor taste. In a letter last year to Valenti, I stated:

A feasible recourse might be for citizens (particularly mothers) to picket theaters displaying the ever-increasing "everything goes," nudity, and perverted sex presently dominating the American screen.

Apparently the theaters have been picketed—but in another manner. Citizens, in increasing numbers, have been refusing to go to theaters, and this has had catastrophic consequences at the box offices.

Mr. President, I am not a believer in straitjacketed ideas that some would wish to compel others to accept. I believe there must be freedom of choice at the movie box office. I do, however, hold the conviction that movies should be educational, stimulating, entertaining, artistic, and in good taste.

The movie industry is experiencing high unemployment and lower profits. This is due, I believe, to the poor quality of movies to which the public has been subjected. This is not to say there have not been good movies produced. I maintain that an overabundance of "R" and "X" rated movies have dominated the American screen. They are beginning to be rejected.

Mr. President, McCandlish Phillips, of the New York Times News Service, has

written an article entitled "X May No Longer Mark Film Industry's Features." He states that film industry executives believe there is a tendency by the public to steer clear of certain movies.

Sherrill C. Corwin, chairman of Metropolitan Theaters Corp., a string of 40 theaters in southern California and a former president of the National Association of Theater Owners, told Phillips:

I think that everyone is regaining his senses, and we're going back to some of the values that mean so much to us, without losing the freedom of the screen. I personally call it the "No, No, Nanette" syndrome.

It is my hope that a course has been determined which will change the type of movies that now contribute, in large degree, to a lessening of the strengths that have kept the Nation strong.

I ask unanimous consent the article by Mr. Phillips be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEX ON THE MOVIE SKIDS? "X" MAY NO LONGER MARK FILM INDUSTRY'S FEATURES

(By McCandlish Phillips)

NEW YORK.—Major segments of the American motion picture industry are turning away from the detailed exploration of sex that has marked some recent feature films.

Several companies have put an outright ban on X-category films in their production schedules. Most of them have also decided to make very few, if any, R-category films. X-rated films are those with content to which no one under 17 is supposed to be admitted, while R-rated films keep out those who are under 17 except when accompanied by an adult.

A storm of complaints by exhibitors, and declining box office receipts, have combined with other factors—notably including the huge success of recent films without heavy sexual content—to spur the change.

The shift is already a fact in the film schedules at oldline studios and among independent feature filmmakers, but it will not become widely apparent to theatergoers for at least six months.

HARD JUDGMENT

Camera eyes are being averted from the bedrooms into which they have peered so often lately—not, industry sources say, out of any moral inhibition but out of a hard judgment of what will pay off best. Sex has proved not be the magic ingredient for box-office success it had seemed for a while to be.

"Permissive films might have been successful six months ago, but they aren't now," said James Aubrey, president of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. "The whole country has undergone a remarkable reversal in taste."

Aubrey used a term that others in the industry also summoned in speaking of a public "backlash" against "the permissive type of entertainment that all of us had overindulged ourselves in."

"There is certainly a swing," said Jones Rosenfield, vice president at 20th Century-Fox in reference to feature films. "It's away from the heavy emphasis on sex and sensuality. Apparently the availability of hard-core pornography on the screen has dried up the market for titillation and light voyeurism to a great extent."

Fox quietly instituted a policy of making no X-rated pictures last year, shortly after suffering what one production executive called "an absolute disaster" when the company released two X-rated films in one week—"Myra Breckinridge" and "Beyond the Valley of the Dolls"—and "got our brains beat out for it," as he recalled.

American International Pictures recently

ordered its directors to stop making films calculated to be tagged X or R and to "make all films within the G and GP range," to which persons of all ages are admitted.

The move is designed to get films in a classification "where the whole audience can come and see them" and that means an "absence of nudity, copulation, et cetera," Samuel Z. Arkoff, chairman of the A.I.P. board, said.

SOUTHERN TURNOFF

Such pictures play well in "8 or 10 cities in the country but have absolutely no legs at all through the whole South and much of the Midwest and other places, too," said James H. Nicholson, president of the company, which releases about 30 pictures a year.

"Youngsters in their middle and late teens are the most valuable part of audiences today—certainly for their future patronage—and producing films to exclude them is financial suicide," he said.

Pictures are rated on the basis not only of sexual content but also on other elements adverse to children. American International has found that a relatively mild horror picture that get a G rating, instead of an X, can double its audience.

"Exhibitors on the West Coast tell us they would like a G or GP horror picture," Nicholson said. "In the South and Midwest, they simply say flatly we will not play an R."

In swinging away from shockfilms, producers are not abandoning shock titles.

"We've already been given GP ratings on 'Blood and Lace,' 'The Incredible Two-Headed Transplant' and 'The House That Screamed,'" an A.I.P. announcement boasted.

NEWSPAPER ADS CITED

About 30 daily newspapers in the United States refuse to accept advertising for X-rated motion pictures—a fact that makes it extremely hard for exhibitors to make the showing of such films locally known.

Joe Solomon of Fanfare Corporation has decided that his company will avoid X-rated pictures and "concentrate on G and GP pictures." A film called "The Curious Female," now in release, will be "the last of our X films," he said. Stephen Ellman, advertising director for Fanfare, said:

"As the backlash to permissiveness and pornography began to spring up in this country, calls kept coming in saying, 'Joe, we can't play your picture in Memphis,' or 'We can't play this in Omaha.'

"The backlash originates in the areas and cities where the newspapers and certain local groups begin to bring pressure on community officials, like the district attorney or sheriff, and on the theater owner for playing a certain film.

"The problem for the theater owners is there's too much harassment, and they're losing part of their audience. When you have a G picture, you don't have to worry about ratings, and kids lying about their age, about the police dropping by."

"About 95 percent of the country's affected with it. The only place that's not really affected with this problem is New York City, but believe me, what's in New York is not what's in the rest of the country."

INCESTUOUS BUSINESS

"This is sort of an incestuous business," another producer remarked. "The people in New York and Los Angeles, where most of the people in our business seem to stay, tend to feed on one another, and don't know the mores of the rest of the country.

"Pictures which do open well in New York and Los Angeles can engender a great deal of comment on television, and it's not generally realized that the other parts of the country may remain stony cold."

He said he thought the country was "going through a period of one step back."

For a while the industry "wallowed in its new-found freedom," Aubrey of Metro said. "I think all of us in the film business found ourselves with an inventory of films that, in-

explicitly, there was no longer an audience for," he added.

"The pendulum has begun to swing back towards the middle as fast as taste is concerned, but I don't in any way feel that what we went through was bad," Aubrey said. "People do use bad language in certain situations, and we all know that people who are going to make love undress."

The test, he said, is whether such elements are "indigenous to a story, rather than just exploitative."

No one in the industry expects any future scarcity of films exploiting sex, since nearly anyone can make such a film who has "a camera, two people and a hotel room," as one producer put it. What is expected is a substantial de-emphasizing of sex content in films made for general national release.

Most producers and exhibitors who are now veering away from explicit sex made it clear that they would be equally ready to swing back to it if the public mood so dictates.

"People are sick to death of the explicit language, unnecessarily used, and of the sexual situations dragged in by the heels," said Sherrill C. Corwin, chairman of Metropolitan Theaters Corporation, a string of 40 theaters in southern California and former president of the National Association of Theater Owners.

"I think that everyone is regaining his senses, and we're going back to some of the values that mean so much to us, without losing the freedom of the screen. I personally call it the 'No, No, Nanette' syndrome."

PUBLIC FED UP

Eugene Picker, the current president of the association and president of the entertainment division of the Trans-Lux Corporation here, said the public "has been fed up with the kind of material that has been presented lately."

"I've been in this business close to 50 years, and it runs in cycles," he said. "There's a period when Westerns become the rage, then suddenly it switches to musicals; now we've reached the peak of these so-called sex pictures.

"It looks to me like 'Love Story' and romantic types of pictures is going to be the next round."

"Generally we don't run X pictures, and we'd just as soon have a lot fewer R pictures," said Mel Gerber of Martin Theaters, Inc., at Columbus, Ga., a company that operates 160 theaters in nine Southern states.

"In five years the 13-to-17-year-old group becomes our prime motion-picture audience, our mainstay, and we're turning them away. That seems to me about as unwise a policy as you could think up."

The Motion Picture Association of America said that since the present rating system began on Nov. 1, 1968, the ratings had run this way through April 16:

Rated G, 283 pictures, or 25.3 percent; 416 pictures rated GP, or 37.5 percent; 335 pictures rated R, or 30 percent; 83 pictures rated X, or 7.4 percent.

Many more than 83 pictures with the X rating have been on the market. Any producer, who wants an X rating can "stick the X on himself, and I would guess that there are perhaps 300 or more self-applied X ratings," said James Bouras, a member of the association's rating administration.

TIME WILL TELL

Bouras said it would take six months to a year for the new trend to become apparent.

"They are still submitting to the assumptions of a year and a half ago," he remarked.

A high executive at Columbia Pictures, a company that has not had an X-rated film, said the public had failed to appreciate the rationale behind the X-rating, which is not that the film was necessarily dirty but that it contained the kind of subject matter that is mature.

"The symbol X has unfortunately taken

on a taint," he said. "I think it's an unfortunate symbol. Instinctively, people shy away from it. By any other name, it might not appear to be as objectionable."

In Maryland, a state that imposes film censorship and where hard-core films are not shown in theaters, the situation seemed to be different.

Philip Glazer, president of the Associated Pictures Company at Randallstown, Md., said that customers "do not want to see in a theater what they see on television." Pictures that go beyond the proprieties of television are what the people are "going out and plunking down their money for," he said.

However, Glazer argued for the wisdom of some reserve. "The producers used to be smarter," he said. "They'd show you a little, and you'd come back next week and think you were going to see more. Once you've seen it, you've seen it and you may not be too anxious to see it again."

BASIN COULD BE GREAT PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgent need for public works projects, and the employment they provide, not only in my own State, but across the Nation, I insert in the RECORD the following article from the April 21 Wenatchee Daily World:

BASIN COULD BE GREAT PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT

Senator Henry Jackson minced no words last week in telling the President that he has been grossly negligent in solving the unemployment crisis in this country.

He said Mr. Nixon should immediately release \$146,500,000 of funds appropriated for federal activities in the state of Washington and "restore hope to some of those who have borne the brunt of this ill-conceived effort to make the working men and women of America pay the total price for the control of inflation."

Jackson told Mr. Nixon there is something specific he should do at once: release appropriated funds. Said the Washington senator: "While men and women face the desperation of unemployment your administration has impounded \$11.1 billion in funds appropriated by the Congress for important and worthwhile projects across the entire country."

What Jackson is saying is: "Get public works started."

A good place to begin is the Columbia Basin Project. There a mere \$1,400,000 (for a tunnel) is tied up. While the amount is small, it could start a building program of some three-quarter billion dollars, the amount necessary to bring water to the remaining 500,000 acres of land in the million-acre development.

The Daily World's managing editor found out in Washington, D.C., last week that the Bureau of Reclamation is ready to go into action at once in many places in the West if funds are released. But it has not been asked to start making plans for a sizable public works development to reduce unemployment.

It should be, for there is no finer program for the long-range development of the West than federal reclamation.

Commissioner Ellis Armstrong, while emphasizing to the Daily World that a Reclamation make-work program is not now being considered, revealed some graphic facts to

show how worthy and necessary more reclamation is.

He recently told the Senate Subcommittee on Public Works appropriations that it is estimated in 50 years the population of the West will increase to about 300 per cent of the 1960 population and the water supply requirements will be about 500 per cent of those of 1960.

"These projects . . . point up the necessity for an aggressive action program," Armstrong told the senators.

"A 10 to 20-year lead time is required to bring today's complex projects into operation. We simply cannot wait until a crisis develops before we begin to do something."

One measurement of the effectiveness of stimulating economic growth is the trend in increased federal income tax collections attributable to federal reclamation projects. Armstrong said more than \$800 million in tax collections were attributable to irrigation in fiscal year 1970. The revenues include collections directly from project farmers and those from supporting business and services, not to mention the workers engaged on the construction.

Furthermore, reclamation is a wealth-producing venture. The gross value of crops grown on federal projects approaches \$2 billion annually.

Armstrong pointed out some additional good reasons for considering reclamation as a make-work development. He told the senators that a Washington State University study of the Columbia Basin shows growth in every major economic indicator while adjacent dryland area showed nominal or no growth.

Population and business establishment growth in the project area, exceeded the comparison area by a ratio of 17 to 1. Employment and wages grew by a ratio of 20 to 1. The property tax base increased by a ratio of 6 to 1. And postal receipts and retail sales tax collections increased by a ratio of 17 to 1.

The consumer benefits, too, from irrigation developments, Armstrong went on to say. The stability provided by irrigated areas is one of the reasons why today the housewife spends less of the family income on food than ever before—only 16 cents out of each dollar of disposable income. During the past 20 years, the percentage for food has decreased an unbelievable 50 per cent.

To those who say "what about surplus crops," Armstrong replies: Only 20 per cent of a year's supply of crops exists at this time and it takes a long, long time to bring about more irrigated farms.

The Daily World discovered in Washington, D.C., that there is no ground swell for a public works program, such as was formulated during the depression of the early '30s. Most Congressmen fear they'll be criticized for having instigated "leaf-raking" projects, as were those of the '30s.

There will be leaf-raking if federal moneys for Federal reclamation is released to provide jobs but it will be the kind that is highly desirable—in the yards of the new homes that irrigation will create in the rural areas and in adjacent towns, and in the yards of willing workers who were able to save their homes from foreclosure because they found new jobs provided by a sympathetic administration.

EDUCATION REVENUE SHARING LONG OVERDUE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's message on education revenue

sharing offers a far-reaching solution to many of the problems now faced by elementary and secondary educators across the Nation. Federal expenditures on elementary and secondary education have increased over the past decade from \$0.9 billion in 1961 to \$5 billion in 1972. But as Federal assistance has grown, so have Federal strings and redtape. Many school districts have reached the point that they have a full-time person hired to do nothing, but seek out possible sources of Federal aid and write applications in the proper bureaucratic prose.

This situation often means that the schools which need Federal aid the most are the last to receive it—if, indeed, they receive it at all. Poor school districts cannot afford to hire a Federal grantsman. As a result, they may be totally unaware of Federal programs for which they might be eligible. Their students fail to benefit, while rich school districts reap the rewards.

The President's proposal would eliminate the overlap and duplication which now characterizes Federal aid to elementary and secondary education. In the place of more than 300 different authorizations, he would substitute a single authorization. States would be free to spend funds according to their own needs in areas of national concern—education of the disadvantaged and the handicapped, education of federally connected children, vocational education, and supporting materials and services. Programs would be tailored to what a State's children need, rather than to what Washington wants.

States would no longer have to file exhaustive plans for Federal approval. Instead, they would develop their own plans for intra-State distribution of the funds, after the opportunity for public involvement and comment. Differences in local strengths and weaknesses could be taken into account, as no uniform Federal standard would be applied. Educational officials would be free to design badly needed programs, rather than required to spend a large portion of their time filling out Federal forms.

I feel that the changes proposed by the President are long overdue. Educators should be allowed to return to their primary responsibility—the education of the children of this country. Education revenue sharing would allow such a return. I urge my colleagues to support the President's proposed Education Revenue Sharing Act.

PORTUGUESE GUINEA: NAILING A LIE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, some segments of the mass media seem to take great pleasure in attacking our staunch NATO ally Portugal. Portugal's war against Communist aggression in Africa has been falsely termed a war of "colonialist suppression," and Portugal's efforts to better the lot of her citizens in

Africa—black and white—are labeled "colonialist exploitation." The result of this massive press campaign is that the American people know little or nothing of the true situation in Portuguese Africa and of the reasons for Portugal's determination to stay in Africa. One of the finest articles to appear on this subject is "Portuguese Guinea: Nailing a Lie," by John Biggs-Davison, a member of the British Parliament and an on-the-spot observer of what is really happening in Portuguese Guinea.

Portugal's war in Africa can no longer be ignored by the American people nor can they permit the media to persuade them to side with and support Portugal's Communist enemies. For if Portugal is defeated in this war, the resulting Communist regimes will give the Soviet Union bases which will enable its growing fleet to dominate and, very likely, eventually to control the South Atlantic. "Portuguese Guinea: Nailing a Lie" is a superb antidote to a very poisonous campaign of distortion and falsehood.

PORTUGUESE GUINEA: NAILING A LIE

(By John Biggs-Davison, M.P.)

(NOTE.—Mr. John Biggs-Davison is also an author and journalist concentrating particularly in African affairs. The first M.P. to travel to Angola shortly after the outbreak of the war in the north of that country in 1961, he has combed many of Africa's trouble spots and investigated at first hand "nationalist" claims to have taken over large areas of Portuguese Africa.

(The Conservative Member of Chigwell since 1955, Mr. Biggs-Davison is the Hon. Secretary of the Conservative Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee, the Vice-President of the Pan-European Union and Chairman of its British Committee. He is Chairman of the British Commonwealth Union, a co-Founder of the Pakistan Society and a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society.

(Mr. Biggs-Davison is married, with four daughters and two sons. An ex-Royal Marine officer, he has taken a special interest in subversive and amphibious warfare. The struggle in Guiné is both.)

"THIS IS WAR"

Guinea in the rains—dark drizzle, alternating with desceptively strong sun that beats relentlessly through helicopter perspex. My teeth chatter uncontrollably. After a shivering flight back from the interior in a "chopper" with a shattered window, I have fever.

On a hard bench in the Military Hospital outside Bissau, I await the result of a malaria blood test. Next to me sits a tall Negro soldier with belly-ache. Surgeons and medical orderlies stand expectantly.

Suddenly, deafening din. Through the windows of the white-washed hall we can see a first Alouette "ell"—they drop the "h"—touching down. Seconds later, the first battle casualty, a subaltern, is rushed in on a stretcher.

Unchecked by surgeons or staff, by-standers, including my Negro neighbour, belly-ache forgotten, crowd around the stretcher. A medical officer stoops, pipe in mouth. He is nonchalant, but efficient. A casual attitude is part of the Portuguese imperturbability, in face of that "wind of change." The subaltern is hideously gashed, but will live.

Another stretcher is hurried in and its occupant carried straight through to the operating table. Then a third casualty, lying on his side.

"This is war," a cavalry captain murmured. Trite, but true.

"THE 'MONTY' TOUCH"

I had been before to the Military Hospital. The Governor and Commander-in-Chief, General Antonio Sebastiao Ribeiro de Spínola, took me to see his wounded. He visits them nearly every day.

His approach is un sentimental, which is best. One senses him willing his soldiers to recover.

Black and white lie side by side. So do Portuguese soldiers and their prisoners.

There were civilian casualties too, one a woman with her child at her breast, for as Mr. Basil Davidson writes:

"Civilian casualties are unfortunately inseparable from war. I think the PAIGC² tries hard to keep them to a minimum."

General Spínola is Arab-dark and spare. No chicken, he keeps himself in vigorous trim by an ascetic diet. He does not even take wine. This is a magnetic, powerful personality, not lightly to be crossed. The last No. 2 in the civil administration tried his luck—and left for Lisbon on the next flight.

The General flew me in his helicopter to Cachéu, Bula and Jete. He stood in the rain to address troops about to sail home at the end of their commission. Only once was he ruffled. That was when they turned out the guard in an operational post. Ceremonial is out. "This is war."

General Spínola was wearing his "tiger suit," plus monocle and the brown gloves and riding whip of the cavalry officer he was in Angola. Like "Monty," he cultivates a legend.

Like "Monty," he is a soldier's general. He listens to their problems and suggestions and delegates responsibility. The fat majors and colonels have been weeded out. General Spínola accepted the toughest appointment in the Portuguese service on condition that he could pick his subordinates, civil and military.

At the beginning of the struggle, there was friction between the two. Later the Governorship and the Command-in-Chief were combined in the person of General Arnaldo Schulz, who was Minister of the Interior when The Queen visited Portugal and, like his successor, served in Angola with distinction.

This year Bissau is at least as efficient as Lisbon. To anyone who knew it earlier and has endured the trials and lassitude of Guinea, where even to move is an effort, this is a sizeable miracle.

PRE-PORTUGUESE

Stone Age man was in Guinea—the principal prehistoric site is at Nhampasseré—and traces of ancient gold diggings in the Geba and Corubal valleys recall the extensive mediaeval states of the Sudan.

Portuguese Guinea has been described as an "ethnographical museum" and a "Negro Babelao". Her peoples vary widely and are easily recognisable. Dress and dwellings differ. For example, the Fulas paint their houses red, the Beafadas white.

Fugitives and exiles from Sudanic empires conquered and crumbling into Saharan sands were thrust down towards the coast to seek refuge behind the natural defences of a myriad rivers.

Lack of modern development has preserved the old Negro and Arabic cultures. Here are people of dignity and fine physique. The women who go "topless" have nothing to be ashamed of.

The wood carvings of war canoes made in the Bijagos Archipelago are inspired by their raids upon the Beafadas for slaves to sell to the European mariners. Once the Beafadas appealed for protection to Philip III of Portugal (II of Spain). In vain.

The Mandingos, light skinned, intelligent, sensitive featured, have something of the im-

Footnotes at end of article.

perial men of golden Mali (or Melli), where Leo Africanus and mediaeval Europeans identified Mansa Musa, who ruled in Timbuktu as "Lord of the Negroes of Guinea," with Prester John, Muslim and *Haji* though he was. The fourteenth century Arab writer and historian, Ibn Batuta, noted his subjects' hatred of injustice.

FULANI INVASION

When the Portuguese arrived, the Mandingo empire of Mali had reached its furthest bounds and ran from the Gambia mouth to the Lower Geba. Invading Fulani pagans crossed the Gambia and Cabu in the last quarter of the fifteenth century but were worsted by the Beafadas who continued, with the Mandingos, to dominate the interior of Guinea, exacting tribute from the Fula (or Fulacunda) cattlemen.

Eighteenth century revolution brought Muslim Fulas to power in the massif of the Futa-Jalon. These invaded what is now Portuguese Guinea and enslaved the Mandingos and Beafadas, who in their humiliation became known as Black Fulas.

Only Portuguese occupation halted the Fula raids on the pagans of the coast north of the Geba river. To the south Beafadas and Nalus succumbed.

THE DISCOVERIES

Today Portugal takes more seriously than some of her allies the Communist design of enveloping Europe from Africa. By irony of history, this Eastern turning movement against the West is the converse of Portugal's circumnavigation, and penetration, of Africa. This was part quest for gold and slaves and fame and knowledge but part also an outflanking of the Saracen in a last mediaeval crusade. A league was sought with Prester John, the legendary Christian emperor. The Arab hold on the Eastern trade was to be broken.

The Portuguese led. Others, including England, had a finger in the pie. In the year of Agincourt English Knights took part in the Christian conquest of Ceuta. So was the half-English Navigator Prince, who from Lagos, near his castle and observatory at Sagres, sent forth the caravels of Christ.

Some then believed that the Rio Doro, the "River of Gold", lay somewhere south of Cape Bojador. From thereabouts one of Prince Henry's squires called Gil Eannes brought back in 1484 a sprig of rosemary, thus breaking the spell of superstition that had bound seafarers with terror of the seas beyond. In 1486 Diogo Gomes was exploring the estuaries of Guinea.

Next year the *Infante* Henrique died. He bequeathed Guinea "with all its islands" to his nephew, Dom Fernando. The legacy embraced five of the Cape Verde Islands. The rest were soon discovered, too, and in 1486 all received a royal charter and special privileges. In 1489 the Guinea coast between the Senegal river and Sierra Leone was reserved for the dwellers in Cape Verde and their trade.

The history of Guinea and Cape Verde is thus bound up together. They were long under the same ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction. Today they form the single objective of those who wage, and back, the subversive war.

ALLIES AND RIVALS

Not only were English knights at Ceuta but English knights helped liberate Lisbon from the Arabs and there enthroned a Sussex priest as its first bishop. English bowmen had fought at Aljubarrota where our oldest alliance was born.

The treaty signed at Windsor in 1386 was "for ever" and committed the two thrones to the defence of each other's interests and territories "wherever they may be." Yet Anglo-Portuguese dealings in Africa have not run smooth.

Hakluyt records that Edward IV acceded to the Portuguese Ambassador's request "to stay" and sent an English expedition to "the seignury of Ginnee." The seadog and slaver, John Hawkins, sacked Cachéu, the oldest Portuguese settlement in Guinea—I flew there with General Spinola and our helicopter angled low over the ancient fortress—and captured slave caravels lying in the broad river.

In 1578 Drake sacked Cidade Velha, in Praia, which was then the capital of Cape Verde. This was Europe's first settlement in Africa and you may see there the ruins of Africa's only Gothic church.

In 1600 the Guinea coast was annexed to Cape Verde. Captains-Major were stationed at Cachéu and Bissau, now the capital. Portuguese sovereignty was exercised in various fortified *pracas* and the policy was ordained of friendly treatment of the natives, propagation of Christianity, control and settlement of *lançados* (outlaws) and a national trade monopoly.

For centuries, however, the Portuguese writ ran little beyond the coastline and river banks. The native chiefs feared that if Europeans were allowed inland they would discover the source of their slaves and become interlopers. Not that the European of the era before quinine could easily survive in the dense rain forest that pressed hard upon the coast.

NEGRO GOVERNOR

In 1792 300 English merchants attempted to colonise the island of Bolama but quarrelled with the inhabitants and gave up. Portuguese authority only became undisputed after the arbitration of President Grant. A statue in the American's honour stands on the Graham Greenish waterfront at Bolama, which in 1839 became the capital of what, under the overseas reorganisation done by the Liberal regime in Lisbon, was known as the Guinea district under Cape Verde.

Portugal was fortunate in having an outstanding Governor to defend her territorial claims. Honorio Pereira Barreto was a Negro of Cachéu. His statue stands in the *Praca* Honorio Barreto in Bissau.

THE CAPITALS

Bissau became the capital during the Second World War. Between 1879 and 1942 it was at Bolama, now ghostly with departed splendour.

Bissau, with a population approaching 30,000, has wide avenues, modern buildings, some of architectural merit, a fascinating museum, an imposing club for the business community, a cinema, a whitewashed Cathedral and the old fortress of São José de Bissau, known colloquially as Amura and still a barracks. On the outskirts, towards the airport at Bissalanca, stands a superb housing estate, constructed under General Schultz, complete with market, mosque, church and social services.

PACIFICATION

In 1886 the Casamanca was ceded to France in exchange for Congo territory now within Angola and the definitive frontiers were drawn. The "scramble for Africa", a phrase popularised in a *Times* leader of 1884, was on. To assert her sovereignty, Portugal must show "effective occupation." She must pacify the virtually unadministered tribes of the interior. To this end were fought a series of little wars, which ended only in 1915.

Old men can still remember the pacification. Carlotta Peres, proprietress of an excellent restaurant at Nhacra, near Bissau, was mistress of Captain Teixeira Pinto, who with native troops combed the Oio forests free of hostiles in 1913. In 1962 Madame Peres performed her own pacification. Single-handed, she suppressed the local revolutionaries with the thickness of her stick and the

strength of her personality. She was invited to Lisbon and met Dr. Salazar.

The PAIGC is active in Oio today.

TOURISM?

Late in August, 1969, I returned from Cape Verde and a fourth tour of Guinea. My first visit was in October, 1962, not long after the guerrilla war began; I returned in February, 1966, and again in May, 1968. I have received the fullest access to classified information by the Army, Navy and Air Force.

I once told a colleague where I was going. "Ah, Portuguese Guinea," he sagely replied, "that's in South America, isn't it?" But then few British have ever gone there, apart from some Protestant missionaries. There is no British consul. The Consular Corps consists of an able Frenchman—his country is concerned for Senegal next-door—and a Portuguese acting for Belgium.

Guinea has had, and can provide, tourist attractions. But it is no honeymoon haunt in 1969. Much of the buffalo, wild pig, gazelle, crocodile, lion and leopard which would formerly attract the hunter, has been killed or driven off in six years of war and aerial activity. I did sight, and miss, a basking croc. from a LDM (medium landing craft) escorting a convoy down the Rio Cumbija.

In the slime on the banks were terrorist footprints. Men now hunt men in Guinea.

CLIMATE AND COUNTRY

I have now sampled every season, except the cool weather round Christmas. The climate of Guinea may be summed up as humid heat, punctuated by tornadoes. Malarial and unhealthy, it is yet a beautiful country. White settlers are few; there are not many large plantations; there is no railway except in the dockyard at Bissau.

Both the old capital and the new are on islands and the Bijagós Archipelago fringe the mainland, which is pancake flat until it reaches the foothills of the Futa-Jallon. The view from the air is of dark green mangroves, emerald green rice paddies, sub-Saharan savannah.

The territory is minutely dissected by tidal rivers, negotiable by frigates in what is an amphibious war, and a multitude of lesser streams. Measuring 13,948 square miles which is about the size of Holland, but substantially less at high tide—some 1,500 square miles are periodically flooded—this is a land where there is said to be more water than land. "Guiné," according to the 1913 *Boletim* of the *Sociedade de Geografia*, "does not require roads because there are many navigable rivers!"

It is an enclave hemmed in by Senegal and the Republic of Guinea (Conakry). In 1905 a former *adjoint* to the Mayor of Dakar called M. J.-E. Giraud, full of the *mission civilisatrice*, addressed the *Société de la Géographie*, of which he was a member.

"*Souhaitons même que dans un avenir rapproché notre pays puisse acquérir pacifiquement les deux enclaves de la Gambrie anglaise et de la Guinée portugaise, dont le rôle naturel paraît d'être rattacher à notre Soudan occidental dont la cohésion serait ainsi complète.*" France and England have left. Portugal remains.

THE PEOPLE

Portuguese Guinea, with half a million folk, is densely inhabited by African standards. The population increased substantially between 1950 and 1960, owing to better health and rising living standards.

There are more than 30 tribes, and, apart from Lebanese traders, ubiquitous on the West Coast or Africa, a permanent white and mulatto population of about 7,000 supply lighter threads in the ethnic tapestry.

The natives may speak *Creolo* or one of many dialects but will describe themselves "Portuguese," which in law they all are.

Footnotes at end of article.

From the Bijagós Archipelago through Senegal to the Gambia are Felupe (more correctly Dyola), an assortment of tribes described as "typically Negro." Matrilineal, they worship a god of the sky and the rain.

The Arab culture of the Fulas, who form 20 per cent of the population, is apparent in their music and dances, their gowns, turbans and tarbooshes.

RELIGION

The Fulas, Futa-Fulas and Mandingos (12.5 per cent of the population of Guinea) are Muslim. Among the Balantas (30 per cent), Manjacos (14 per cent) many are Animist, as is more than half the entire population. Seven other tribes account for about five per cent of the population of Guinea.

As elsewhere in West Africa, Islam makes many more converts, more easily, than does Christianity. Only five per cent of the population is recorded as Christian, mostly Catholic.

In 1940 Guinea achieved ecclesiastical independence of the see of Santiago de Cabo Verde. In 1955 it became an Apostolic Prefecture. This is mission territory. Portuguese and Italian Franciscans are among the religious and secular clergy who preach, teach and care for the lepers, the sick and the orphans—including war victims from both sides.

At Bor, near Bissau, the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary have run a famous children's home and nursery since 1935. Their girls are taught cooking, sewing, embroidery and other home crafts, and are in high demand as wives.

FAITH AGAINST COMMUNISM

The Muslim Fulas are a sword arm of Catholic Portugal. The Army builds and repairs mosques. The dazzling new *mesquita* at Bafatá is celebrated in Islam. The Government fly *hajis* (pilgrims) to Mecca and Medina.

When in Aldeia Formosa (Quebol), I call on Cherno Raschid, a holy man whose spiritual sway extends to the Republic of Guinea. I remain the only non-Portuguese white man with whom he has conversed. Amílcar Cabral, the leader of the nationalist party, the PAIGC, sent him an emissary, but the Cherno keeps the peace for Portugal.

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY

The tribespeople till, and herd, semi-nomadically, under tribal custom. Only a third or so of the country is cultivated but it was self-sufficient in rice, the staff of life for many, until terror and conflict disrupted agriculture and obstructed communications in parts of the Province.

The main crops are the *mancarra* (cashew nut) in Farim, Bafatá and Gabu districts; palm oil in Cachéu, Gebu and Bijagós; rice in Manosa, Catió, Fulacunda, Bissau and São Domingos. As is usual in West Africa, millet, cassava, sweet potato and sugar cane are also grown. Research has been done at the Pessubé agricultural station on cocoa beans, groundnuts and pineapples. There are agricultural demonstrators and veterinary staff in the interior.

There is good timber, which, with groundnuts and coconuts, is a main export. Sawmills, extraction plants and the Sacor oil refinery at Bandim are the chief industrial enterprises. The bauxite deposits are hard to get at and Guinea lacks sources of power.

HOW GUINEA IS GOVERNED

The people of Guinea are all Portuguese citizens with the rights and duties of Portuguese in Macao, Madeira or Minho.

Like other Portuguese Provinces, Guinea sends representatives to the National Assembly and Corporative Chamber in Lisbon, as well as to the Overseas Council, which advises the Minister of *Ultramar*. Guinea's "M.P." is James Pinto Bull, formerly Secretary-General of the Provincial Government,

who retired from public service to go into business.

Like other Overseas Provinces, Guinea exercises considerable local autonomy in finance and administration. A provincial budget is drawn up annually and voted on by the Legislative Council, which consists of members elected for four years, together with the Secretary-General, a legal and a financial officer.

The basic administrative sub-division is the *posto*. The *chefe de posto* (district officer) works with the *regulos* (traditional chiefs) and *chefes de tabanca* (village headmen). The tribespeople in effect govern themselves through their own councils. Those who move to town usually maintain their ties with their villages.

The posts are grouped in nine *concelhos*, Bissau, Bolama, Bafatá, Bissorá, Cachéu, Catío, Farim, Gabu (Nova Lamego) and Mansoa, and three *circunscrições*, Bijagós, Falacunda and São Domingos, under Administrators.

Local civil and police officers include Natives, mulattos and a number of Goanese exiled from the "State of India." One admirable *chefe de posto* I have met had a Portuguese father and a Fula mother.

There are elected Municipal Councils in the larger, and Municipal Committees in the lesser, towns.

EDUCATION

The civil administration, the Armed Forces and the Missions are partners in education, and in town and *tabanca* (Creole for village) there are Islamic schools where Muslim boys squat to chant from the Koran.

There are 21,512 pupils in primary, and 1,858 in secondary school, and 346 at the Honório Berreto Lyceum in Bissau, named after the celebrated Negro Governor. 490 pupils are training at the Industrial, Professional and Technical School. The Dr. Silva Tavares Agricultural Apprenticeship School takes boarders from the countryside. At Bafatá the Catholic fathers run a trade school for boys.

18 scholarships are awarded annually for secondary and higher studies in European Portugal by the State, the Provincial Government, the Bissau municipality, administrative departments, the Trade and Industrial Association, private enterprise and the Gulbenkian Foundation.

A few native seminarians train for the priesthood in the *metropole*.

EXAMPLE TO AFRICA

In 1963 a World Health Organisation mission to Guinea, Angola and Moçambique came to the following conclusions:—

(a) The Portuguese authorities gave the WHO experts every facility. Nothing was hidden from them and they were not dissuaded from going anywhere.

(b) There are exemplary health services in all three provinces.

(c) The local inhabitants have full confidence in the health services.

(d) The Rural Labour Code is strictly applied in all three provinces, which applies without discrimination to all racial and cultural groups and guarantees workers and their families medical assistance.

(e) Existing plans would lead to a better standard of living.

(f) There are first-class hospitals in the three provinces.

(g) There is no racial discrimination.

M. Raoul Follereau of WHO recorded that "within a few years leprosy will be conquered and you will then be able to be one of the first territories in the world where leprosy will have disappeared." The Portuguese conquest of both leprosy and sleeping sickness has been commended as "an example to Africa." The only threat to its complete success is the terrorist obstruction of inoculation and supervision.

But Mr. Basil Davidson⁴ knows better than WHO:—

"Elsewhere the last twenty years of the colonial period saw a great deal of effort directed at tropical scourges such as these. But not in Guinea; the colony could simply not afford it."

Mr. Davidson was writing in 1969 but retelling 1954 statistics given by Commander Teixeira de Mota, now Naval Chief of Staff in Guinea, in his authoritative two-volume monograph, *Guine-Portuguesa*⁵ and quoted by the PAIGC leader, Amílcar Cabral, in his *Report to U.N.* of 1961.

AFRICAN FORCES OF SUBVERSION

In PAIGC the Portuguese are at grips with a formidable, insidious foe. The military forces of Amílcar Cabral may number 6,000, of whom about half may be in Portuguese territory.

His armed forces of "popular revolution" (FARP) include an *Esercito Popular* (People's Army) and a *Guerrilha Popular*. On paper at least PAIGC reproduces an administrative and command structure after the Portuguese pattern. Amílcar and his comrades are, after all, Portuguese in upbringing and education. The PAIGC troops wear camouflage uniform similar to the loyal Portuguese and are difficult to distinguish from their own black soldiers and irregulars. The majority of rebels are Balantas.

Cabral has divided Guinea into northern, eastern and southern "inter-regions," subdivided into zones.

The People's Army (E.P.) comprises mobile groups intended to operate anywhere under the direct orders of the Inter-Regional Committee. Their role is to engage the enemy, sustain the guerrilla forces (G.P.) and mobilize and organize the people against their rulers.

The basic E.P. unit is a group of 21 made up of:

- Leader.
- Political Commissar.
- Bazooka aimer.
- Bazooka loader.
- L.M.G. aimer.
- L.M.G. loader.
- 6 riflemen.
- 7 snipers.

Each such group contains 3 sub-groups with its leader and 5, usually supported by a mortar operated by 4-6 men and a heavy machine-gun manned by a team of 4.

That is the basic unit. A tougher proposition are the *bi-grupos*, hard-hitting combat units endowed with additional fire power. A *bi-grupo* consists of the following:—

- Leader.
- Political Commissar.
- 3 bazooka aimers.
- 3 bazooka loaders.
- 3 L.M.G. aimers.
- 3 L.M.G. loaders.
- 9 riflemen.
- 3 snipers.

There are three sub-groups to each *bi-grupo*. The sub-group is made up of a leader, bazooka aimer, bazooka loader, together with three riflemen and snipers. The normal supporting arms for a *bi-grupo* are two mortars and two heavy machine guns.

TERRORIST BASES

The G.P. have installed bases and some field hospitals in densely forested parts of the Province. In Oio, where PAIGC is strong, there are about 12 bases and more in the South. The main ones are at Canjambari on the Northern, and Unal on the Southern Front. Each base is manned by a garrison whose strength may range from 32 to 64, besides its leader and political commissar, and comprises four groups, each consisting of a leader and eight rank and file. Their weapons are rifles and both light and heavy machine guns. The base itself is also provided with a bazooka, a heavy machine-gun and a mortar. As fast as the Portuguese destroy a base, the PAIGC make it good. Field hospi-

tals, served by Cuban doctors, have been set up at Morés and Xitole.

In addition to the FARP, a teenage *Milicia Popular* (M.P.) has been recruited to spy and forage. The M.P. is organized in regions, zones, sections and groups. Each group includes a leader, political commissar and 15 militia of both sexes. Every section, zone and region is controlled by its Committee and, at the top, the Revolutionary Committee consists of a Chairman, Political Commissar, two Vice-Chairmen (one of them a woman) and a Secretary.

24 TONS OF CAPTURED ARMS

Except for air support, possession of which would "escalate" operations to the discomfort of the republics harbouring the terrorists, the PAIGC lacks for little in the way of warlike material. In some respects it is better armed than the Portuguese. Its troops are equipped with Soviet, Czech, East German, Chinese, Cuban and a sprinkling of American and British weapons. These include Russian 82 mm. recoilless cannon, 82.5 mm. bazookas, heavy and light mortars, 12.7 mm. anti-aircraft machine guns, multi-barrelled Kalashnikov automatic rifles, land mines, anti-personnel mines and grenades.

In August I inspected the 24 tons of Communist material just captured at Colina do Norte, on the northern border with Senegal. Some of it was displayed under the flagstaff of the local garrison; the rest I saw at the Air Force base at Bissalanca, where it had been taken by the green-bereted parachutists who had shared in this most successful operation. (In Portugal the paras are part of the Air Force.)

The 1968 version of the Degtyarev, as used in Vietnam, was in evidence. A bazooka was marked, "Cuba Exército Rebelde."

Ammunition boxes bore at one end the name of a Soviet manufacturer, at the other "PAIGC Conacry."

In my possession are Soviet-made "dumdum" bullets, which are against the conventions of war.

Also amongst the captured material were exercise books for instruction and propaganda literature in Portuguese, all printed in the USSR. A booklet commemorating the centenary of Lenin's birth contained photographs of PAIGC leaders.

These are the weapons, physical and psychological, of the PAIGC of Amílcar Cabral. There are other revolutionary parties, too. We may pass briefly over BNGC (*Bloc des Naturels de Guinée-Bissau*). Its leader, a Fula called Oumaro Gano, once worked in Senegal, until Amílcar Cabral had him chased into the Gambia. BNGC believes in a peaceful negotiation of autonomy, and is against Cape Verdian dominance in Guinea.

The PAIGC rival FLING (*Front pour la lutte pour l'indépendance de la Guinée Portugaise*), which now does little but talk and bring out its paper *Bombolon*. Its weapons and soldiers are strictly controlled by the Senegalese *gendarmerie*. François Mendy has been replaced as leader by Benjamin Pinto Bull and the party is divided within itself. Paulo Dias heads a pro-Cuban, pro-Chinese fraction.

But the OAU has cut off funds for FLING in accordance with its policy of one movement per territory to be "liberated"—PRELIMO for Moçambique, MPLA for Angola, PAIGC for "Guinea-Bissau". Senegal, too, has withdrawn support from FLING. When President Senghor's Francophil "African Socialism" was under fire from the Marxist PAI (*Parti Africain de l'Indépendance*) in 1966, he entered into an agreement with Amílcar Cabral granting PAIGC bases and free movement in his territory. This is one reason why PAIGC have been able to step up their operations. Another is the presence of Cuban mercenaries acting as instructors, radio operators and medics. On the 19th November last year a Cuban army captain, Pedro Rodriguez Peralta, was captured after being

Footnotes at end of article.

wounded in a Portuguese ambush. He had been attached to the PAIGC by the Cuban Government five months previously.

PAIGC A CAPE VERDE MOVEMENT

Note the "C" in PAIGC—the African Party for the Independence of (Portuguese) Guinea and Cape Verde. Cape Verdians are something of an élite in Guinea. They are to the fore in official and commercial posts. Thus, in Bissau, if you embark on the somewhat lengthy task of sending a cable or cashing a cheque, you are likely to be served by a pretty Cape Verdian girl. There are Cape Verdian ground staff in the Air Force (Guinea and Cape Verde constitute a single Air Zone) and Cape Verdian engineers in the Bissau dockyard.

From Amílcar Cabral down, Cape Verdians predominate in the hierarchy of PAIGC, which is resented by Negro members. In July, 1967, some of the leading Negroes plotted to assassinate Cabral; but he got wind of the conspiracy and some of them were liquidated. They say that there is talk in the PAIGC of having to fight another war, when they have ousted the Portuguese, a war against the Cape Verdians.

AMILCAR CABRAL

The Secretary-General of the Party was himself the son of a Cape Verdian father and a Mandingo mother. He was born at Bafatá. He won a scholarship to Lisbon University after doing well at the Lyceum in São Vicente in Cape Verde. His teacher of English told me what a good pupil Amílcar was. He became an agronomist in the administration of his home Province and showed exceptional promise. Unfortunately, he fell foul of a white superior who was his professional inferior. He drifted to other jobs in Lisbon and Angola, then defected to Conakry, by 1958 the capital of the Republic of Guinea which under Sékou Touré's leadership had defied General de Gaulle and opted out of the French Community. Amílcar may have been influenced by his Marxist wife, a white Portuguese whose brother is serving as an officer in the Army. They have since parted.

Cabral attended the "Three Continents" Conference at Havana in 1966, met the late Ché Guevara and is highly thought of by Fidel Castro. In October, 1969, he was prominent together with Judas Honwana of the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) and five other leaders of African 'liberation' movements, at an international symposium held by the Russians at Alma-Ata, capital of the Soviet Central Asian Republic of Kazakhstan. The gathering, jointly sponsored by the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee and the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, was to commemorate the centenary in 1970 of Lenin's birth and its theme was Leninist teaching on national liberation revolutions. Cabral is certainly a cut above some of the postures further South, who, like Dukes of Plaza Toro, lead their regiment from behind in places like Dar-es-Salaam.

POLITICAL WARFARE

Besides up-to-date Communist arms, PAIGC has the use of *Radio Libertação* in Conakry. Some extravagant claims are broadcast, for instance, the "capture" of Bedanda, where in 1968 I visited a locally recruited Negro company, embarked in the LDM (medium landing craft) of a river convoy—and missed my croc. Six months before that Algiers Radio reported a raid on Bissau. Moscow Radio went one better and reported the bombing of Bissau by 20 aircraft. In fact there was a long range mortar attack on the airport. Little damage was done.

PAIGC commit fewer atrocities than the organizations operating against Portugal in Angola and Mocambique—though, cruelly, faked letters purporting to come from company commanders in Guinea are sometimes sent to the homes of serving Portuguese soldiers falsely announcing their death in action. Examples have been shown to me at

the Lisbon offices of the *Movimento Nacional Feminino*, which roughly corresponds to the W.R.V.S., by its leader Madame Cecilia Supico Pinto, who might be described as Portugal's "Lady Mountbatten". She has the same burning concern for the wounded and distressed. We first met in Guinea in 1966. "Lady Mountbatten" had become the Portuguese soldiers' "Vera Lynn." She visited units in all sectors and sang *jado* to her own guitar accompaniment. Nothing like this had happened before, and it was not the normal behaviour of a Portuguese society lady. "Celinha," as she is known, also told me of Communist women who have impersonated her own welfare workers and ghoulishly appeared in peasant homes to give lying news of a son or husband dead in a Guinea swamp.

WAR OF WORDS

Monotonously, under datelines not even as near as Conakry, there appear reports of most of Guinea passing under PAIGC control. On each visit I have found such reports exaggerated to the point of fantasy. The story goes that when Amílcar Cabral met the international Press in President Sékou Touré's capital a naïve, or naughty, journalist asked him: "Why then is this Press conference being held here?"

In subversive war "control" is a different term which can be misleading. Deep penetration is child's play for the well-armed guerrilla fighters who lay mines or ambushes on roads, tracks and rivers, and make their nocturnal flits from inviolable bases in foreign territory. Compare Angola, Mocambique, Rhodesia. Who controls what in Vietnam? Not that the PAIGC are as successful as the Vietminh and the Vietcong. Bissau is not Saigon.

The Bijagós Islands and the islands of Bissau and Bolama are unscathed by terrorism. I have motored unarmed and without military escort from Bissau to Nhacra and beyond, whereas elsewhere one travels in convoy. A murderous outrage near the capital some while ago turned out to be a *crime passionnel*. . . . In Bolama a few months ago a mine exploded on the road from the local airfield to the sea, damaging a car and wounding two soldiers and a civilian. A second mine was discovered the same day on the same road. But the probable source of these outrages was the Zunquera area on the mainland opposite Bolama.

This is a tract where the Portuguese concede "dual control." In such areas communications are so difficult that the people must needs placate the latest visitors, be they Portuguese on patrol or a guerrilla group.

General Spínola, who is practical as well as aggressive, ordered withdrawal from Béni in the east and, if it pleases them, the terrorists may claim to have occupied the surrounding territory that borders the Republic of Guinea. But there is no population for them to "control." It has long since fled the terror and the war.

SUBVERSIVE GRAND STRATEGY

At the time of my first visit, in 1963, the Balantas, and others, fell under revolutionary persuasion. By 1965 the south country along the Rio Cacine was a cockpit of guerrilla activity seeping north-westward towards the heart of the Province.

PAIGC strategy was to try to link up another of their strongholds in the traditionally turbulent Oio region around Farim, Mansaba, Mansoa, Bissorá, and drive a wedge through the narrow waist of the country. They thus hoped to sever the peaceful loyal, groundnut-producing north-east from the trading ports of Bafatá, Bambadinca and Bissau.

The Portuguese, however, reinforced their river patrols, using naval landing craft and marines as well as soldiers, and garrisoned the southern border posts of Gadambel, Sangonha and Cacula to intercept infiltrators.

In Oio villages were fortified and their in-

habitants armed. Posts were established round Bissau to check incursions from Senegal. A line of defended villages runs from the neighbourhood of Cambaju on the Senegal frontier to Bambadinca.

PAIGC still infests Oio, notably round Canjambari, Mores and Sara. But Quitáfine, in the south, is hardly as described by their propaganda. Last year it was largely cleaned up with the assistance of parachutists landed from helicopters. In August of this year I spent a day and a night in what Mr. Basil Davidson calls the "liberated zone, the coastal zone of Quitáfine".^o A political commissar, formerly a schoolmaster, had been captured in the Catió sector and the battalion commander gave examples of co-operation between Balantas and Fulas against the enemy of their peace.

OPENING UP THE INTERIOR

Terrorism has profited from poor communications with the Province, and road building is a major civil-military activity. In 1968 I drove without escort along the straight tarmac road connecting Bambadinca with Bafatá. Bambadinca is the port—it has two jetties, one for high, the other for low, tide—for Bafatá, which is the second commercial centre in Guinea and a pretty Portuguese town, all white and terracotta.

Last August I flew along the line of the road Peúndo-Catora. Between Bula and Catora it is already metalled and the tarmac will eventually go through to Teixeira Pinto.

Airfields are being enlarged, to take jets, at Bafatá, Nova Lamego and Cufar, near Catió in Quitáfine.

"FIGHT FOR THE PEOPLE"

Improved communications by road and air will lighten the heavy, unremitting labours of the Armed Forces. But, as their commanders are the first to acknowledge, there is no purely military solution to their problem. Given the situation and terrain of Guinea, the attitude of her neighbours and the calibre and armament of the PAIGC, the Portuguese military achievement is remarkable and without widespread popular support their position would by now have become untenable.

In their field manual the Portuguese proclaim that "the fight against subversion is a fight for the people and never against the people." The reference is to Mao Tsetung's treatise, *Guerrilla Warfare*, in which the Chinese veteran says that "it is only undisciplined troops who make the people their enemies and who, like the fish out of its natural element, cannot live."

The Portuguese claim that they are taking the "water" away from the "fish."

This is the main purpose of the policy of "regroupment." It is a difficult operation and the authorities were slow to start. It was objected that tribal life and agriculture would be disrupted. But terrorism was already doing this and one of the PAIGC's successes has been to compel the importation of rice into a Province which formerly grew at least enough for its needs. In Bissau I watched the unloading of rice from a Greek merchantman.

REGROUPMENT

Regroupment is now a main instrument of countersubversion. In its early stages it was a largely civil undertaking. Thus, in Oio the administration regrouped Balantas at Bissau and a predominantly Balanta population at Antotinha. Since then it has become a joint enterprise with the military; in the first instance on the responsibility of individual units, latterly as part of a co-ordinated plan.

New, and better, villages are built by the people, with expert help, along roads and rivers and near Army posts where they can be shielded from terrorist influence and intimidation and protected against armed attack. There the fugitives of war can be

Footnotes at end of article.

brought back from their places of refuge on both sides of the frontiers and afforded security from molestation or conscription into the service of PAIGC. Thousands who were impressed into the terrorist ranks have come back to the flag. Often they bring their weapons with them. Safe conducts and propagandist strip cartoons in bright colours are disseminated and dropped from the air.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

On the more positive side of this battle for the people, regroupment is used to bring them education and social services. The civil power, the military and the *regulos* meet in refreshingly unbureaucratic local committees. The invention of the last Governor, General Arnaldo Schulz, they are known as *cadmits*. They undertake the sinking of wells, the running of peasant co-operatives, the distribution of improved ploughs and seeds, and organize collective cultivation. In the first year of its life the *Club de Mancarra*, a producers' co-operative at Bajacunda banked 14,000 *escudos*.

The Army build primary schools and "sanitary posts" in each area of regroupment. They are later handed over to the civil administration. Guinea has never before enjoyed medical care on this admittedly still imperfect scale. The "sanitary posts" and the Army doctors attract many patients from across the frontiers. The Air Force operates a "flying doctor service," moving serious cases to the hospitals in Bissau, Bafatá, Farim, Teixeira Pinto or Catió.

Young officers of Lisbon's *jeunesse dorée* and from the University find a new sense of purpose in helping the people of Guinea to improve their conditions of life.

SELF DEFENSE

Each regroupment is garrisoned by regular troops until the people are ready to undertake their own defense. Members of nearly every tribe, Mandingos, Manjocos and Balantas, as well as Fulas, are issued with Mausers, sometimes with Lee-Enfields, and with light machineguns. Some 79 mm. grenade throwers and mortars have been distributed and a certain number of heavy machine-guns. Captured Communist weapons are also given out. It has been found that this helps the people to overcome the fear inspired by the scale and quality of the PAIGC's armament.

Cambaju, on the southern border, has withstood frequent attacks, in one of which the civilian defenders killed 20 terrorists. That is but one example of the courage and loyalty Portugal can command among the people of Guinea.

The people's war against the PAIGC has revealed that the Fulas, although unshakably loyal, have no undisputed pre-eminence in valour. As was found by the British in India, the idea of a martial race *par excellence* is often a myth.

MILITANT PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Not all the self-defense villages are the product of regroupment. Near Xitole 25 traditional Fula villages and in the area Camamudo-Fajonquito-Contuboel 10 Fula and Mandingo villages have made themselves responsible for their own protection against the terrorists.

As for the Felupe, they need little help and advice. Barbed wire they disdain. In the north-west of Guinea round Susana and São Domingos, these former, and perhaps sometimes recidivist, headhunters prefer their own bows and arrows to the firearms proffered by the Portuguese authorities. The Felupe terrorise the terrorists and in blood-thirsty, hot pursuit, have been known to cross the Senegal frontier and have thus caused Portugal to be arraigned at U.N., an organization which, as a body, cares nothing for frontier violation in the interests of subversion.

Having accompanied a Felupe patrol, I would not care to be their enemy. Their more peaceable sport is wrestling. Bouts sometimes end fatally—for rival spectators.

DISENCHANTMENT

Not all those who revert to their Portuguese allegiance are peasants. In Bissau in 1968 I met intellectuals, including an idealistic former *chefe de posto*, who had become disenchanted with revolution. They were engaged in broadcasting counter-subversive propaganda. Among them was a former interpreter of Amílcar Cabral who had acted in the *Creole* propaganda film, *Labanta Negro*, made by Italian Marxists.

The Portuguese also cultivate friendly personal relations with officials of the neighbouring republics. Across the border from Bajacunda there was stationed a Senegalese police chief who had fought under the tricolor at Monte Cassino, in Indo-China and Algeria, and was on excellent terms with his Portuguese opposite numbers, whom he told of his weariness of war. When President Sékou Touré's men of Guinea-Conakry show a disposition to fraternize on the frontier with Portugal's Guinea, they are speedily transferred.

RAFAEL BARBOSA

I was in Bissau soon after that extraordinary scene at the Governor's Palace in early August, when the Chairman of the PAIGC Central Committee (with him were Raul Nunes Correia and Pascoal Anrigema) declared that he had been "deceived by promises in the name of the winds of history and renounced the revolution before a large crowd. General Spínola replied that there must be no recriminations. For a better Guinea "we must build and not destroy."

I talked to Barbosa and Correia. Rafael is grey and aged after years of prison. He declared himself a Protestant and sickened by violence. He mentioned in particular the recent wounding at Bula of two women and two babies. Raul is younger, dark and a bit of a "card." He owes his qualifications as a mechanic to the University of Kiev and has placed them at the service of the Portuguese Air Force.

91 other prisoners were declared to be rehabilitated at the same time as these three.

WORDS AND DEEDS

For Guinea, asleep through centuries, the war has induced social expenditure and a new approach. At the same time, it is fair to remember that a development plan had been introduced before the war broke out and that there were some devoted officials—*homens de Guiné*—who served her ably and well. John Gunther, who was never "inside Portuguese Guinea," was unjust when he said that the place was "shabby, almost moribund".

As often, Mr. Basil Davidson is out of date in writing of the struggle as the "company's war." The C.U.F.'s monopoly handles most commodities; but it is losing money, and the authorities protect the peasant by fixing prices for his crops. His groundnuts fetch more in Guinea-Bissau than in Guinea-Conakry, in Senegal or the world at large.

In the Republic of Guinea scarcities and high prices fail to commend the ideology of Sékou Touré. The Soussou President is suspect to the Fulas and Futa-Fulas, who on both sides of the border remained faithful respectively to Portugal and to France.

Mr. Davidson is more accurate when he says of Portuguese Africa that:

"There were none of the basic conditions, upon which revolution on Europe and Asia had been founded: no large proletariat, no crystallized working class, no masses of peasantry deprived of land . . .

And of Portuguese Guinea that: "There has been no great problem of land expropriation or rural indebtedness."

Almost one hears a murmured "Too bad!" The PAIGC claims as proto-martyrs of the revolution the Bissau dockers, who in 1959 struck against exploiting shipmasters. About 30 were shot by the police. Their grievances

Footnotes at end of article.

have since been redressed. Dockers can now earn 30 *escudos* a day, which is a high wage in Africa. They have excellent canteens and rest rooms.

In 1956 I was invited to the dockers' annual outing. Drums beat, *vinho* and palm wine flowed and there was much dancing. A leading docker exchanged orations with the Governor. Both ended "Viva Portugal!" They embraced. An official account recorded that—

"Twelve hundred stevedores and dockers held their annual get-together lunch, at which they consumed (1) six hundred and fifty kilos of rice, (2) eleven hogs, (3) ten goats, (4) one cow, (5) one thousand two hundred rolls. All this was washed down with one thousand litres of red wine, eighty litres of brandy and . . . one hundred and fifty litres of the local palm wine!"

This potentially revolutionary force has been won over. In Guinea there is no genuine basis for popular uprising. How significant were President Sékou Touré's words:

"If these people do not want to be liberated, we, who are free and conscious, have a duty to liberate them."

MORALE

How are the Portuguese standing up to this messy, treacherous war of hide-and-seek and blast-and-run?

One sees the weariness in many eyes, but despite hardship and the appalling climate of a land where in the rains everything rocks of fecund decay, morale is high.

The soldiers have few amenities—occasionally a cinema, *fado*, ration wine laced with vitamins or Sagres beer. The empties they will hang on the barbed wire to tinkle a warning of an approaching enemy.

But in some respects the Portuguese peasant-soldier's standard of life is higher in Guinea than in Europe. He has the pay and the opportunity to buy American cigarettes and the Yardley toiletries which, with Lifebuoy soap, Land Rovers and Raleigh cycles, are a principal British export.

ON THE ROAD

I accompanied a road convoy in 1968 from Buba (which was bombarded before the Granada TV cameras) to Aldeia Formosa. Nothing was laid on for me; I asked the battalion commander at the last moment to allow me to go. The escorting infantry included Negroes and Arab-faced peasants from Algarve. Their officer was a subaltern from Macao. Their debonaire-desperado air would have enpurpled a British R.S.M. Some of the men were stripped to the waist or capless under a pitiless sun. Some had cut Redskin fringes as seen in the King's Road, Chelsea, in the trousers of their camouflage suits. Revolvers dangled from lanyards, cigarettes from mouths. Some seemed clothed in nothing but their equipment and a crucifix.

The bush came right up to the appalling laterite road and choked us with thick red dust. At danger points, particularly one road junction, we dismounted until scouts were sent out and reported all clear. Otherwise, the troops chattered, laughed and sang, and bought bananas by the roadside for a few *centavos*. . . . Their cheerfulness was unfeigned.

Saluting in Guinea is capricious. An officer may take a parade with nothing on his head. More serious is the absence of malaria discipline. Authoritarian Portugal does not believe in compelling a free man to swallow antimalaria tablets. Some soldiers fear that it affects their virility.

RONCO

Units differ vastly. Who was it said that cavalry prevented warfare from being a vulgar brawl? In 1968 I stayed at Mansabá with a *Batalhão de Cavalaria* of style and tradition. There was no mess silver, but the cook was from the Lisbon Ritz. Loyal toasts were drunk. The Colonel made a speech in Portuguese, which referred to the oldest alliance

(more than we deserve, I thought) and ended in English: "God save the Queen!" Then his officers raised the war cries of a cavalry charge. All of which is *ronco*, an approximate Portuguese equivalent of the English "bull."

Mandingo chiefs and native girls training to be nurses were entertained in the mess. There was Mandingo dancing before dinner and singing afterwards in the sergeants' mess. That battalion was a family.

A gay captain from the Azores excelled at singing *fado*. By the small hours he was on patrol. At breakfast time he signalled that he had made contact with a terrorist base, captured some arms and taken care of some women and children who had accompanied the terrorists from Senegal.

Mansabá was growing as Mandingos were re-grouped under the protection of the cavalry. The school worked two shifts. A civilian teacher, a native lady, officiated in the morning, a cavalry sergeant in the afternoon. The local militia embraced Mandingo and Fula (old enemies) and also Balantas. The Army reconciles the differences of centuries.

The battalion ran a large irrigated farm. Fruit, vegetables and cotton were grown and sold in Bissau. Nearby a working party, which included white soldiers and was commanded by a Fula sergeant, was clearing bush to lengthen the air strip.

EQUIPMENT

Operating mainly as infantry, the battalion had some aging Ferret armoured cars. "Foxes" the Portuguese have renamed them. Owing to the perfidious arms ban, civil officials ride in brand new Land Rovers, but the Army officers, who protect them, in antique jeeps. The damp and dust of Guinea are an insidious foe. Much of the transport is old and has clocked up a prodigious mileage.

At the busy and growing naval base at Bissau they enquired wistfully about Merlin engines. The landing craft used as transports and for the operations of marine commandoes (*fuzilerios especiais*) are also old. Bearded, bare-chested sailors, piratically picturesque, may live in their cramped quarters for years on end.

SALUTE

In his platitudinous treatise on guerrilla warfare, the late Ché Guevara correctly remarked: "The peasant is evidently the best soldier."

I salute the Portuguese peasant soldier and his officers. Their constancy rebukes those who by abandoning their African responsibilities thought that they had made a virtue of necessity, whereas what they did was not necessary and certainly not virtuous.

Portugal holds. But to what purpose? Unless Esso strikes oil, some good timber, groundnuts, cashew nuts and palm kernels do not suffice to justify the sacrifice of so much blood and treasure. Portugal, however, glories in her sense of history and vocation and she knows that collapse in Guinea would undermine her in Angola and Mocambique, whose glittering potential exceeds that of the metropole and attracts world-wide investment.

The Portuguese approach is unfashionable. Yet it is an attitude that must come back into vogue, if Europe is to live.

ON GUARD FOR THE WEST

Guinea grows in strategic significance.

In 1918 the German Colonial Association called for the occupation of "the productive lands of the Senegal and Niger basins, and thence southward to the sea". Already in September, 1914, Solf, the Secretary of State in the Reich Colonial Office, had submitted proposal for the "partition of the African possessions of France, Belgium and Portugal". Bolama and Bissau he rated second only to Britain's Bathurst as naval and commercial ports of the first rank.

These were the war aims of the Kaiser's Germany. What is the grand design of the "heartland" empire of Soviet Russia, whose

Red Fleet shows the Red Flag in the Mediterranean, the Atlantic and the Indian Ocean?

Nkrumah's Ghana was the intended Soviet link in a chain which was to stretch from the Mediterranean to West Africa and connect her sphere of influence across to Castro's Cuba, whose "Gulf of Guinea subversion plan," disclosed by the defecting Dr. Lionel Alonso, is manifest in Portuguese Guinea. The Yugoslav-designed naval port at Sekunde near Takoradi and the Soviet-built air base at Tamale far exceeded the needs of the Ghanaian forces.

Ghana has since been redeemed from her self-styled Redeemer. But MIG's bombed Biafra and Conakry, where a Chinese envoy has been received, continues as a main centre of subversion. Guinea is the last territory in West Africa north of the Equator still possessed by a NATO power, 276 miles out to sea lies Cape Verde.

Mr. Basil Davidson describes them⁹ as Guinea's "off-shore islands," destined, with the Bissagós, for attack and "liberation"—though to speak of the "liberation" of islands uninhabited when Portuguese were settled there in communion, never since broken, with Portugal-in-Europe, is a meaningless hypocrisy.

In 1967 Amílcar Cabral declared the "liberation of the Islands" to be indispensable to "the struggle of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and South Africa (the aerodrome on Sal island being a South African Base (sic))."¹⁰ That magnificent all-weather air base, Portugal's unsinkable aircraft carrier, is indeed the objective of those who would sever, or menace, Europe's line of communication with Southern Africa, the Commonwealth and allied countries of the Indian Ocean basin, the Far East and Australasia.

"SATO"?

The only African ports in dependable allied hands are Portuguese or South African. If NATO is necessary, there is greater need today for a "South Atlantic Pact," extended into the Indian Ocean. It is more than time to put an end to the bans and boycotts and blockade directed against Portugal and her friends in Africa. For Britain, they are bad business, bad strategy, bad faith.

AN AFRICAN "BRAZIL"?

These vital considerations apart, the Luso-tropical experiment deserves the objective examination it seldom receives. U Thant's repeated refusal to visit Portuguese Africa and see for himself is regrettable, though not unexpected. Less understandable, unless it arises from a desire that Portugal should not succeed where they failed in the discharge of African responsibilities, is the hostility of allies who profit from her constancy.

At least, it is generally conceded nowadays that Portugal is "colour-blind." In Guinea churches, clubs and cinemas, schools and swimming pools are open to all. Black soldiers command white. All races in the Armed Forces share quarters and messes.

Commander Teixeira de Mota writes¹⁰ of the "informal personal and direct relationships" which both European and African in Guinea prefers "to those of class and caste." "The whole history of Portugal overseas (he goes on) involves a constant intercourse of different races and civilizations and neither colour nor culture imposes economic or social barriers. Individuals really mean more to the Portuguese than racial or cultural purity. . . . Portugal's own history is a continuous process of fusion of races and cultures."

But what is a "European" Portuguese?

"ULYSSES"

The celebrated Brazilian Luso-tropicalist, Gilberto Freyre, writing of a Portugal that is Semitic as well as Celtic and Latin, Portugal that was African when the centuries of chivalry were not yet spent, compared the Portuguese with Ulysses. For he is restless with the restlessness of Moor and Jew, restless

within his Iberian confine. For him "the tropics were mother lands, native lands, and strange lands to which he returned with very special rights—almost the rights of a tropical expatriate who has wandered in Europe, absorbing her qualities in his blood, being and culture, until Europe has also become intimately his."

In Guinea one sees on the walls of public buildings and of peasant homes thatched with grass, a poster depicting a black soldier and his white comrade clasping hands in friendship beneath the flag of Portugal. Below are the words *Juntos Venceremos*, "Together we shall conquer."

Portugal fights on, and in the end the West will be grateful.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *The Liberation of Guiné: Aspects of an African Revolution* (Penguin African Library 1969).

² The revolutionary *Parti do Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde*.

³ "Let us even wish that in the near future our country may be able peacefully to acquire the two enclaves of English Gambia and Portuguese Guinea, whose natural role appears to be attached to our Western Sudan, of which the close cohesion would thus be complete."

⁴ *The Liberation of Guiné: Aspects of an African Revolution*. (Penguin African Library 1969).

⁵ *Agência General do Ultramar*, Lisbon, 1954.

⁶ *The Liberation of Guiné: Aspects of an African Revolution*. (Penguin African Library 1969).

⁷ *Inside Africa* (Hamish Hamilton 1955).

⁸ *Companhia União Fabril*.

⁹ *The Liberation of Guiné: Aspects of an African Revolution* (Penguin African Library 1969).

¹⁰ *Guiné-Portuguesa, 1 Volume. Monographias dos Territórios do Ultramar*. (Agência Geral do Ultramar 1954).

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative at its annual meeting at Madison on March 29 and 30 adopted its statement of intent, beliefs, and goals.

The resolutions, embodying the principles and purposes of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, are broad in scope and are aimed at the complex and pressing problems of the modern day.

The Wisconsin Electric Cooperative is to be commended for its farsighted statement of principles and purposes, which I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues.

The resolutions follow:

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES

A statement of intent, beliefs and goals adopted by delegates to the 1971 annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative at Madison, Wisconsin, March 29 & 30, 1971.

I. REA LOAN FUNDS

We believe that many rural electric cooperatives, in order to serve their consumer-members properly on an area coverage basis, must depend on continuation of the REA 2 percent loan program, therefore,

We request the Congress to appropriate increased loan funds for a projected two-year construction program to assure these cooperatives adequate growth capital to meet the increasing power requirements for rural people, and,

We urge that the REA Administrator establish such fiscal requirements and recommendations for cooperatives so they can build up and enhance their own financial condition through adequate reserve funds, and,

We recommend the establishment of a minimum of at least 15 per cent of total plant investment as a guideline for minimum adequate reserve funds.

2. WHOLESAL POWER—G & T LOANS

We believe that G & T loans are, and have been from the beginning, a most vital element in the REA program because they have provided the rural electric systems with an effective bargaining leverage and have given the systems a realistic alternative when existing power suppliers refuse to provide wholesale power on acceptable terms and conditions.

We believe this bargaining leverage is even more important to the rural electric today as they have to struggle to survive in an industry where technology and economics are putting a dangerous squeeze on the smaller electric systems. And we believe the G & T program cannot serve as a bargaining tool if wholesale power suppliers can feel assured that Congressional and/or administration policy decisions will put a stop to G & T loans, therefore,

We urge that both Congress and the Administration support the G & T program that it might continue to be a viable force, recognizing that REA has never had adequate funds for this job but also recognizing that the needs for help at the wholesale power negotiating table is now greater than ever.

3. SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCING

We believe that rural electric cooperatives, aided by their national association, having properly established a cooperatively owned and controlled credit institution, incorporated as the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation, as a self-help means of providing future growth capital, supplementing the traditional REA loans, which must be continued, therefore,

We encourage each WEC member cooperative to continue to add its prescribed investment to the initial capitalization of this institution, and to operate in accordance to the statements of viewpoints and objectives set forth by the Long-Range Study Committee as guidelines for policy and operation.

4. CFC FINANCING FOR G & T COOPERATIVES

We believe that the Cooperative Finance Corporation offers a new hope as an important source of supplemental financing. We recognize that the backlog of loan fund appropriations grows ever larger while the level of appropriated loan funds has remained static, offering little hope for the immense needs for the generation and transmission systems of the nation, and that for more than two years REA has not approved a single loan for the full cost of any major generating unit. We also recognize that the G & T power supply commitment to distribution member systems and the G & T cooperative obligation to the power pools in which they participate are approaching critical deadlines, therefore,

We urge CFC to lend its leadership and ingenuity to the development of innovative ways to finance generating units and transmission systems. We further urge CFC to protect the future access of rural electric systems to continue 2 percent REA financing in all circumstances wherein such is required to assure system integrity and to carry out the purposes of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

We commend the many dedicated rural electric leaders and the NRECA and CFC

boards of directors for their tireless effort of the past few years in bringing this self-help supplemental financial institution into operation.

5. 1971 ANNUAL MEETING THEME

We believe that our 1971 annual meeting theme, "Our Third Dimension," which refers to member involvement in the business affairs of cooperatives, encourages us to look at the important role of the member in our electric cooperatives, therefore,

We propose that electric cooperatives evaluate their member relations and member information programs, and that each board of directors carefully consider establishing those programs which will best inform and involve all segments of their memberships, including women, in the business affairs of the cooperatives.

6. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT (SUBMITTED BY STATE YOUTH BOARD)

We believe that electric cooperatives must emphasize adult member involvement and member relations activities in order to preserve a fundamental principle of cooperation, therefore,

We propose that rural electric cooperatives accomplish this objective through such means as adding home service advisers to their staffs, constantly encouraging their members to express their views in cooperative publications and that adult members be encouraged to work together with youth in programs sponsored by the cooperatives for youth.

7. YOUTH INVOLVEMENT (SUBMITTED BY STATE YOUTH BOARD)

We recognize the need for youth involvement and for youth's voice in our policies today. We commend those cooperatives which have asked youth to participate in their annual meetings, to work on various committees and to help educate their peers on the policies and functions of rural electric cooperatives. We further recognize the need for all cooperatives to support community youth activities, therefore,

We urge all electric cooperatives to study the possibilities for greater youth participation within their cooperatives and their communities in order to stimulate interest in the cooperatives and the communities and to help prepare their young members for their future responsibilities.

8. POLLUTION CONTROL (SUBMITTED BY STATE YOUTH BOARD)

We believe that pollution of all types is a nationwide problem that threatens our continued existence. We recognize that water and air are no respecters of political boundaries. We also recognize that it is economically unfair to industry to allow standards to vary across the nation, therefore,

We urge the Congress to provide funds for adequate research programs for finding ways to eliminate pollution from industrial and agricultural processes, and from all other pollution causing activities, and to set strict but reasonable nationwide standards to control pollution of our air, water and land.

9. NATIONAL POWER POOLING AND INTERCONNECTIONS

We believe the principal hope for future substantial reductions in the cost of power lies in the future development of a nationwide power grid employing extra high voltage transmission lines and interconnections and utilizing generating units of a size scale substantially greater than those now commonly in existence and integrating therein for power pooling and interchange purposes all power supply systems, including those owned by commercial power companies, the Federal and state governments, municipalities, power districts and cooperatives, and,

We believe that it is vital to the welfare of electric consumers everywhere that all power suppliers, whether large or small and whether investor, public or consumer owned

have the right to participate in the construction and benefits of modern, large scale unit components and power pooling, and that this principle has tacit recognition in the formation and operation of M.A.P.P. and the Upper Mississippi Power Pool, therefore,

We commend the operational principles established by M.A.P.P. and the Upper Mississippi Power Pool permitting participation by all segments of the electric supply industry, and,

We urge that legislation be enacted that will encourage and require the development of a nationwide power supply grid which will permit participation by all segments of the power supply industry to the end that modern technology in the generation and transmission of power to bring about lower costs and greater reliability can be utilized and will result in benefits to all consumers on an equitable basis.

10. RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

We believe there is a critical need for future sources of abundant, low-cost electric power which will create minimal impact on our natural environment together with decreased use of natural resources, therefore,

We urge the Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission to speed development of the fast breeder reactor to achieve its benefits as soon as possible, and, to intensify research on the safe disposal of radioactive wastes from reactor fuel reprocessing, to finance major research and development programs for various technologies which promise more efficient use of resources for commercial power production with significantly reduced adverse environmental effects.

11. RURAL DEVELOPMENT

We believe that many of today's pressing urban problems are due to an overwhelming population congestion which places impossible demands on the capacity of cities to provide jobs and services, therefore,

We recommend a highly coordinated, comprehensive rural development program including, but not limited to: Programs to attract industries and commercial enterprises to rural areas to provide jobs; Programs to expand existing industries and to launch new ones, especially those which will develop the natural resources of rural areas; Programs to make available to rural areas the same type of employment services now provided for urban centers including surveys to accurately identify the unemployed and underemployed, and to provide counseling, testing and training services aimed at giving rural people new marketable skills; Programs to assist farmers and other land owners in the development of income-producing resources; Programs of highway and public transportation improvement to further develop the full potential of industry, recreation and agriculture in rural areas.

We propose that all electric cooperatives and their associations add new impetus to their efforts to enhance the quality of rural life in every way possible, and work actively in the cause of rural development to help provide the jobs and income levels that will encourage rural residents to remain in rural areas, and those who have left for the crowded cities to return.

12. RURAL HOUSING

We believe that the improvement of housing in rural areas is one of the most pressing needs for creating a better life for rural people, and that improved housing is basic to the further development of agriculture and industry in rural areas, and that improved housing will help curtail the outflow of population in rural areas, therefore,

We reaffirm our support of the plan created by Wisconsin Electric Cooperative for developing a new approach in cooperative housing for rural areas, and urge the Board of Directors to continue to support WEC's effort to serve in any capacity necessary as a means

of achieving the goal of providing adequate, low-cost, quality housing for rural people.

We commend the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity for refunding the Wisconsin Rural Housing Cooperative with a \$150,000 grant for 1971 to continue implementation of its rural housing plan.

13. CONSUMER INTEREST PROTECTION

We believe that the interests of consumers are universal and actions of every department and agency of the federal government can and do affect consumers. And we believe that all Americans, regardless of their vocations and divergent interests, share a common interest as consumers, that there are all too many examples of fraudulent and deceptive practices used by the unscrupulous and the negligent to the detriment of the consumer's pocketbook, health and safety, and that we and other consumers deserve to be protected against fraud, price-gouging and indifference to the needs of consumers, therefore.

We support the establishment of an independent Federal agency which will provide consumer representation in the highest councils of government, and which also will have a watchdog function over consumer activities which are housed in the departments and agencies of the Federal government.

We urge that particular emphasis be placed on working with consumer groups, such as Consumer Federation of America and its affiliated local and state organizations, in behalf of meaningful consumer protection legislation, as these efforts will result in the double benefit of protecting our individual interests as consumers and of showing urban Congressmen and their constituents that rural electric support legislation which directly benefits all people, urban and rural.

14. PROJECT SANGUINE

We believe that presently not enough valid information is available or known on which to make a final decision for either supporting or rejecting the completed Sanguine Project in parts of Northern Wisconsin, believing that a great deal of misinformation and misunderstanding has developed as the result of individuals and groups seeking to deter and terminate any fair consideration of the Sanguine program. We further believe that Northern Wisconsin will continue to suffer severe loss of population, business development and economic growth unless serious efforts to change the rapid economic deterioration are put forth, and while there is the possibility that some economic growth opportunity might be created by the Sanguine Project, we suggest that this possibility should be fully and carefully considered along with all other factors in the assessment of this program, therefore.

We urge that the initial tests programmed in the Project Sanguine schedule be continued and completed, as well as any additional tests required to allow for a fair and complete evaluation of the total project to be undertaken.

15. ACRE—AND OUR ROLE IN POLITICS

We believe that electric cooperatives must develop greater awareness concerning the political origins of this program, and the continuing political involvement demanded by the urgent need to obtain adequate REA appropriations, adequate wholesale power, and to protect the integrity of their service areas, therefore.

We recommend that electric cooperative directors, employees and members join together to provide a substantially broader base of support for ACRE, the Action Committee for Rural Electrification, which seeks to focus our mutual interest and influence in bipartisan political activity.

16. CO-OP AND MUNICIPAL COOPERATION

We believe that rural electric systems and municipal systems have numerous common

characteristics and share many common problems, therefore.

We urge the rural electric cooperatives to work toward gaining legislative and economic strength by working together with municipal electric systems, and we support the efforts of the recently created MEUW-REC Joint Action Committee which has been set up to provide a vehicle for achieving the goals of cooperation in the areas of employee training, legislation, safety programs, mutual assistance in emergencies, standardization of equipment, and other areas where working together would be of mutual benefit.

17. NATIONAL POWER CRISIS

We believe that mounting evidence shows that the electric industry is facing an ever increasing demand for electric power, and that the reserve generating capacity of the nation is approaching dangerously low levels with several regions already having suffered brownouts or blackouts during peak load periods, therefore.

We call on all segments of the electric utility industry to take immediate steps to cooperate in planning interconnections, pooling of generating capacity, and construction of transmission facilities to assure an adequate and reliable supply of electric power for the nation.

18. NATIONAL FUEL CRISIS

We believe that the increasing acquisition of the nation's coal and uranium resources by oil companies could lead to the eventual domination of the nation's fossil and nuclear fuel supplies by oil interests, and that this domination would eliminate competition, resulting in a threat to every energy user, whether that user is a large industry or simply a homeowner purchasing electricity, therefore.

We support the enactment of legislation or federal restraining measures which would preserve competition among producers of the nation's fuel supplies by declaring it unlawful for any oil company to acquire any coal or uranium assets and by requiring that oil companies divest all present interests in coal or uranium assets.

19. TELEPHONE CO-OP BANK

We believe that an economical and efficient network of telephone communications ranks with electric service in making possible rural America's impressive contributions to the economy of this country, and to the general well-being of its people, therefore.

We urge the Congress to make possible a continuation of this contribution by approving legislation now pending which would authorize establishment of a Rural Telephone Cooperative Bank as a user-owner source of supplemental growth capital.

20. WEC SELF-FINANCING

We affirm the fact that the self-financing program of WEC is necessary and of critical importance for continuation of its valued services to over 400 electric and telephone systems in rural America, and

We recognize that our rural electrification program is facing a period of inadequate funding which reflects unfavorably on many electric systems' loan requirements and that the limited availability of funds could adversely affect the need and the opportunity for our member-systems to support vital WEC services through continuation of the self-financing program which has served so well for over thirteen years, therefore.

We urge that all present investors in WEC's self-financing program continue their current investment effort and further urge that any investments which may soon expire be renewed so that WEC's operating capital structure will not be impaired.

21. NEED TO INFORM

We believe that if the critical problems now facing the rural electric program are to be resolved successfully, the broadest pos-

sible base of public and member understanding and support must be elicited and obtained, therefore.

We support informational programs designed to acquaint various publics and our members with the needs and objectives of the rural electrification program in order to obtain greater understanding and support by the people.

RESTRUCTURING THE EXECUTIVE

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed restructuring Government activities to consolidate similar programs now administered by seven departments into four larger, but more orderly departments. For too many years, Government has been allowed to grow like an untended garden with little thought given to the tedium of upkeep and weeding so necessary to flourishing flowers.

We have, so to speak, let the Government organization go to seed.

Many Americans are distressed about Government operations almost to the point of despair. But, I am convinced we can rescue their faith. We have enacted sound, progressive programs during recent years and with a better organization, using the most modern management techniques, we can put the programs in an environment where they will flourish.

An editorial in the Washington Star reiterates the great need for reorganizing Government and commends President Nixon for his detailed proposals, but it also cautions Congress to scrutinize the legislative proposals with an eye to the proper placement of each Government program.

The purpose of restructuring domestic programs is to make Government an effective agent of the people. I trust we will promptly consider the tasks of reorganizing.

I include the editorial in the RECORD:

RESTRUCTURING THE EXECUTIVE

President Nixon, his face still stinging from the legislative slap that ended the SST hassle, has turned the other cheek to Congress by sending to the Hill his ambitious plans for streamlining the executive branch. The members will be tempted to let him have it once again. But this time, Congress should stay its hand.

The reorganization plan, first proposed in the President's latest State of the Union address, is sure to raise some congressional hackles. The proposal to reduce the total number of cabinet departments to eight would mean a major reshuffling of the entrenched congressional committee system. And unless human nature changes abruptly in the coming weeks, considerable reluctance can be expected from those chairmen who will be asked to preside over the dissolution of their empires.

But even though the pill may be bitter, the prescription is valid. Now that the details have been filled in, it is clear that the proposal would not eliminate any of the present functions of the federal government, nor would it add any new ones. It does not fulfill the predictions of those who antic-

pated the creation of bigger, less workable departments to replace the present big and barely workable ones.

It would, rather, replace the ungainly result of haphazard governmental growth with a structure based on logic. It would eliminate duplication, clarify lines of responsibility and make the government more comprehensible. It might make the government function with something approaching efficiency. It might save the taxpayers some \$5 billion a year.

This is not to say that the proposal is perfect in its present form and that it should be swallowed whole by Congress without debate or alteration. Even a quick review of the plan turns up at least one questionable compromise and one seeming blunder, indicating that painstaking congressional consideration is not only justified but demanded.

The President has proposed a compromise solution to the struggle between the environmentalists and the military over control of the civil construction activities of the Army Corps of Engineers. The Pentagon, citing the possibility of national emergency, fought to keep the engineers in the Defense Department. The environmentalists charged the corps with a spotty ecological record, and demanded that they be placed under the watchful eye of the proposed Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Nixon's compromise would leave the engineers in the DOD, but would transfer the funding, planning and evaluation functions to Natural Resources—a move that would appear destined to increase the confusion, inflame the conflict and further tangle the lines of responsibility.

Then there is the matter of the Indians. For some reason not readily apparent, the Bureau of Indian Affairs would be moved to the Department of Natural Resources. If there are arguments for such a move, they had better be good. As it stands on paper, it appears that someone up there still thinks of the Indians in the same category as coal, oil, fish and wildlife—items to be exploited for the benefit of the latecomers to North America. Surely the Indians belong with the rest of us under the Department of Human Resources.

Despite these preliminary reservations, though, the President's reorganization plan is essentially sound and should be given the full and respectful attention of Congress. Mr. Nixon is right about the need for reform. The present structure of the government is a mess. Americans are losing faith in the ability of the government to perform. Further tinkering will only compound the problem. A major restructuring of the apparatus is overdue.

SHOE IMPORTS CONTINUE TO EAT INTO AMERICAN JOBS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the shoe industry in New Hampshire continues to face further declines in employment and output as a result of the alarming increase in imports of foreign footwear. As the following letter from Irving R. Glass, president of the Tanners' Council of America, indicates, shoe imports are up 25.3 percent from last year. And during this past March, foreign-made footwear skyrocketed to 66.9 percent of domestic production, as opposed to 42.1 percent for all of 1970.

Shoe manufacturing for a long time

has been the No. 1 industry in the State of New Hampshire. Not only is it the largest employer of labor in the State, but it is a major industry in most of the 20-odd cities and towns where shoe plants are in operation. Since 1968 more than a dozen New Hampshire shoe factories have been forced to shut down, leaving thousands of workers jobless.

Clearly, this is far too high a price to pay for the illusive goal of truly free trade. Why should the American worker be asked to sacrifice his job to aid nations that more often than not blatantly discriminate against American products?

I urge speedy consideration of orderly marketing legislation to establish as U.S. policy that trade is a two-way street.

The letter follows:

TANNERS' COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 28, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Some quarters have charged us with crying wolf about shoe imports, with exaggeration about the imminent death of an American labor intensive industry. You can now judge whether we have exaggerated or actually been too conservative in our projection of a devastating import flood.

The March foreign trade returns are in. In that month, shoe imports soared to 31,518,000 pairs, an increase of 25.3% from last year. In March imports climbed to more than 66.9% of domestic output. In all last year shoe imports were only 42.1% of domestic production.

Even more ominous, March confirms the drastic upward surge of imports during the two previous months. The tally for the first quarter is:

Shoe imports, first quarter	
	Million pairs
1971	87.5
1970	68.7
Increase	27.3

How long can the U.S. delay some reasonable action to stop the engulfing flood of low wage cost foreign shoes, to keep job opportunity in labor intensive industry, to preserve a viable American economy? Every week and every month that goes by without moderate import restrictions, such as proposed in the Mills Bill, brings irreparable damage to job opportunity in this country and thereby to our entire economy. For whom the bell tolls . . .

Sincerely yours,

IRVING R. GLASS,
President.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROPRIATIONS PROCEDURES

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have realized that congressional procedure with regard to the budgetary process is becoming increasingly inefficient. As Congress fails to update its appropriations procedures, more and more of the task of setting budgets straight and of setting spending priorities has fallen to the Office of Management and Budget in the executive branch—not where the Founding Fathers intended this function to rest.

Through much deliberation, I have ar-

rived at two suggestions which I believe would help to put both the budget and the powers of Congress back into balance. My proposals are outlined in a weekly column I wrote last year, and I insert my statement into the RECORD at this time:

CONGRESS MUST REVISE PROCEDURES TO FIGHT INFLATION AND PREVENT WASTE

(By Congressman FRANK HORTON)

The people of America have a right to expect Congress to watch over the purse-strings of government, to set Federal spending priorities and to achieve balance in the budget without waste. Of all branches of government, Congress is closest to the people and it should be equipped to respond to demands for more efficient use of tax dollars and an end to inflation.

At the present time, more and more of the responsibility for government fiscal policy has fallen into the hands of the Executive Branch by default. The procedures Congress follows to make spending and budgeting decisions are far too disorganized and "stop-gap" to enable it to effectively plan and carry out a business-like plan for the government's \$200 billion a year budget.

As years have passed and Congress has failed to update its appropriations procedures, more and more of the task of setting budgets straight and of setting spending priorities has shifted to the Budget Bureau, or what is now called the Office of Management and Budgeting. This is not where the responsibility belongs. Congress must adopt tax laws, set spending priorities and adopt appropriating legislation for every function of government.

Where has Congress failed in its fiscal responsibility and what steps can be taken to place these powers back into the hands of responsible representatives of the people?

First of all, Congress has failed to recognize that national problems have grown so diverse and the Federal budget has grown so large that it is impossible for Congress to complete action on appropriations for the coming fiscal year between the months of February and June. Each year, the President submits his budget to Congress near the end of January—the budget which will go into effect in the fiscal year beginning July 1st of the same year. This means that Congress must sift through each spending item in hearings and prepare and pass through both the House and Senate about 14 massive appropriations bills—all before the 30th of June. If Congress could accomplish this, then all Federal agencies and states and localities would know exactly how much is to be spent for each Federal function and program at the start of the fiscal year. This would permit a planned and well-organized implementation of the budget.

However, it has been many years since Congress has completed its appropriations work by the June 30 deadline. Unlike the earlier days of smaller budgets and six or seven month sessions of Congress, we now find ourselves considering legislation ten, eleven or twelve months a year. Frequently, less than half of the appropriations are acted upon before the beginning of the fiscal year—leaving Federal agencies and the taxpayer with stop-gap "continuing resolutions" which enable programs to operate at the same level of the past year, until action is taken on the spending legislation.

Recognizing that this yearly appropriations lag made it impossible for Federal, state and local government to plan efficiently any of their programs which involve Federal funds, I proposed a change in the Federal fiscal year to the calendar year. Beginning the fiscal year on January 1st instead of July 1st would give Congress and the Executive more time for budget planning and for reviewing appropriations and spending priorities.

Spending bills enacted between the President's budget message in January and the adjournment of Congress in the fall would not take effect until the first of the following year. There would be no need for stop-gap resolutions now needed to keep agencies' programs and payrolls going on a month-to-month basis.

I first made this proposal in the 90th Congress—over three years ago. And each year since the performance of Congress in completing action on appropriations has been slower, less organized, and less suitable to the task of accomplishing efficiency without inflation.

While a change in the Federal fiscal year would give Congress the time it needs to make the fiscal decisions required in the 1970's it is not the only reform that is needed. What is even more essential is a new procedure which will force Congress to make fiscal responsibility and budget balancing a priority, along with the priorities we set for spending on particular programs.

Present appropriations procedures place fiscal responsibility last on the priority list. In acting on individual spending bills, each house of Congress makes separate decisions as to whether more or less money should be allocated for each program than was budgeted by the Administration. Through this procedure, we may add funds to a housing bill or subtract funds for a defense project or leave both as they were when approved in Committee or by the Executive.

But there is no mechanism which forces Congress to look at the entire budget picture at once, to determine if its spending priority decisions can be accommodated within a balanced budget.

With the time pressure currently placed on Congress by the July fiscal year, the time is never taken to look back over all of the spending decisions on individual programs to see if they are in line with the year's expected tax receipts, or even to see if they are in line with the spending ceilings Congress itself adopted earlier in the budgeting process.

The result has been that Congress is rapidly losing its power over spending priorities—because it has not exercised them in an organized or businesslike way. Congress places higher priority on one or more important areas too often without regard for the overall spending result.

My personal practice has been to balance "yes votes" for additional funds for high priority programs with "no votes" for spending on low priority items—thus seeking a balanced budget. But the actions of Congress as a whole often do not reach a balanced result. More funds are added than subtracted from the Administration budget.

This leaves the Administration with the job of holding up spending on programs which it determines should be cut back or it results in Presidential vetoes which place the President's priorities in opposition to those of Congress.

Again, this is an example of where Congress, by failing to adopt better fiscal procedures, has ceded powers to the Executive by default—in this case, the powers over spending priorities.

I have prepared a proposal which would help to put both the budget and the powers of Congress back into balance. The proposal is a simple one, and it will be adopted if Congress is serious about retaining some say over how citizens' tax dollars are spent.

After all appropriations bills for the next fiscal year are passed and acted on in conference committees, both Houses of Congress should measure the total amount appropriated against the total budget ceiling agreed upon by the House and Senate. Where the appropriations exceed the budget ceiling by a certain percentage—say two per cent—then amendments to the individual spending bills should be prepared and enacted, reducing the

total appropriation for each program by two per cent—the same percentage. This is the only way the budget ceiling can have any meaning—if Congress stays within it during the appropriation process. This is the only way that Congress can retain power over spending priorities, without having to remove funds, through veto or budget hold-backs, from program areas which Congress feels are of very high priority.

To me the choice is clear. Either we adopt these reforms in the next Congress, and thus enable our system to function effectively under the Constitution, with Congress controlling the purse strings. Or, without such reforms, we will continue an era of budget waste, inflation and stopgap measures, with Congress fumbling its fiscal powers away—along with the tax dollars of our citizens.

ALLEGATIONS REGARDING MAINE SUGAR

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, last week, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) brought to our attention a composition by expose writer-turned White House employee-turned expose writer Clark Mollenhoff which appeared in a number of daily newspapers across the country. The article intimates possible wrongdoing on the part of Mr. Fred Vahlsing, Jr., president of the Maine Sugar Industries, Inc., of Easton, Maine. The allegation made concerns the transfer of Maine Sugar Industries equipment from Easton to a Vahlsing-owned plant in Montezuma, N.Y. The suggestion by Mr. Mollenhoff is that the transfer wrongfully took place after Vahlsing's receipt of a "freeze order" on Maine Sugar Industries' assets.

With permission, I insert into the RECORD, a Lewiston, Maine, Evening Journal article regarding Mr. Vahlsing's response to the Mollenhoff suggestion, together with a letter from Mr. Henry C. Rackliff, president of the Aroostook Development Corp. of Easton, to the Economic Development Administration's Director of Business Loans, Mr. Jeff Cahill. Mr. Rackliff, I should point out, is one of a large number of business and civic leaders who have joined with Mr. Vahlsing over the past several years in an effort to enliven the agricultural economy of a severely hard-pressed area of the State of Maine by making possible for that area the prospects of a second cash crop and heightened employment.

The article follows:

VAHLING SAYS ARTICLE "ERRONEOUS"

Fred H. Vahlsing, Jr., president of the Maine Sugar Industries Inc., of Easton, Maine said today that an article which appeared in the Boston Herald-Traveler Sunday, Apr. 25, containing certain facts about trucks transporting certain property from Maine Sugar Industries Inc., of Easton, Maine to Maine Sugar of Montezuma, N.Y., (which he also heads) is completely erroneous, and without fact.

In addition, Vahlsing stated that the article that appeared in the Boston newspaper was a serious and damaging blow to the Northeast sugar beet industries struggle to establish a vital sugar beet industry.

"Presently, I would like to point out, unemployment is ranging between ten and 12 per cent in the area surrounding the Maine Sugar Industries plant," he declared.

"This industry is not only vital to the agricultural economy of Northern Maine, which has for many years, been based upon a one-crop economy, but also this industry is a prime factor in the correction of the unemployment problem," he said.

Vahlsing further stated that he would hold discussions with the counsel for Maine Sugar Industries Inc., in order to review his and Maine Sugar Industries Inc. course of action."

In addition, Vahlsing said he hopes that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, from whom he presumes Mollenhoff received his information, makes its findings completely public. He stated he wished that the writer would have the opportunity to visit Maine Sugar Industries Inc., during Christmas time when people who count on jobs and paychecks do not have enough funds to have an equally joyous Christmas as he presumes the writer has, "considering his standard of living."

AROOSTOOK DEVELOPMENT CORP.,

Easton, Maine, April 26, 1971.

Mr. JEFF CAHILL,

Director of Business Loans, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAHILL: I have been a Republican all my life, having served years as a Republican Representative from Aroostook County.

This article is a pack of lies and is a beligerent and obvious political attack on Mr. F. H. Vahlsing, Jr., using our industry which we have struggled so hard to build and which we need so badly as political fodder. We are considering right now to send a delegation to the White House demanding whose behind all this stuff and since you investigated the industry, we would like to have your comments before we make our move.

We have never seen anything as rotten as this and I am considering resigning from the Republican Party.

Very truly yours,

HENRY C. RACKLIFF,
President.

JEFFREY H. EBSARY, EAST AURORA HIGH SCHOOL, SAYS THANKS TO TAXPAYERS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, keenly aware of the financial crisis in the field of education, and as the U.S. Representative of the 39th District of New York, deeply interested in the problems of our youth today, it was indeed a pleasure to be on hand at the dedication of the new East Aurora, N.Y. High School.

Mr. Speaker, high school education in East Aurora dates back to 1838 when the Aurora Academy was erected on the Main Street site. On May 25, 1968, district voters approved by a vote of 2,222 to 536 an expenditure of \$5.4 million to construct the new building on the Center Road site.

The freedom to move, to think, and to create is the philosophy behind this new building. Some of our youth today, who think they are the "movers," do not do

much thinking and creating. Therefore, it was a pleasure to hear Jeff Ebsary express the gratitude of the student body for what the taxpayers had given them. At this point I include his remarks:

How exactly does someone, privileged as I am to express the gratitude of the student body of E. A. High School, tell you thanks for this magnificent building?

I wish I could say it directly as well and as sincerely as our paperboy does it when he comes to collect each week for the papers he leaves at our house every morning. This fellow has a priceless talent I'm sure he doesn't yet realize or appreciate—and I envy him at this moment, for it enables him, when he says thank-you, to convey the idea that he really means thank-you for the extra tip he usually gets for a job well done.

At this moment, with all the sincerity that I can muster, I want you to know that while we have waited a long time for a new school, this one is absolutely perfect, and is more than we ever imagined we would have.

It may seem that kids today take most things for granted, but you can be assured that we have never taken for granted the possibility that we would have a school like this.

Another way to tell you thanks—perhaps indirectly—is to have you know that many of us seniors wish our high school careers were not ending quite so soon so that we might really be able to take advantage of all that this great new school has to offer.

I, for one, would just love to be able to play another year of football on the beautiful new field we know we're going to have, and I know that those kids pursuing music, science, industrial arts, and fine arts would love to be able to study and learn here for a few more years.

And so, in behalf of all my present schoolmates, and all those who will attend here in the years to come, I say a most sincere Thank you, very much!

MARCHERS IGNORE FACTS

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that a man should be judged not by his words, but rather by his deeds. This is a sound bit of philosophy—yet it is seemingly disregarded by the President's Vietnam war critics.

President Nixon upon assuming office pledged to end American involvement in the Vietnam conflict, and in a way that would hopefully avoid future Vietnams. The President kept faith with the American people. He deserves our support.

I include in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues an editorial from the Jackson, Mich. Citizen Patriot, of April 27, 1971, which has put the recent peace demonstrations in plain perspective:

MARCHERS IGNORE FACTS

Saturday's peace march on Washington and parades and continuing demonstrations in the capital and other cities are noteworthy for the size and the orderliness of the crowd.

It is impossible to minimize the significance of such a demonstration even though the participants represent only a very small portion of the population.

It also has to be said, however, that the marches largely are futile because they will

have little impact on President Nixon's timetable for ending American involvement in Vietnam. More than that, the marchers seem totally out of touch with reality with respect to the war.

Their cry of, "Peace, now," has a pleasant sound to all Americans who are weary of the war, regard it as useless and futile and would like to see it stopped.

The demonstrators seemed determined to ignore the arithmetic and the practical military aspects of the conflict.

The report by the Nixon Administration Monday that the number of American troops in Vietnam dropped to 281,400 last week, or only a little more than half of the peak of 543,400 in April of 1969, seemingly was ignored by the marchers and the anti-Nixon members of Congress who used the crowds as sounding boards for their own political pitches.

The demonstrators seem not conscious of the fact that it took many years to transport more than 500,000 troops to Vietnam and that they simply cannot be brought back overnight.

In denouncing President Nixon they seem to forget that the buildup came under his predecessor, President Lyndon B. Johnson and was directed and urged by the man the late President John F. Kennedy named as his secretary of defense, Robert S. McNamara.

The effort to make this Mr. Nixon's war and blame him for anything and everything that has gone in Vietnam simply is not fair.

A demand for an immediate end to the fighting and evacuation of all American forces requires the assumption of responsibility for the fate of the South Vietnamese and the probable loss of American lives in a hasty withdrawal. More than that, it means abandoning to the good offices of the Hanoi regime the fate of the Americans now held as prisoners of war.

Are the marchers, and the senators and representatives who cheered them on, willing to accept that responsibility?

We hope not, only there may have been many among the crowd who sincerely hope for a complete Communist victory in all Southeast Asia.

And who among the crowd is willing to offer guarantees that the Communists will respond any better to an immediate end to the fighting by Americans than they have to the many peace feelers which have been sent out by the Johnson and Nixon administrations?

We also want an end to the war which has cost so many American lives and will claim more, no matter what is done.

But as long as Mr. Nixon has a plan for disengagement by American forces and actually is carrying it out, as the troop strength figures show, harassing him with marches and political pressure serves no purpose.

WILD HORSE'S EXISTENCE THREATENED—PRESERVE OUR HERITAGE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is evidence today that along with the obvious need for our Nation to save and conserve our environment, we also have an urgent need to protect the traditions that make up our national heritage.

In this regard, the humanitarian effort to save our Nation's wild horses and burros is of particular interest to Congress and has received widespread support from citizens all over our Nation.

The wild horse, or "mustang," once roamed our western grasslands in great number. The Bureau of Land Management states that of the 2½ million wild horses that once roamed free, only 17,300 now exist—and this number is still being reduced. Disease and starvation have played a part in this, but more recently, they are being threatened by those killing them for sport and for commercial use in pet food.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be one of the original sponsors of the wilderness bill which set aside thousands of acres in the West for future generations to enjoy. I think it has now become obvious from the outpouring of concern of our people, particularly our young people, that we must not only save and preserve our wilderness areas but also our national heritage.

Today, the Great Plains stand empty where once great herds of buffalo roamed. Our majestic mountain peaks are practically void of life where they once were inhabited by the bald eagle. This proud bird is now in danger of becoming extinct. The wild horses of the West also represent a colorful chapter in our Nation's history. We owe it to ourselves and to future generations not to let these animals become simply another closed chapter.

For this reason, I have joined in the national effort to provide for the protection of our wild horses and have introduced legislation to place the protection of these horses under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. This bill, H.R. 7953, would prohibit the horses from being sold for commercial purposes and would provide fines and prison terms for those who disregard these provisions.

Many of my colleagues have introduced similar bills or bills containing additional provisions—all designed to offer maximum protection to free-roaming horses and burros. I am hopeful that Congress will pass the best possible bill to see that full protection is given.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of correspondence from the 17th District in Ohio expressing concern and support for this effort. Most recently, I received a large number of letters from young people in my hometown of Johnstown. I do not believe that this legislation would come to the attention of Congress had it not been for the initial interest and support by our Nation's young people. Credit should also go to the teachers in our schools for their efforts in organizing and directing this humanitarian effort.

In this regard, I would like to submit for the RECORD the names of the young people and their teachers who recently wrote my office regarding this issue. I think we in Congress owe these young students and their many counterparts a debt of gratitude for their efforts to see that our Nation's future includes the rich and proven traditions of our heritage:

Teacher, Mrs. Eunice Melick—Dave King, Frederica Hall, Dave M., Laura Davis, Georganne Glick, Teresa Lynn Hickman, Jeff Smith, John Johnson, Donald A. LaRue, Judy Heim, Tamara Richtee;

Teacher, Miss Darsie Gettinger—Ricky Burris, Beth Hoffer, Sandy Priest, Debbie

Miller, David Fisher, Elizabeth Elchner, Terrie Lundy, Molly Goldsberry, Eva Cannon; Others include Danny Slane, David Hendren, Kenny Crockett, Jeff Wingo, Paul Grice, Robi Zeallear, Barbi Ritter, Robert DeVault, Gary Montgomery, Robin Harvey, Sue Toomey, Betty Miller, Cheryl White, Tammy Stagg, Mark Hacraft, Barbie Zinni, Mitch Grindle, Jo Gibson, Valerie Deal, and Mark Grindley.

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS STUDY SOVIET EDUCATION

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the other day I had a letter from Mr. Ken White, superintendent of the Independent School District of Mission, Tex., a town of about 14,000 located on the Mexican border.

My good friend, Mr. White, was one of 24 school superintendents chosen by the National Association of School Administrators to visit the Soviet Union and to study their educational system. These superintendents ranged in location from Craig, Alaska, to Mission, Tex.; from California to Maine—from 22 States; from schools where there were 100 students in high school to a system where there were 176,000 high school students.

The trip was a working trip, but because Superintendent White's letter is so eloquent, I would like to share it with all of you. Here it is:

DEAR KIKKA: I have just returned from three weeks in the Soviet Union. Our purpose, as school administrators, was to study Soviet Education. The purpose of my letter is to express gratitude to my nation and the elected officials who govern it. I saw nothing there for which I would trade my American citizenship.

Please know that in saying this I do not intend disrespect for the Soviet people. In fact, the things that I observed there helped prompt this letter. I am sure that you realize that we are not struggling with a second-team nation. Their greatness stems, I think, not from their system, but from their unity of purpose. It seems that we are struggling with a nation where the entire population is pulling in one direction and nationalistic pride is tremendous.

There is also a national commitment to education and this commitment rests on firm support from the parent, the populace as a whole, and the government. It is apparent that the Soviets place priorities on their educational system.

Somehow, as I return to my job as administrator in a small school, I feel that we must rededicate ourselves to some of the basic things from which we as a people can draw strength. I, for one, have had quite enough from those things and those groups that seek to bring attention to their cause through irresponsible action.

In the Soviet nation we were told that there is no crime—and I saw evidence that this is basically true. Then I thought smugly: There is no crime because there is no freedom. Then I had a disturbing thought: Which is better—No crime through a complete absence of freedom, or rampant crime from irresponsible use of freedom?

Of course, I still choose the freedom. Somehow I wish as a nation we could get our freedom based on responsibility.

MRS. MARY GEORGE WAITE ASSUMES TOP BANKING POST IN ALABAMA

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Mary George Waite, who lives in Cherokee County, Ala., and is president of the Farmers & Merchants Bank of Centre, has been elected president of the Alabama Bankers Association.

Not only is Mrs. Waite the first woman to be elected president of the Alabama Bankers Association, but she is also the first woman to be elected to the presidency of any State banking association in the entire Nation.

We are all extremely proud of Mrs. Waite. I know that she will serve in this office with great distinction.

At this time, under unanimous consent, I am placing in the RECORD a recent article about Mrs. Waite's election, which ran in South magazine and an editorial from the Birmingham News:

IT'S A FIRST IN THE UNITED STATES: A LADY STATE BANKING PRESIDENT

It might be pleasing to a small minority to report that Mrs. Mary George Waite of Centre has been a pioneer in the women's liberation movement. There's no denying that Mrs. Waite has gone a long way in her chosen profession—further, in fact, than any woman in the entire United States.

But accuse her of being a lib leader and prepare to duck. If you doubt this, ask her about the libs.

"They are for the birds," she will respond. "I happen to like for a gentleman to open a door for me, hold my chair, to extend to me those courtesies which gentlemen of the South have always extended to their ladies."

To say that Mrs. Waite feels so strongly about the subject that she will make a speech about it is not a figure of speech. She has a speech she has made many times to women's organizations. Its title: "I like being a girl."

Lib leader though she may not be, Mrs. Waite has nonetheless made a sizable dent in a profession which for years has prided itself on its masculinity—banking.

Mrs. Waite is president of the Farmers & Merchants Bank of Centre. While this in itself is remarkable, there are other women who have been bank presidents. What is unique about Mrs. Waite is that this month she will assume the office of president of the Alabama Bankers Association. This is a first and it is a bigger first than many might imagine.

Not only is Mrs. Waite the first woman to be elected president of the Alabama Association, but she is also the first woman to be elected to the presidency of any state banking association in the entire nation. That covers a lot of years and a lot of state associations.

Some might well say Mrs. Waite has been destined for a unique career from birth. She was born Aug. 18, 1918 in Centre and was an instant "celebrity" in that small town since she was the first and only World War I "war baby" in Cherokee County. Her father, the late J. O. Jordan, had departed several months before for France with the A.E.F. when Mary George arrived.

Mrs. Waite laughingly recalls that being a "war baby" might have had some advantages, but it also carried with it one distinct disadvantage.

"Some women have the privilege of fibbing a little about their age as they grow older,"

she said. "It would be pointless for me to try because everybody in the county knows I was born in 1918."

Mrs. Waite grew up in Centre, and following high school graduation, she enrolled at Huntingdon College in Montgomery, graduating in 1939. It was while she was at Huntingdon that she met her roommate's brother, Dan Waite of Clanton, then a University of Alabama student. They were married in 1940.

Being an only child, Mrs. Waite recalls that she had vowed that when she married she intended to have several children. Tragically, of the three daughters born to the Waites, only one survives. Linda Gall died at the age of three months in January 1950; and in 1965 20-year-old Diane died of leukemia. (In 1968 Farmers and Merchants opened its first branch in West Centre—appropriately, it was designated the Diane Branch.)

The Waite's other daughter, Betty, is now Mrs. Tommy Graves, the mother of two daughters and yet another little one is expected in July.

Mrs. Waite's first job was not in the bank, which since 1923 had been headed by her father. Having majored in English at Huntingdon, she taught school in Centre while her husband served in the Southwest Pacific during World War II. He suffered a complete physical breakdown while overseas and has never fully regained his health.

It was not until 1957 that Mrs. Waite entered the banking profession. On Jan. 1 of that year her father died, and she immediately entered the bank as chairman of the board and president.

It is no secret that Centre and Cherokee County were a little dubious of a "woman bank president" but Mrs. Waite was not long in dispelling any doubts as to her capabilities to do the job. How well she has done is best seen in the bank records. Under her imaginative leadership Farmers & Merchants has grown from a \$5,000,000 bank to a \$16,000,000 institution in the past 14 years.

Mrs. Waite makes light of the bank's growth.

"All banks have grown in recent years," she insists. But the people of her city and county would argue that Mary George—that is the only way she is ever addressed by the homefolks—has had a great deal to do with the bank's growth.

Mrs. Waite vividly recalls her first Bankers Association meeting.

"It was to be a seminar on farm credit programs, and since we make a lot of farm loans, I felt it would be wise for me to attend," she said. "When I got to the meeting in Montgomery, there were about 100 bankers present—all men but me. I don't know who was the most uncomfortable—the 99 or me."

But she emphasized that from the beginning her male counterparts went out of their way to make her feel at home.

"They have been wonderful to me," she said, "and I always tried as hard as I knew how not to use the fact that I was a woman to get any advantage on them. I think I would have been resented if I had tried to push myself forward in the association."

Actually the election of Mrs. Waite as ABA president this year is no surprise. The big surprise came two years ago when she was elected second vice-president. That meant she would in two years reach the top spot.

Neither she nor any other banker could have known two years ago what would face banking in Alabama during her one-year administration, it could be a very tough year for banks in the Alabama Legislature, and Mrs. Waite is well aware of this.

This will be a defensive year for us," she said. "We will not be so interested in passing any legislation as we will be in killing legislation."

It is no secret that Gov. George Wallace,

in his quest for new state revenue, will look toward the banks. Part of his motivation is unquestionably politics—many bankers supported a candidate other than Wallace in 1970.

Mrs. Waite is particularly concerned about the much-discussed escheat bill which probably will be pushed by the administration. Such a measure would take funds from dormant accounts in banks and give the money to the state.

"This is an indirect tax on the people, because this money belongs to them," Mrs. Waite said. "It certainly does not belong to the state, and I do not feel the state has any right to it."

Mrs. Waite does not foresee a recurrence of the bitter brawling within the ranks of banking which exploded in 1969 on the issue of mergers.

"I think the courts have pretty well settled that issue," she said.

But for the record, she expressed her firm opposition both to the merger as well as to the establishment of holding companies—the latter now being sought by several major metropolitan banks.

"I am not speaking for the association regarding the proposed holding companies—I am speaking purely as an individual banker," she emphasized. "I just do not believe any form of statewide banking is good for the people."

SPEAKING OF WOMEN'S LIB . . .

When you mention the name of Mrs. Mary Jordan Waite, the immediate response by those who know her is likely to be an outpouring of high praise. Surprisingly, perhaps, the praise more often will be for her deep involvement in efforts that attract little public attention rather than her better known accomplishments in the field of banking.

Today, at its 78th annual session, the Alabama Bankers Association elected Mrs. Waite president of that organization, the first woman to be named president of a state banking group.

This is hardly her first "first" during her years as a Cherokee County High School teacher of English, and for the past 14 years as president of the Farmers and Merchants Bank at Centre, a position in which she succeeded her late father. Her other "firsts" in the world of banking are numerous.

Always throughout her professional career as teacher and banker, Mrs. Waite's interest and contributions have turned time after time to the children and young people of her community and state. They changed the rules to make her an honorary member of the Future Farmers of America, and she was the first woman to serve on the executive committee of the Choccolocco Council, Boy Scouts of America. She has received high honor from the National 4-H Club Foundation. National officeholder in the National Association of Bank Women, she has performed high service for the American Cancer Society and the Alabama Business and Professional Women.

Mrs. Waite has served in all these public and civic-minded roles with distinction. Proof of her selfless interest is the recognition tendered her by her friends and associates.

REES INTRODUCES LEGISLATION FOR EXPANSION OF SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will expand

one of America's greatest national parks. I am proposing that Sequoia National Park be expanded southward on the Kern Plateau and in the Kern River drainage to include another 250,000 acres.

This area is the last major unprotected bloc of wilderness in the Sierra, and it is also the habitat for a number of rare and endangered species. Only about half of the existing Sierra redwood, *Sequoia gigantea*, are protected in the existing park. Most of the rest are within the area that my bill would add. Moreover, this addition embraces the habitat for the unique and endangered golden trout, which needs the isolation of wilderness to survive.

This wilderness will not survive if it is not added to Sequoia National Park. The area is now administered by the Forest Service. For 15 years or more, the Forest Service has promised that some of the area would be protected as wilderness, yet it has still to give secure protection to one acre of the area in this bill. Its plans remain indefinite, and change with each changing ranger and regional forester. The southern part of the whole wilderness, which used to run south to the Domeland area, has been turned over to logging. Now the central part has been chopped up by roads and timber sales also. This fragile and serene country is being destroyed by logging and eroding timber development roads. The timber is commercially marginal, and the soils are very susceptible to erosion whenever the surface is broken. New highways, promoted by local boosters, are being platted across the area. Permits are being issued for high density resorts around its edges. Dams are being planned on the Kern River. While the Forest Service talks vaguely of protecting it, it is really acquiescing in its destruction. By the time the Service may get around to proposing any plan to Congress, we will only be able to deliberate over how to bury the corpse.

Conservationists have been actively petitioning the Forest Service now for almost two decades to protect the area. It is time to face the fact that the Forest Service is either suffering from a paralysis of will power, or that it has no intention of moving affirmatively to protect this great southern terminus of the Sierra. In any event, it is now time for Congress to do its duty in superintending the management of this part of the public domain. The National Park Service has demonstrated that it is capable of protecting the parts of the Sierra entrusted to its care. The only problem it suffers from is that too many people want to enjoy the land in the parks it administers. Part of the answer is to expand the areas given secure protection: to protect them from unjustifiable logging, intruding roads and vehicles, and inappropriate commercialism. We should expand the park southward to embrace more of its adjacent wilderness and the features that give this park renown and meaning. We should complete the historic work begun so long ago by rounding out this classic national park.

I am attaching to my remarks a short description of the features included in this addition to Sequoia National Park.

I include the article, as follows:

PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

Elevations in the area range from 12,000 ft. to 5,000 ft. in some of the lower areas in the south. Therefore, there is a wide variety of life zones, ranging from Upper Sonoran to Alpine.

From the main crest of the Sierra Nevada on the east the proposed addition extends to the approximate longitude of Mineral King. The southern boundary of Sequoia National Park marks the northern limit while the southern limit has been determined by the encroachment of timber sales and road construction giving the area an average north-south dimension of approximately 10 miles.

Much of the southern portion of the area below 6,000 ft. in elevation consists of brush and scrub forest. This section is an important wintering area for the deer herd of Sequoia National Park. Between elevations of 6,000 ft. and 8,000 ft. there are stands of Yellow Pine and Fir, and on the west many scattered groves of *Sequoia Gigantea*. This portion of the forest contains the only commercial timber included in the proposed addition. Above 8,000 ft. the forest consists mostly of Lodgepole Pine, a noncommercial species at the present time. Should a market develop for this tree, there might be great pressure put on the Forest Service to allow timber harvesting in the watershed of streams containing Golden Trout. The Forest Service is far more vulnerable to this kind of pressure, with its historic preoccupation with selling timber, than would be the Park Service. Above elevations of 10,000-11,000 ft., alpine conditions restrict the growth of forest.

The Sierra south of Sequoia National Park is characterized by large rolling meadows that are very fragile due to arid conditions. The rolling, relatively gentle high country extends as far south as Lake Isabella. The only chance to save a portion of this gentle yet beautiful country in its natural state for future generations to enjoy is to add it to Sequoia National Park.

Glaciation during the Ice Age created a rugged alpine landscape in the Sierra to the north. The southern limit of the glaciers reached only to the northern portion of the proposed Park addition, leaving the rolling, gentle pre-glacial landscape much as it was before the Ice Age. This ancient landscape, along with unique volcanic formations, should be preserved for their scientific value alone.

The only natural habitat of the Golden Trout is Golden Trout Creek, an important tributary of the Kern River. The Creek originates near the main Sierra Crest, flows westward just south of the present Park boundary, and joins the Kern River at the point where the river crosses the present Park boundary. Golden Trout have been transplanted successfully to other areas, but it is biologically important to maintain a pure strain of the species in its native habitat. The fish cannot stand heavy fishing pressure. Yet the newly completed road up the east side of the Sierra to Horseshoe Meadows, and demands of vehicle users to open the area up to mechanical access, threaten the Golden Trout's very existence in its native habitat. The Forest Service only recently acquiesced to demands from vehicle users to have access to a part of the area that the Forest Service had previously stated should be off limits to vehicles. This susceptibility to pressure further demonstrates the inability of the Forest Service to adequately protect the wilderness values of the area and, perhaps, even the Golden Trout itself.

A related subspecies of the Golden Trout has been recently recognized in portions of the Little Kern River drainage. This subspecies is even in more urgent need of protection since not much is known about it, and it is much more limited in distribution.

Presently, the Forest Service is managing

only the northern half of the area included in this bill in such a way to protect its wilderness values and the Golden Trout. In the southern half of the area, new roads and timber sales are being planned. It is imperative that while Congress deliberates upon this bill's merits, the Forest Service be directed to declare a moratorium upon further development.

"PEACE" LEADERS AT HOME PLAY INTO COMMUNIST HANDS

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, four fellow Congressmen and myself recently completed a personal inspection tour of Southeast Asia as members of the House Armed Services Committee.

We returned from this tour with renewed confidence that President Nixon's strategy is working, combat deaths and injuries have been sharply reduced, our men are coming home in record numbers and Vietnamization is proceeding ahead of schedule.

One of our colleagues on this tour, Congressman C. W. BILL YOUNG of Florida, has concluded that our disengagement now is being delayed not by the enemy in the field but by the activities of some of our so-called leaders at home.

What Mr. YOUNG has to say should concern all of us who are determined to end the Vietnam conflict with honor, and in a way that will leave the South Vietnamese with the capability of handling their own defense. For this reason, I am putting into the RECORD an account of Congressman YOUNG's report as it appeared in the Clearwater Sun, one of the fine newspapers in his home district:

[From the Clearwater (Fla.) Sun, Apr. 23, 1971]

RECORD DUNEDIN CROWD HEARS GOP SOLON—DOVES, PROLONG WAR, YOUNG SAYS
(By Wally Dillon, Sun Correspondent)

DUNEDIN.—U.S. Representative C. W. Bill Young charged this morning that the Vietnam war might have been concluded "with honor," six months to a year ago if public speeches of Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.), and Rep. Paul N. McClosky Jr. (R-Calif.), had not led the North Vietnamese to believe that America would surrender voluntarily.

Speaking before the largest audience ever assembled at a meeting of the Dunedin Council of Organizations at Dunedin County Club, Young pulled no punches in discussing his recent visit to the Vietnam, Cambodian and Laotian war zones.

Young stated that "Hanoi Hannah," the propaganda voice of the North Vietnamese, is heard by a large percentage of U.S. soldiers in the war zone and the most effective propaganda is simply recordings of speeches made by "doves" in Congress which advances immediate and unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces.

"These are the very people who, two years ago, stated how we must support our troops in the Far East. They are pulling the rug out from under our troops today," Young declared.

"I hope that these people will examine their consciences and find out who the dead and maimed soldiers were who fell in battle in the meanwhile. I am convinced that our

participation in this slaughter could have been ended six months to a year ago had it not been for our own people advocating our surrender," Young stated.

Young also blamed certain news media, specifically the New York Times and the Washington Post for editorially calling for an "unconditional surrender."

News reports that South Vietnamese forces were badly beaten in the recent Laotian invasions are highly exaggerated Young said.

"Newsmen, who were denied advance notice of armed forces intentions were so incensed that they decided they were going to make the invasion look like a terrible defeat," Young charged.

The Congressman said that of 22 battalions of South Vietnamese troops committed to the Laotian invasion, 18 performed "with honor," two were "hit badly" and only two "performed badly."

As proof, Young cited the fact that the First ARVIN Division, which was the main unit in the Laotian invasion, launched a new offensive only a few days later.

"Despite what some politicians say," Young said, "the drug problem in Vietnam is nothing like they would have you believe."

"These young Americans in Vietnam are nearly all outstanding, fine people," he said.

Young, supporting President Richard Nixon's Far Eastern policies emphatically noted that, "We are in a world community and are being challenged both militarily and economically. I support the President's Guam doctrine all the way."

Noting that the recent conviction of Lieutenant William L. Calley on charges of murdering civilians at My Lai had "a highly demoralizing effect on our U.S. troops in the combat zones," Young said that front line troops had spoken strongly about the incident.

"They told me," he said, "that the enemy is not necessarily in uniform . . . there is no way to tell who can be trusted."

Two and three year old children suddenly appear on the battlefield with little packs on their backs, Young stated, then walk toward American troops.

"When they near our troops, suddenly the little child and his back pack explode, killing and maiming our soldiers," he said.

"This enemy is willing to take the life of a little child to kill or wound a few of our people," Young declared.

"I hope and pray that never again will our country be involved in a conflict but I pledge to do all in my power to see that if we are, we will not be hampered in limited actions that this country's soldiers will be able to fight with the full capabilities for which they are armed," Young concluded.

LET US NOT CRIPPLE NARCOTICS TREATMENT

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under the 1-minute rule today I made reference to the announced closing by the administration of the U.S. Public Health Service Clinical Research Center in Fort Worth.

This is one of only two such institutions in the United States. The other is at Lexington, Ky.

Two years ago the administration announced that this center at Fort Worth—the only one west of the Mississippi River—would be closed in 1969. Public hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and

the demonstrated need for the facility was so overwhelming that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare rescinded its plan and kept the center open.

Now, even though the menace of narcotics abuse has grown even more rampant in the past 2 years, the Department has again announced that the facility will be closed. It has shut off acceptance of new patients as of the first of this month and has sent reduction-in-force notices to the employees of the center.

It would be difficult to imagine a more unfortunate or more untimely circumstance than this.

To close the Fort Worth hospital, as the administration proposes—at the very time when drug abuse is reaching epidemic proportions—would be "utterly incongruous" in the words of Dr. Charles Sprague, Dean of Southwestern Medical School. It would be false economy and shortsighted folly.

At no time in history has the menace of narcotics abuse been more widespread across the Nation than today. The problem grows at an alarming pace, and no city in America is immune.

Less than 2 weeks ago, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE) reported from Saigon that between 10 and 15 percent of our American troops in Vietnam—perhaps as many as 40,000 in all—have been hooked on hard drugs. Where will these unfortunate men go to get treatment? Last year between 60 and 90 U.S. servicemen died from overdoses of heroin.

In one New York high school, no less than 1,200 students—40 percent of the entire student body—have experimented with heroin. Throughout the country, we hear of the alarming spread of drug abuse in junior high schools and even elementary schools. In Washington, Judge Alfred Burka of the District Court of General Sessions recently estimated that between 75 and 85 percent of all criminal suspects brought before his bench were narcotics users.

A knowledgeable San Antonio physician believes that 90 percent of the crime in that city can be traced to narcotics use and traffic. Many criminologists believe that at least 50 percent of the street crime in America has its roots in illicit drugs.

Dr. Dale C. Garell, director of adolescent medicine at the Los Angeles Childrens Hospital, testified 2 years ago that drug abuse is "the number one health problem in the United States today," and cited statistics for Los Angeles County. In 1960, there were 13,000 arrests for drug law violations. In 1967 the figure had jumped to more than 31,000. It is estimated that the figure exceeded 40,000 last year.

Tragically, an ever-increasing number of addicts are young people. Dr. Garell declared that juvenile drug offenses in Los Angeles had increased by nearly 500 percent in 7 years. And Dr. John E. Ingersoll, director of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, told the Senate District Committee in 1969 that fully 20 percent of all new addicts discovered in the previous year were juveniles.

Many of these alarming facts came to light in public hearings 2 years ago in Fort Worth where then Senator Ralph Yarborough, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, conducted hearings on the proposed closing of the Fort Worth Center. An extremely persuasive case was made. The administration, confronted with the overpowering facts, withdrew its plans to close the center. Now it has revived those plans. Why? The facts are certainly no less staggering today.

Educators, physicians, criminologists, social workers, former drug patients—all made the same plea: To close the center would be costly, counter-productive, almost criminally negligent.

It would slow down much-needed research. It would hopelessly overcrowd the Lexington facility. It would make voluntary commitment infinitely more difficult for the great body of our population which lives west of the Mississippi—including areas of southern California and the southwest in which drug abuse is particularly rampant.

The administration says that it wants to change the concept of drug treatment by closing big hospitals like the Fort Worth Center and encouraging instead the creation of a number of small, community clinics.

Admittedly, there is a need throughout the country for community-based treatment centers. But for heaven's sake let us get them organized before we close one of the two hospitals we have. Let us build the lifeboats before we sink the ocean liner.

The blunt fact is that we do not now have the "community-based clinics." Forty-seven States have no State program whatever for rehabilitation of narcotics victims. This is like advocating the abolition of cortisone because we hope to provide a better drug at some future undisclosed date.

It is like a father junking the family stationwagon on the ground that he thinks it would be nice—sometime in the indefinite future—for each member of the family to have his own Volkswagen. Meanwhile, they would be completely without transportation.

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY-BASED CLINICS

In announcing the closure of the Fort Worth facility—the only such Public Health Service Hospital anywhere west of the Mississippi River—the administration announced that hereafter it would turn over the treatment of these unfortunate narcotics victims to certain "community-based clinics" throughout the country. The announcement made reference to some 325 such institutions and cited 14 in the State of Texas.

Yesterday, my office was able to reach by telephone 12 of these 14 upon which the Government apparently intends to rely in the future for long-term treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics victims.

I am including at this point a recitation of exactly what we were told by officials at each of these institutions:

Amarillo Hospital District Community Mental Health Center, 2103 W. 6th Street,

Amarillo, Texas—Mrs. Louise Evans, a spokesman for the center, said it does have an in-patient narcotic treatment program in association with a hospital, but that perhaps 80 per cent of the patients treated so far have been adolescents.

Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center, 1516 Red River, Austin, Texas—Mr. John Wymer, executive director, said this center can place approximately 80 in-patients for treatment in a section of the Austin State Hospital, a Texas institution used mainly to care for mental cases.

If the Austin center were called on to increase its in-patient treatment load, Mr. Wymer said, rehabilitation and psychiatric services would have to be vastly increased. Mr. Wymer said that while he approves of the community center approach for drug addict treatment, results so far in Austin have been poor.

Bayshore Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center, 1410 Louisiana Street, Baytown, Texas—This center does not have a long-term in-patient treatment program for narcotics addicts. If a patient requires longer than three months of hospital care, he normally is sent to Austin State Hospital, a mental institution. For shorter-term patients, the center places them in Methodist Hospital in Baytown. The center itself has neither a methadone program nor a half-way house.

Bell County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center, Belton, Texas—Mr. Warren Townsend, Assistant Administrator, said the Bell County Center does not have an in-patient treatment program. The center can refer patients on a short-term basis to a local hospital, but this institution is not equipped for long-term care of addicts, Mr. Townsend said. He expressed belief that current federal budget restrictions on narcotic programs, combined with the end of drug treatment at the Clinical Research Center in Fort Worth, would prevent the development of an effective narcotics treatment program in Texas for at least three to five years.

District VI Mental Health Center, 3804 S. Central Expressway, Dallas, Texas—Mr. Steve Washington, staff social worker, said it is his understanding that the center presently does not have facilities for in-patient treatment of drug addicts.

Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas Community Mental Health Center, 8200 Walnut Hill Lane, Dallas, Texas—Mr. Papas, Assistant Administrator, said the center at present has no in-patient treatment program.

El Paso Center for Mental Health and Mental Retardation Service, 4815 Alameda Avenue, El Paso, Texas—Mr. Bill Steffens, Director, said the center has no in-patient treatment facilities or program.

St. Joseph-Mid-Houston Community Mental Health Center, 1919 LaBranch Street, Houston, Texas—Sister Amelita, Assistant Administrator to St. Joseph and Administrative Director of the center, said in-patient narcotics treatment can be provided only for adolescents, not for adults. Eighteen youngsters are presently under treatment.

Kingsville Community Mental Health Center, Kingsville, Texas—Miss Beryl Hill, Director, said the center presently has no facilities for in-patient treatment of narcotic victims. If beds are needed, Miss Hill said, they can be provided only under a contract with a mental hospital.

Laredo Community Mental Health Center (listed as Rio Grande Area III Mental Health Center for Starr, Webb and Zapata Counties), Laredo, Texas—Gilberto Morales, Case Supervisor, said the center has no in-patient treatment program, but makes arrangements at a hospital in Harlingen for those needing care.

Northwest San Antonio Mental Health Center, Bexar County Hospital, 4502 Medical Drive, San Antonio, Texas—Narcotics victims

can be handled as in-patients only if they also are adjudged to be mental cases.

Wichita Falls Community Center for Mental Health and Mental Retardation, 2007 Wenonah Street, Wichita Falls, Texas—Doyle Lamb, Assistant Administrator, said the center has no in-patient treatment facilities for narcotics addicts.

Obviously, the time has not yet arrived when we can safely rely upon such institutions as these to provide reliable long-term treatment for the most unfortunate affliction of drug addiction.

But even assuming we can successfully stimulate the development of smaller, locally oriented facilities at some time in the future, they still will not provide the complete answer.

As pointed out by Dr. Robert Leon, professor of psychiatry at the University of Texas Medical School in San Antonio, part of the necessary treatment often is to provide a complete change of environment. Rehabilitation would be rendered impossible for some addicts if they were released directly into the streets and ghettos where the horrible temptation ensnared them and the dreadful habit enslaved them in the first place.

Moreover, the Nation simply does not have the pool of trained and experienced personnel to staff all the local treatment centers we need. Would not there be, then, a continuing and even greater need for both the Fort Worth and Lexington facilities to provide training and internship, to carry on sound research and medical investigation?

HEW admits that its concern is basically budgetary in recommending the closing of the Center. Budgetary? How much is the growing national menace of narcotics abuse costing us? How much is it worth to fight it?

We have been spending only some \$10 million annually on treatment and rehabilitation of drug victims and new research at such facilities as Lexington and Fort Worth. But the cold cost of drug addiction to our economy was recently estimated by the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health at more than \$500 million a year.

The Federal Government is spending about \$39.9 million this year on enforcement activities trying to stem the flow of heroin, cocaine, and morphine. This is the smallest sum in the budget for any major crime control effort. It is a tiny fraction of the profits that organized crime makes in importing narcotics, and a pitiful figure compared to what society pays in crime losses to keep the addicts going.

If we are to keep pace with the growing problem of illicit drugs and the tragic damages they are inflicting upon our human and material resources, we need to be expanding the services provided at the Fort Worth Center. We certainly cannot afford to eliminate them.

The narcotics evil is a menace to the very fabric of society. Mental health problems are on the increase. This is definitely not the time to restrict and curtail—in fact to cut in half—our national capacity to cope with these problems.

LOUIS STULBERG

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dynamic leaders of the labor movement today is the president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, Louis Stulberg. Mr. Stulberg's profile is featured in this month's issue of American Labor: The Magazine of Labor News. I call this article to the attention of all my colleagues as meriting their review. I extend to my friends in the ILGWU the wish that they have the benefit of Louis Stulberg's excellent leadership for many years to come.

At this point, I include Louis Stulberg's profile in the RECORD:

PROFILE: LOUIS STULBERG

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free," begins the Emma Lazarus poem on the Statue of Liberty—and never did the mounting tide of earlier immigrants give more of them than they gave to the ILGWU.

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union has consistently been an organization comprised largely of ethnic minorities: first the Germans and Irish, then the Jews, then the Italians, and of late—the Puerto Ricans and the Blacks.

It's still a melting pot in which bubble the ambitions, the hopes and the destinies of some 450,000 workers plying their trades in 38 States, 5 Canadian provinces and Puerto Rico.

Out of this fusion have come some of the most creative designers of this—or any—century, some of the most colorful and imaginative leaders in the entire labor movement and some of the most progressive social programs in labor history.

This is the heritage of Louis Stulberg who succeeded David Dubinsky as president of the International Union in June of 1966 and who—by any measurement—has lived up to both its expectations and demands.

The succession itself, to turn the clock back some five years, was a moment of drama. Ever the showman, Dubinsky had kept the announcement of his proposed retirement a closely guarded secret up until practically the minute he unfurled it. "Only seven members of the union knew about it in advance," said Leon Stein, editor of "Justice," the ILGWU's award-winning publication, of the incident. "I was one of them because I happened to help prepare the statement."

Before a stunned and emotion-packed board on March 16, 1966, Dubinsky stepped down after 34 years in office, stating he was aware that the decision came unexpectedly, but urging the board nevertheless "to respect my wishes . . . and to proceed immediately to elect my successor."

Chosen to succeed him on March 18 was General Secretary-Treasurer Louis Stulberg, who suddenly found himself on "center stage" in one of the most dramatic moments of the union's history.

In the terminology of the theatre, "D.D." was a hell of an act to follow. But most observers are almost unanimous in their opinions that Stulberg has followed it well.

Re Stulberg's subsequent election to the presidency, one ILGWU official stated that he was "the most logical man" for the job at the time and "certainly the best equipped."

Stulberg had been working in the International Union's General Office since 1945 when Dubinsky first appointed him as assistant executive secretary. For better than

a decade he had been assistant manager of Local 10 (the cutter's union in New York, which he joined in 1927) and had been a manager of Local 62 for about the same time period. Local 62, composed of undergarment workers, is predominantly female and a continuously revolving door in terms of ethnic composition. Thus, he brought to his assignment considerable first hand knowledge in many areas of the union's activities.

Pursuing his own course and assessing the union's needs out of his own experience and judgment, Stulberg—during the five years he has been in the top executive post—has transformed many of the ILGWU policies, modernized its structure, changed much of its image and—in the process—has provided greater overall benefits and greater proportionate wage increases for his members than any officer has ever done before, this—in the face of growing imports, during a period of an almost complete revolution in women's fashion which disrupted many sections of the industry and vis-a-vis perhaps the worst national economic downturn in better than a decade.

Through all that, the new president managed to procure for his people the highest standard of living they have ever achieved. A pretty impressive performance by any yardstick.

STULBERG THE MAN

Stulberg, the man, is a little more difficult to set into print than are his achievements. Though he puts one at ease quickly enough, still it would be stretching it to catalogue him, at any initial meeting, as the outgoing type.

A feeling of reserve is there despite the humor which is an inherent part of his personality and despite the informality of the interview which was held in his suite at the Americana in Florida where he was attending the winter meeting of the AFL-CIO Executive Council of which he is a vice-president.

To the writer he appeared more a "measurer" of men first than one who gives of himself immediately. How long it takes to "measure" any individual is an imponderable, of course, but Stulberg's commitment of friendship—once made, however—according to close associates—takes a lot of shattering to disrupt. If he's with you, he's with you all the way. One has to earn that commitment—which seems fair enough.

Like many other international presidents, Stulberg is not a limelight hunter. That comes through immediately. Soft spoken, more analytical than emotional in his reactions, he is far more concerned with what can be done to better the conditions of the workers in his industry than with the projection of any personal glory for himself. That, too, comes through in the very emphasis he gives to his interests.

One cannot qualify this characteristic as modesty because it isn't that at all; rather, it might better be amplified as his sense of the relationship of values. He has a purpose, he knows that purpose and the achievement of that purpose is more important to him than anything else.

Actually—though he should be accustomed to it by now—he still seems a bit uncomfortable when too much of the spotlight is on him.

EARLY YEARS

By formal definition, Stulberg would have to be classified as an immigrant. He was born in Poland on April 14, 1901, came to Canada as an infant, spent his childhood and got some of his schooling in Toronto (Harbord Collegiate Institute) and—in that same city—joined the ILGWU in 1916. Subsequently, he emigrated to Chicago, attended the University of Chicago, leaving there to work in a number of cities before ending up in New York.

But though the above data is factual

enough, the word "immigrant," as it is generally applied, somehow—in Stulberg's case—does not fit. If a distinction is applicable here, he might more reasonably be placed in the category of "first generation" for by training, schooling and in his thinking, that is what he actually is. And his ideals and beliefs are American to the marrow.

"He's a combination of the best of both worlds," stated an ILG worker of him effusively; a glorification Stulberg would be most uneasy with, because as a man—with admittedly many of the faults of man, and as an individual with an acute sense of the absurdities and contradictions that make up what is known as character—he'd be the first to admit was a bit of an overstatement.

If it was such, however, it was uttered not out of any sense of sycophancy—for the speaker had no notion it would be recorded here)—but rather as an expression of the genuine regard of one individual for another. And as such, it should be respected and let stand.

On a man-to-man basis, Stulberg is easy to talk to. He's relaxed, he's pretty much in command of the scene at all times, straight in his answers and meticulously honest. There's a working ego there, of course—it's one of the traits of leadership—but it never gets in the way of truth or alters it. Stulberg sees things as they are, with a seasoned eye and with a refreshing amount of warmth and humor.

If life is treating him well now, there were many lean years, and allusions to them cropped up often in the conversation. He hasn't forgotten his past. "When I started as a cutter the pay was \$3.00 a week for 54 hours. I cut canvas, saten and sometimes—my fingers."

When he was elected president, one company head said of that incident: "I'm sorry he cut his fingers. Let's hope he doesn't cut our throats."

After five decades with ILGWU, Stulberg is now, in a sense, its father image and—to this observer—quite a good father, indeed.

ON PROBLEMS AND CHANGE

The union he heads, as noted before, is a composite of ethnic minorities, but to the question of whether such a mixture posed any "situations", Stulberg answered that there were many problems the union faced but that race, religion or country of origin were not among them—and never have been.

"With the change in the composition of the garments," he explained, "and with women's acceptance of the type of garments they buy today, there's more section work in the process than before. The business of making a garment is fractionalized . . . divided into anywhere from 6 to over 30 parts . . . with different workers on different sections."

Under these conditions, Stulberg pointed out, less experienced help is required. And since such labor is generally procured from minorities or immigrants, the union has always been a kind of haven for this citizenry to begin with.

"No one has ever been excluded because of color or creed," said Stulberg, "and every ILG worker knows this."

"We never had anything like that even over 50 years ago when I started in the trade," Stulberg added, "when skill meant a lot more than it does now; when it was nothing to cut out a front composed of 16 or 18 parts; when the tailoring that went into the garment was the thing that sold it." he dismissed the subject as one that needed no further discussion.

"Today . . ." he stopped and his face slowly widened into a grin as his thoughts moved to another area, "I don't want to call some of the things that women wear 'shapeless' because I'll probably never live it down . . . so let's call them 'casuals' . . . with emphasis

on color . . . which hide any number of contours, if you know what I mean . . ."

The writer replied he knew what he meant. What Stulberg could not quite fathom in this context, and he admitted it openly, was why women—whom he believed dress principally for men (a supposition vociferously denied by many females, incidentally) allow themselves to be seen in some of the clothes they wear.

But since the subject matter at hand lay more in the field of economics than in the motivational drives of the opposite gender, the fascinating dialogue was left in limbo.

ON FASHION AND WEBSTER

What was causing some of the ups and downs in the industry of late, he mentioned with what seemed to be a straight face, was the very ups and downs of the hemlines.

"Our fashion industry is predicated on the production of two, three, or four styles a year—one for each season. And then there's cruise-wear, too," he said. "Now, if you don't know whether to make a long or a short skirt or a short or a long dress, you've got yourself a kind of little trauma."

In this sense, the whole world of fashion was sort of like show business. "If the public likes what a designer creates, the house can make a fortune. But if the guess is wrong—you can be stuck with all your inventory and can't even give it away. And a lot of dollars and a lot of jobs can be at stake."

"Webster's dictionary," the writer noted with a poker face, "defines a dress as 'an outer garment for a woman or a child.'"

"Does it really?" Stulberg replied with as straight a face.

Did he have any comment on that?

"Well—" he said finally. "Some people make a living writing dictionaries. I'm sure he never made a nickel in the garment industry."

"A dress is a part of life that touches one of the basic human instincts. Call it 'sex' for want of a better word. To some it's more important even than food. A lot of ladies have skipped a lot of meals to buy one of those 'outer garments' as Mr. Webster calls them. I'd say it's a little more than a piece of cloth that covers a piece of skin."

ON FASHION LEADERSHIP

"We're in an era of rapidly changing fashions," Stulberg said. "And America is no longer among the followers. We're the innovators now. I think we set more trends than any other country in the world. And as long as we can do that, I believe we'll be able to hold our own."

With the exception of the miniskirt (and he wasn't certain that that wasn't an improvement on an American version) "we're responsible for the creation of everything our women wear today," he said, from the pants suit to the brassiere mentioned before.

"Even the present underwear is American in origin," he continued, "which has an interesting history of its own."

Originally, according to the ILGWU president, this diaphanous creation was made of black lace and sold in the 1890's by peddlars principally to the ladies of the evening. By what process it ultimately assumed the mantle of respectability it enjoys today is not known, but it's big business now.

A lot of this business has gone south during the past generation and many of the plants there are still unorganized. And the ILGWU—strange as it may sound—still spends the bulk of its dollars for organizing purposes. Statewide, including Puerto Rico, the membership is about 435,000—representing about 55 percent of the workers in the women's and children's-wear industry.

On a sub-division breakdown, it's about 96 percent organized in the coat and suit field; between 66 to 70 percent organized in the dress field.

"The tough one is the underwear industry," Stulberg said. "That cuts the overall percentages down."

Organizing efforts were becoming increas-

ingly expensive according to him because the battle with many of the larger firms is no longer one of wages but of principle.

The facts are open secrets. Some corporations in the garment industry are so opposed to the very concept of a union shop that they actually exceed the union wage scales in an effort to dissuade their workers from joining. And every time the ILG negotiates a wage increase, the corporation matches or betters it to help discourage any organizing drive.

"We try to tell these people that even though they may be getting a few pennies more—because of our efforts and our efforts alone—they're getting none of the safeguards that a union can provide and a great deal less in fringe benefits, and that what God gives He can take away." There was a pause, "But the other side isn't sitting still either. They spend as much trying to keep their members out of the union as we do trying to get them to join."

Section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act was another seemingly unresolvable problem at the moment, in Stulberg's book.

"When you organize a shop today, the workers know that they are entitled to the benefits you get for them—whether they become members or not. We've got situations like that in the South where some sub-sections of the plant have refused to come with us—even though we negotiated the contracts. And there's no legal way we can make them join, because the law says they don't have to."

It was one piece of legislation he felt, that had to be repealed.

Mounting layoffs, too, were a deterrent to organizing progress. "People are more afraid these days," he said, "when they hear that a plant may have shut down in their town or nearby—or there's been a reduction in the workforce. . . . They don't want to rock any boats at such a time."

In the face of all that, however, the ILGWU has negotiated the most substantial percentage wage increases in its history; a 15 percent wage boost in 1966, a cost-of-living increase between that and the agreements consummated in 1970; all in all—a 40-odd percent increase in the last four years.

On business in general, Stulberg felt the American workers had been given "a hosing" to date by the Administration; that fear, rather than confidence was the mood of the times; that President Nixon "thinks he can please people with words"; that most of his promises are never translated into action; that even when some pretty good laws get on the books there's rarely enough money allocated for enforcement; that the economy has suffered; that inflation has skyrocketed and that unemployment was at a truly dangerous level.

"In my opinion, Mr. Nixon is a poor president," he summed up. "I hope we can find somebody to beat him the next time around."

AUTOMATION NO THREAT

Re technology and/or the growth of conglomerates, Stulberg said the garment industry had not yet too much to worry about on either score.

"There are some exceptions, of course," he said, "but the majority of the businesses in the garment industry are still relatively small. A lot of it is still 'family' in a sense. Many of the employers we deal with were pressers, cutters, operators not so long ago. They hock what they have to go out on their own and if they have a couple of good seasons, they're in business."

Mergers wouldn't affect the job situation much, in his estimation; nor present innovations in technology. "With all the so-called improvements made, the cutter still handles one piece of goods at a time, the operator still sews on one collar or sleeve at a time, the presser still presses one garment at a time. They haven't found a way yet to automate those operations. There've been some

improvements in speed and quality but it's still the same old business. . . .

"You can't take a piece of material, throw it into a machine and come out with a dress or a completed pair of pants—as yet. Maybe tomorrow," he shrugged, "but it's not on the horizon."

A number of experiments have been made, he observed, on sewing by fusion with heat. "They haven't mastered it as of now," he said. "But even if they did, they'd still be fusing only one seam at a time."

"And they haven't found a machine yet that can spread chiffon as well as a man—or that knows when to lay velvet with the nap up or when to face it nap to nap."

"We've got a lot more problems of under-employment due to fashions and the economy," he concluded, "than we have with automation."

VITALITY EVERYWHERE

There's a kind of vitality in the ILGWU that comes through, no matter whom one talks to at the central offices. One senses a drive no matter what the project and the projects seem endless.

As a labor organization, it is probably as politically oriented as any in the country—and far more than most. Even on a local-by-local basis, this interest and fervor prevails. The union apparently looks upon itself as both a political and economic institution and the educational material from the New York headquarters covers both areas of concern.

"It's a way of life," said Gus Tyler, Director of Political Education. "Our membership is constantly involved; legislative drives, fund raising. . . . the whole works."

"We supply the candidates we're supporting with what few other unions can give. Not only money—we put that on the line soon enough—but a solid core of activists. We don't separate education from politics. It's all one. Our educational program is over 50 years old. We cover not only issues but how you move, register and vote and how you get out the vote. Our political machinery is working all the time."

The relationship between the locals and the central headquarters is, also—in a sense—unique. There's brotherhood, yes, but it's really more like "family." A closeness of blood, one might say, rather than of abstraction.

The nerve center is 1710 Broadway and practically everything radiates from there. Its growing up processes were actually a bit different from the norm. It did not come about via a merger of a variety of independent locals formed in various sections of an area, as in the history of many of the craft unions, but started rather as a centralized force in New York City and poured out from there as smaller satellites about a mother star. And the energy that warms them all is still that mother star.

The ILG is not only politically conscious, but socially conscious and culture conscious as few others in America. It has probably placed more mortgage money in low-cost housing projects than any other labor organization in the United States. It has been a constant sponsor of the arts for almost half a century.

It backed one of the finest musicals ever written when it produced "Pins and Needles" a generation ago. Few people know that it commissioned an oratorio to be composed on the occasion of the union's 40th anniversary.

It has backed sports activities on the old Randall's Island, music groups, choral groups; it backs an ILGWU Art Show every year. The list goes on.

Stulberg has been an active participant in all of these ventures for over a quarter of a century. Based in New York, he loves New York, the excitement of New York, the rhythms of the city and—for all of its problems—the individual kind of humor it creates.

And he feels humor far better than most. His style is understatement, but the message

is clear. And perhaps his very *understanding* of communications made him feel so strongly that the labor movement was overlooking a vital area in this field that might help provide a brighter future for its members.

INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL

The area was not internal, he began obliquely, acknowledging that coverage there—in the main—was pretty comprehensive; that his own union, "as well as many others," were doing a thorough job at the membership level.

Justice, the ILGWU newspaper, he pointed out, is published twice a month and sent to every member. It is printed not alone in English but in Spanish and Italian as well, to help keep many thousands of foreign speaking workers informed. In earlier days there was an edition in Yiddish; in Montreal, there's an edition in French, for the French-Canadian membership.

Re activity at the local level, there are some 50 to 60 separate publications printed on a scheduled or occasional basis by various locals in a variety of languages which include (over and above Spanish, Italian, French and English) Greek, Portuguese, Chinese (in New York) and Japanese on the West Coast. One paper even used to be printed in Pennsylvania Dutch. These publications vary in quality, content, size and in reproduction techniques. Some are printed, some are off-set, others are just mimeographed sheets.

Yet regardless of quality or lack of it, "All of them," said Stulberg, "generate a sense of community involvement."

In the area of public relations (as distinct from mailings) the ILGWU sponsors leadership institutes in which staff people are brought together for periods of from 3 to 14 days for round robin discussions and briefings on what the union is planning and doing and what part each person present can play in any overall organizing or political drive.

URGES INVESTMENT IN MEDIA

But in any examination of these vital and worthwhile efforts, "When you boil them all down," Stulberg observed dryly, "what are you doing except talking to yourself? Our members read our material—we hope—and other union members read their union's material . . . and that's the beginning and the end of it."

No union, nor any group of unions, as he placed the argument in focus, had any real mass media vehicle to reach the public at large. Every major form of general media in America was in outside hands; controlled by private business interests and generally—in both editorial and news coverage—acting as protagonists for the other private business interests upon whom their livelihood depended.

"In that area—we've missed the boat completely," he said.

Did he have a solution?

Again that dry sense of the absurd which is so much a part of Stulberg's makeup, arose. "I'm not saying we should buy the New York Times, or N.B.C.," he replied, "but let's use them as examples. What would be wrong with unions buying into newspapers—major newspapers in all the major markets or into radio or TV?"

Did he mean buying outright?

"It doesn't have to be 100 percent. A sizeable interest would be enough." It could be done, he was certain, if the labor movement could get together on the idea. "We could invest in half-a-dozen or a dozen papers in an equal amount of markets. We could certainly use a paper in New York . . . in Chicago . . . in San Francisco—as a start."

He wasn't talking of some kind of a propaganda sheet, was he?

"Hell no!" Stulberg stepped on the concept fast. "We've got more than enough house organs now. I'm talking of responsible newspapers, responsibly run. I wouldn't want

them to be pro-labor no matter what any more than I like them being so anti-labor now . . . no matter what. I'd ask for a fairer balance, that's all."

Did he feel it must be a multi-union effort?

It would have to be, he insisted, otherwise it might wind up representing just one union's point of view—which would be bad.

Did he think other unions might come along?

He didn't know.

Had he opened up any conversations along these lines with other union leaders?

"I've talked about it with a few but at the time I was talking to them—they knew and I knew it was just talk."

The ILGWU went into radio on its own, some years back, Stulberg recalled, building a New York FM outlet, whose call letters were WFDR. "I imagine you know what those initials stand for," he smiled. "We were convinced it was the wave of the future."

So—

"So we lost a million . . . maybe more, before we were convinced that maybe it wasn't."

Returning to newspapers, ALM asked whether the ILGWU president would be willing to back his idea of investing if other unions came along.

"I'd be willing to go to my General Executive Board tomorrow," he answered without any hesitation, "and urge them to be a participant. And I think I'd have my way."

Could he think of any reasons for overall lack of union interest in such ventures?

"Maybe we're just not equipped for it," he shrugged. "I don't mean financially; I mean emotionally. Perhaps not too many of us think that way. But if the thinking could be changed . . ." he looked out of his window facing the beach. "I think it would be a tremendous step in the right direction."

It was a natural opening which led to a question on the future directions of the ILG, itself.

Stulberg again chose to start obliquely.

"We're celebrating our 70th anniversary as a union," he noted quietly. "Both the ILG and myself were born practically at the same time." He paused at the reflection.

"We're in a very special kind of industry and the largest industry in New York. But it's mobile. So very mobile. Squeeze it too hard and it just moves away."

"When the union was born, the industry was located chiefly at the major points of disembarkation—where the immigrants landed. There were clusters of plants in New York, Philadelphia, Boston. Later—Baltimore, Chicago and Cleveland. A lot of that has changed. . . ."

"But through most of those early years for the thousands of immigrants that worked in the garment industry the ILG was the first experience with democracy they had ever had. It was the first place they learned to react without fear when someone said: 'All in favor raise their hands.' They had never experienced anything like that before."

"Every new group has enriched it and I think it has enriched every new group in return." His voice trailed off. Then he began once more on a stronger note.

"I don't visualize much change in the immediate future for our people. Fashions come and go but work will remain. Better conditions, yes—we're always fighting for that. . . ."

"But in a sense, the past is prologue. And true progress comes only out of the spirit. If we can hold to our beliefs that we can make a better society, we'll make it. The world doesn't just go round and round. It goes forward as well."

IMPORTS ARE AFFECTING MORE INDUSTRIES ALL THE TIME . . . AND THERE'S NO REAL END IN SIGHT

On the subject of imports, Stulberg was a lot more serious. "It's affecting more indus-

tries all the time and there's no real end in sight. In our own particular area, it used to be just cloth that was imported by the billions of square yards. Now—the finished garments are being moved in as well. So we're no longer on the outside looking in; we're right in the middle of the muddle. In some types of merchandise the trickle has become a flood."

He mentioned the brassiere industry as one such flood. "These components lend themselves to mass production. And style is not a factor." He enumerated a number of foreign locations that were now producing and exporting this product: Haiti, The Dominican Republic, many nations in South America, Taiwan, Korea, the Philippines, Hong Kong.

"In some of these places they pay as little as 9 cents an hour," he shook his head almost in disbelief at such an incomprehensible figure. "The fringe benefits alone that we negotiate with our employers are almost five times that much."

On how to face up to the challenge of this kind of competition, he had no easy answers. The machinery abroad, he observed, was as modern as those in American plants, the management personnel—often largely American in the U.S. based multi-national companies—was equally capable. Against such odds, by and large, Stulberg felt that for the ILGWU worker, trouble lay ahead.

There were occasional foul-ups due to inexperience, he observed on a lighter note, letting his innate sense of the absurd take over for a moment in the recapitulation of an "in" story.

"Once in a while they don't measure so good over there," he grinned. "I've seen brassieres come in with two different cup sizes on the same garment."

Agreement was mutual that this product—at best—would attract a limited market and never be a threat to the balance of payments. *Style*, however, was a different story . . . and color. These could not be produced on an assembly-line basis 52 weeks of the year like brassieres.

"I recall . . . it was several years ago," Stulberg began, "when red was hot. They were cutting it by the millions of yards here. Couldn't get enough of it. Then one day—I think it was May 24 . . . it just died. Like someone had come in with a scythe and cut it all down. The next day, you just couldn't give red away."

There was no rational explanation for it, he said. The women—by some endemic mental telepathy—had just decided that it was passé.

He mentioned the story to indicate that this had been the nightmare of the importer of finished garments in the past, but that with the growth of air freight, even that hurdle could now be overcome. "A dress or a blouse takes up very little room when you compact hundreds of them into a carton," he said. "And all you need here is just the final touch—the pressing. When that happens in great volume, we'll be reaching a crisis stage."

He was a believer in reciprocal trade, Stulberg said, but when pressed on how he would define "reciprocal" on a nation-by-nation basis, he countered that the area was still open to a lot of exploration and admitted that very little had yet been accomplished.

He approached the problem, in ALM's view, from the classical union standpoint that the best solution was to raise the living standards of the foreign workers involved. When it was suggested, respectfully, that this Utopia lay more in the realm of wishful thinking than in reality and that this formula had been tried for years by the labor movement with what might scarcely be termed spectacular success, he acknowledged the lack of accomplishment but restated his beliefs that continued efforts in that direction could provide the only ultimate solutions.

When it was pointed out that workers laid off because of imports—in whatever industry—were growing increasingly more fed up with long-range theoretical planning and

that unemployment rarely induced a philosophical outlook, Stulberg replied that he knew from his own experience what "no work" meant and what it could do to the human spirit.

"There are only two ways to go," he said. "We can try to work out agreements with other governments but that doesn't mean they're going to cooperate at the speed we want. Or we can talk of legislation, hard or soft. And that road might take even longer than the first one."

"We haven't made too much progress. I know that as well as anyone," he said. "We've been discussing the disparities in wages among workers in different countries for a long time. I can go back 18 years when I had a meeting with some Japanese labor leaders at an ILO meeting in Geneva. I believe. They told me that their people worked 49 hours a week and that their workers' pay was equivalent to our \$30.00."

"When it came their turn to ask me questions, I didn't tell them that we worked 35 hours because they wouldn't have believed it; they would have thought it was just another American boast. So I said we worked 40 hours. When it came to wages, I lowered the scales there as well. I knew they wouldn't believe it was between \$90 and \$100 a week, so I told them it was between \$60 and \$70."

"Well—when they heard the word 'week,' they became very excited," Stulberg went on. "The \$30.00 they were talking about was for a month. And the percentage differences between our wages and most of the rest of world's haven't changed very much since then."

To the concept of restrictive tariffs he gave short shrift. "We restrict, so they restrict . . ."

"But they restrict right now," noted ALM. "They not only have prohibitive tariffs on many products but out-and-out prohibitions on importations of many others as well."

Admitting the truth of all that, Stulberg could not be swayed from his original position that some form of reciprocal agreements on a country-by-country basis was—from both the political and economic standpoint—the most sensible solution . . . and that it could not be immediate.

"It's just gone too far too long for any overnight answers."

On who would work out such arrangements and whose judgments would be considered, Stulberg concurred that there was a battle ahead and that organized labor would have to have a solid voice in the conversations if agreements (presuming they could be gotten) were to be meaningful at all.

He outlined one of the ironies that had surfaced in informal talks with leaders in the textile workers' unions. "They're fighting a battle to protect many of the major companies whose plants they can't even organize. The J. P. Stevens and the like. Stevens isn't fighting this flow of foreign cloth as much as the TWUA," he said. "If they're fighting at all. Apparently they may have a financial interest in some of the stuff that's coming from Portugal, or Korea or wherever."

CHANNEL CHANGE THROUGH LAW AND REASON

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening, May 1, I was privileged to hear an address by Hon. Anthony Celebrezze, judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The occasion was the cele-

bration of the 80th birthday of long-time former dean of the law school at Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio, Judge Claude Pettit. It was also Law Day and Judge Celebrezze gave a very thoughtful analysis of the Law Day theme for 1971—"Channel Change Through Law and Reason." I was so impressed with the manner in which Judge Celebrezze handled the subject that I am recommending that my colleagues read and study this sober and reasoned approach to a very sensitive issue. Judge Celebrezze's speech follows:

SPEECH BY HON. ANTHONY CELEBREZZE

As I stand before you on this university campus, my mind races over the new ways of thinking and living that some of the youth of our society have chosen for themselves:

Long hair, student protest, rock music and the rejection of family careers.

Many of these new life styles represent a rejection of the institutions which we helped to create.

Indeed, the theme chosen for this law day, 1971—"Channel Change Through Law and Reason"—largely reflects one generation's fears that our youth with its new life styles may act lawlessly and without reason.

I do not intend, however, to speak to you tonight about these oft spoken fears that American institutions are being arbitrarily rejected by our youth.

Nor do I intend to lecture about the importance of law and order in our system of justice and liberty.

Rather, I intend to speak about why I believe the slogan of "channeling change through law and reason" is as much the theme of the values sought by America's youth as it is the hope of the slogan makers of this law day, 1971.

Implicit in today's theme of "channeling change through law and reason" is the inevitability of change itself.

This is the age of the machine and of the electronic transmission device.

Our industrial society is creating change for change's own sake.

Our technology is creating change at an ever quickening pace.

Our communications media are broadcasting change in less time to more persons than ever before in history.

As a consumer, we are confronted by a corporate state built upon change. Essentially the same commodities are frequently merchandised and packaged to cater to our changing emotional needs.

As a working man, many of our jobs depend upon the planned obsolescence of our so-called durable goods.

As a purchaser, we are bewildered by the endless array of material goods from which we have to choose.

In Alvin Toffler's book "Future Shock," he notes that a computer study revealed that in a recent year, a prospective purchaser of an automobile had 25 million options open to him if we assume that all of the accessories to the cars for sale were interchangeable.

One cannot make a rational choice between 25 million alternatives. Such a bewildering variety of choice—so large as to be incapable of reasoned decision making—is the natural outgrowth of change for change's own sake.

Moreover, just as a machine is impersonal—

So is change in the age of machines a dehumanizing experience.

Some have said that the rapidity with which change encompasses us and dehumanizes our existence is a major cause of the alienation in our society—leading a few to violence, apathy or despair.

As former President Lyndon Johnson observed in his inaugural address, "Change and growth seem to tower beyond the control and even the judgment of men."

Looking at our society today, we can see where change has gotten out of hand.

While America is the world's largest producer and consumer of material goods, we are surrounded by polluted rivers and lakes:

By the scarred soil of strip mining:
By the decaying hearts of cities where the "other Americans" have lived too long in dismal, unchanging poverty.

We read the painful story of technological change in the faces of the men and women whose jobs are threatened by or lost to automation.

We can see the hardship of change among those older citizens who lack the means to enjoy their lengthened life span and also among the young ones—the children of the poor—who lack the opportunity to build the needed foundation for a good and abundant life.

As we look around us, we cannot be satisfied with the quality of life today.

Although technological and industrial change have brought us an abundance of material goods, when left to generate their own momentum, computers can relegate us to mere numbers on magnetic tapes, electronic devices can brutalize our privacy, and machines can deprive us of our jobs and personal dignity.

But these are not the inevitable results of the age of machines.

We are a nation of men, not automated devices.

We are eminently capable of producing a technology which functions as our hand-maiden.

A technology which frees us from repetitive tasks and enables us to develop our family and spiritual values.

The one question we must face, however, is: How can we hold together the fabrics of our nation while we are trying to cope with the change that surrounds us?

First: We must make sure that our laws create a standard of what is fair and reasonable conduct.

No nation, no matter how great its people, can maintain order when its laws do not comport with everyday notions of justice.

The surest way our nation can foster lawlessness is to create laws which impose an unfair or unreasonable standard of conduct on its people.

The lawlessness of prohibition was simply a reflection of the fact that Congress imposed on every person a moral standard of conduct which was inconsistent with what most people thought was fair.

Similarly the American Revolution was in direct response to King George III's imposition of taxes and laws which did not reflect the reasonable expectations of the New World colonists.

Second: We must insist that our laws anticipate the dangers of change.

It is eminently reasonable that we have a free press and a free flow and interchange of ideas in our democracy.

Indeed, the right of any person to express political, economic or moral views in an appropriate place and manner should be inviolate.

But, in today's world of instant communication and commercialization, it is no longer reasonable to use the First Amendment right of free speech as a shield for the panderers of pornography.

Similarly, advances in technology have made it possible to record, store and retrieve unlimited amounts of data on each of us. There has been much talk of centralized computer banks to colate vast amounts of information which is being compiled about each of us every day.

Life insurance companies record significant personal data that you give them in order

to obtain a policy. Credit card companies, banks and department stores record every transaction you make on computer tapes as part of their accounting procedures.

These organizations now have the right to sell this information to anyone claiming a proper "business purpose." And for the most part, you may never even know that your personal dignity and independence are being compromised by our increasingly mechanized existence.

While Congress has recently enacted the Fair Credit Reporting Act, it will have to do considerably more than that single piece of legislation if it is to anticipate the dangers which advances in technological devices are posing to our privacy.

Third: Not only must laws be fair and anticipate our Nation's needs, but also our laws must assure that all have an equal opportunity to participate in our society.

White or black, farmer or merchant, conservative or liberal—all of America must stand together. While our Nation is composed of persons from around the world, our strength has always been derived from a sense of national unity and a national subscription to the Judeo-Christian ethic and a common legal system. In this epoch of change, we must be particularly careful not to sacrifice these traditions of unified moral and legal codes which have permitted us to become the "melting pot of the world."

Fourth, and finally, to meet the challenge of change, we must resolve to become part of the process of lawful change.

For too long, most of us have stood and looked at America as if she were a rushing brook and we were just helpless leaves being drawn along with the current.

We are not.

We are a nation of men, not abstract laws. America's greatest resource is her manpower, its energy, and its eagerness to participate.

Every day, each of us sells or uses our working skills, purchases the goods and services of others, and consumes any number of different products. These daily activities of our 205 million people should be used as new and lawful ways of expressing reason.

Consider for example, the problem of pollution. Consumers in large numbers have begun to purchase products which minimize the contamination of our environment.

In addition, the lives of endangered species are being preserved, not by abstract laws, but by consumers who have refused to purchase their furs or skins.

Industry, in recognition of the consumer's concern, now markets some of their products as the safest or the most sensible, rather than the slickest or the sexiest.

Similarly, many of our youth have chosen careers which contribute to community service.

Many young lawyers are actively engaged in "Pro Bono" or public service work.

Consumer class actions and antitrust treble damage suits have been effectively utilized by concerned citizens to create a climate of fair trade practices.

The daily activities of 205 million people is a resource more powerful than the age of the machine. In the area of ecology, consumers have shown that our technological society is not unresponsive and impersonal to priorities expressed through law and reason.

In closing, as I look past this decade of the seventies and into the next decade, I do so in the expectation that Americans will heed the theme of law day, 1971, and of our youth. I urge all of you here today to respond to the challenge of change around us.

As students and teachers,

As employees and employers,

As purchasers and consumers,

Let your response to change be revealed in your daily activities.

We can humanize our technological and industrial state:

With responsive and just laws.

With the eager daily participation of a reasoning populace, we can—

In the words of President Nixon in his law day proclamation—channel "Change by orderly process, and . . . resolve the basic paradox of a system of liberty under law: that the supremacy of the law rests on its recognition of the supremacy of the people."

BACON SIPHON COULD AID STATE

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to a news story which appeared in the April 19 edition of the Wenatchee Daily World. It refers to testimony presented by William G. Wolford, of Ephrata, Wash., president of the Columbia Basin Development League. The testimony by Mr. Wolford outlines the need to provide funds to build the second Bacon siphon and tunnel, which is the essential step necessary to complete the second half of the Columbia Basin reclamation project. I should point out that the Congress has appropriated money to start the second Bacon siphon for each of the last 2 fiscal years, but the administration has refused to spend the money. For the 1972 fiscal year, the administration has completely excluded the siphon project from its proposed budget.

The item follows:

BACON SIPHON COULD AID STATE

Projects such as the second Bacon siphon and tunnel in the Columbia Basin Project should be financed to help solve unemployment problems in the Northwest.

This testimony was presented in Seattle last week by William G. Wolford, Ephrata, president of the Columbia Basin Development League.

Wolford testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Economic Development. Presiding was the subcommittee chairman, Senator Joseph M. Montoya (D-N. Mex.).

U.S. Senator Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.) sat in on the meeting and also testified.

The persistent unemployment problems of the Northwest and the establishment of an economic development program as an alternative to Federal revenue sharing was explored.

"An existing Federal agency (the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation) can be funded to complete an already-authorized project, thereby creating permanent values and employment opportunities, allowing the state to become considerably more self-sufficient," Wolford testified.

The economic impact of the second Bacon siphon and tunnel—making possible irrigation of the East High area—would include increasing that area's present \$16.6 million annual product from dryland farming to an estimated \$358 million annual gross state product, he said.

About 1,500 jobs would result from production in the East High area. The irrigation project also would create employment for an additional 26,601 persons in the state, Wolford said.

The project would support an additional 67,567 people by jobs resulting from irrigation of the East High area, based on existing worker to non-worker ratios in the state.

The Second Bacon siphon and tunnel would

cost about \$18 million and would make possible more than \$900 million in new reclamation construction work.

Funds totaling \$1,055,000 necessary for starting the project were held in budgetary reserve during fiscal year 1971, ending June 30.

Congress will be asked to add this amount to the fiscal year 1972 budget, said Wolford. "Our population is a mobile population," he noted. "It makes good sense to develop the areas of economic potential which will assist the areas in economic distress.

"Agricultural development brings new opportunities for people in areas of high unemployment. Farm employment and agricultural industry alike offer jobs to our minority groups and unskilled workers.

"Industrial dispersion would be encouraged and, to the extent that new jobs are created, urban crowding and the flight to the cities would be eased.

"By re-establishing orderly development of this, and probably other reclamation projects, the quality of life is enhanced through the creation of water-oriented recreation, outdoor sports and rural living.

"The environment is maintained at a favorable level and, more often than not, sparse population growing old and old communities dying on the vine are revitalized."

In conclusion, Wolford asked:

"Why not complete existing Federal programs which represent sound, self-liquidating investments in agriculture and power, and thereby help satisfy many of our other recreational, social and economic aspirations by so doing?"

WHO ARE THE PRISONERS OF WAR?

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, present estimates reveal over 1,600 Americans missing or captured in Indochina. While this is a significant figure, it is by no means staggering for a war where 50,000 of our men have died and 300,000 lie wounded. It is further dwarfed by the 135,000 Vietnamese soldiers who have died and the millions of civilians left homeless. Yet the plight of these 1,600 individuals is one of the most emotionally tinged of the war.

Every sensitive person regardless of political persuasion realizes the futility of exacting revenge from individuals. Which of us would not like to see the prisoners free and united again with their families under conditions of peace? However, the means of obtaining this end are less readily agreed upon.

In my mind the most effective and immediate means of obtaining their freedom is to end our involvement in Vietnam. Surely, a prolongation of our role will not bring about their release but will only serve to increase their number. Their plight can not be separated from the question of the war itself and attempts to do so are more form than substance.

That politicians would seize upon the natural anguish of the prisoner's families and friends as a means of justifying a continuation of the war or "sanctifying" present policies, is a political ploy of the worst sort. Such grandstand gestures as prisoner-of-war raids or stern threats delivered against the backdrop of a wife's tears, accomplishes little except

politicizing the prisoners, making their release more difficult.

Recently, the Ipswich Chronicle, an outstanding weekly newspaper on Massachusetts' North Shore, spoke eloquently on this point. The insight expressed in that editorial would be of value to everyone and I insert it for the benefit of my colleagues:

WHO ARE THE PRISONERS OF WAR?

This week's letter writing campaign on behalf of American prisoners of war now held by the North Vietnamese plays to a high purpose—more humane treatment of POWs as required by the 1949 Geneva Convention.

And certainly one must admire the efforts of former Navy pilot Gardner Gray who single-handedly organized the Ipswich POW drive in which thousands of form letters and possibly not a few original letters are being mailed to the president of the Republic of North Vietnam.

As the Vietnam war drags on it seems right that something be done about it, anything almost—even at the expense of shifting attention from the heart of the problem.

The number one problem is bringing enough political pressure to bear on the administration and congress to end the war. Inevitably, that is the only way to end the degradation and suffering now endured by our men held captive.

One would like to believe that this past weekend's veterans peace rally in Washington will be judged in historical perspective as a turning point.

Of all the rallies thus far, it was apparently the most homogenous, its ranks swelled by a variety of economic, ethnic and social groups from all parts of the country; including for the first time the men who have fought in Vietnam and returned to tell about it.

The notion that America's high ideals are served by continuing to ravage the people and countryside of Southeast Asia is simply untenable, even to those who have been trained and indoctrinated to do so.

We respect those seeking better treatment of prisoners of war this week, but we would hope even greater efforts will be spent by Ipswich residents on behalf of ending the war.

Its continuation directly affects every man, woman and child in Ipswich, not to mention those yet unborn.

Like many another community Ipswich has a welfare problem, but the state cannot provide the necessary resources or manpower until the war is ended.

Ipswich has an unemployment problem, but until the Vietnam war is ended and the country fully converted to a peacetime economy the jobless picture will continue.

Ipswich has a drug problem, but until the nation's war economy is shifted to peacetime it will be difficult to adequately fund anti-drug programs.

Ipswich has a youth alienation problem, but until the country's narrow perspective in Vietnam is ended that antipathy will continue.

Ipswich has pressing financial pressures which are prompting cutbacks in critical school needs, but there is no real solution until the end of the Vietnam war permits greater federal aid to education.

The needs of prisoners of war are unchallenged, but so are the needs of countless millions of Americans who receive inadequate food and shelter or who face a lifetime crippled by inadequate education or job training because of our country's present financial priorities.

The success in terms of participation of the POW letter writing campaign suggests that perhaps another drive directing letters to President Nixon and key members of Congress should be undertaken.

It may be too much to ask that Ipswich residents equal the eloquence of John Kerry, leader of Saturday's march in Washington. But the simple facts are eloquent enough.

Write President Nixon, Vice President Agnew, Secretary of Defense Laird and members of Congress and tell them like it is.

The war is evil, the war is senseless, the war is illegal.

Tell them where the prisoners of the Vietnam war are—here in Ipswich just as sure as in North Vietnam.

MARTIN HAROLD KELLY

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, the residents of the Third Congressional District of New Jersey lost one of their most outstanding friends, a man respected and loved by everyone, and a man whose great achievements dispel the notion that "nice guys finish last." His name was M. Harold Kelly, and he was publisher of the Daily Register of Red Bank.

Mr. Kelly, who joined the newspaper 43 years ago as a cub reporter saw the one-time small weekly grow into one of the best and most influential daily newspapers in the State of New Jersey. The success of this newspaper was in no small way the result of the great dedication and drive of M. Harold Kelly.

Harold Kelly was a warm man with a quick Irish wit. He was quick to shake your hand, always smiling—and always trying to help someone else. Many of us in the Third Congressional District feel we are better persons today because we have had the opportunity of knowing and of sharing the friendship of M. Harold Kelly.

At this point, I place in the RECORD an editorial from the Red Bank Daily Register:

MARTIN HAROLD KELLY

In collecting, writing, printing and distributing news about events of the day, newspaper people normally are inured to their impact. That was not the case Wednesday afternoon when word reached The Daily Register offices that our publisher, Martin Harold Kelly, had died.

The shock and sadness that followed that report has not diminished, even as this is being written. It is difficult to believe that one so energetic—and one whose enthusiasm and optimism were so contagious—would be called to his eternal reward at the comparatively early age of 60.

In those six decades, however, Harold Kelly lived a full, worthwhile life in which he generously gave of himself to a variety of community, religious and charitable activities.

His association with The Register began 43 years ago when he was hired as a cub reporter by the late John H. Cook, founder of the weekly newspaper that—with his help—was to become one of the finest in the nation.

In those early years, he worked with such people as James J. Hogan of Fair Haven and the late W. Harry Pennington of Red Bank, and with them, in 1959, took over full ownership of the paper upon the death of Thomas Irving Brown.

That was the year that The Register became a daily operation, a change in which Mr. Kelly played a prominent role. It was

considered a great risk in publishing circles, but his faith in the newspaper, its employees and in the community it serves resulted in a most successful changeover.

In 1965 when Mr. Hogan and Mr. Pennington retired, the paper was sold and Mr. Kelly was retained as president and publisher. Among his proudest accomplishments after that was the move of the newspaper from antiquated facilities on Broad St. to a modern plant on Chestnut St.

When disaster struck last Christmas Eve and fire destroyed the Chestnut St. building, his characteristic courage, determination and pride inspired loyal Register employees to perform the difficult feat of continuing the paper's publication, uninterrupted.

The days and weeks since then have been difficult and trying. Although he had planned the modernization of the composing room through what is known as the "cold type" process, the fire caused an acceleration of those plans that caused him much personal concern and worry.

In a week in which the newspaper has approached a degree of normalcy as regards deadlines and delivery times, Mr. Kelly is not with us to enjoy another of the successes which he so ably helped bring about.

Mr. Kelly was not among those in the profession who are known as "Ivory tower" publishers. With a thorough background in the profession, he spent considerably more time with employees—in almost all cases on a first-name basis—in the news room, advertising departments, composing room, printing plant, circulation department and the business offices than he did in his own office.

We have dwelt here thus far with M. Harold Kelly, newspaperman, because that, of course, was what he has been since his youth. The tributes that have come from such personages as Gov. William T. Cahill and our former governor, Richard J. Hughes, have cited him not only for his professional excellence but for his personal qualities and the bonds of friendship that he has earned.

There are so many things for which he will be long remembered. In the days when he performed on baseball diamonds in the county and in recent years when he took up golfing, his companions knew that he wanted to be part of a winning effort. They also knew, though, that just as important was the ability to be able to joke and laugh about it.

He was proud to trace his heritage to his great-grandmother, an Irish immigrant, and of his birthplace—Sandy New in Lincroft—where he succumbed. He was steadfast in the religion in which he was reared, Roman Catholicism, and was a part of all the activities in the parishes to which he belonged, yet he and his family for years practiced what recently has become to be known as the spirit of ecumenism.

Then, too, he will be remembered as devoted to his wonderful wife, Madeline, whose encouragement and devotion he cherished and often praised; as a beneficent father of three fine daughters, and as an extremely proud grandfather of two. They all are very much in our thoughts, and our hope is that they are consoled by the knowledge that his love and affection for them surpassed all else.

Many people in Monmouth County and throughout the state will echo the words of former Gov. Hughes: "This man—Harold Kelly—with his cheerful smile, brains and integrity was one of the bright spots of my public career. I treasured his friendship, and I will miss him ever so much."

Harold was a man of integrity and warmth. His strength included the honesty to speak up when silence may have been a more popular alternative, and to labor in the constant search for truth.

We at The Register will sorely miss him, but we are grateful for the leadership he has provided us. His 43 years with us have passed speedily, but the memory of him will be lasting.

**GYPSY MOTH COULD DISRUPT OUR
ENTIRE ECOSYSTEM**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in support of research moneys which I feel are urgently needed to control the gypsy moth. I also pointed out that soil conservation service activities have been most valuable to Erie County and I am hopeful the projects which are needed to protect our environment will be accelerated. At this point I include my statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. JACK F. KEMP

Mr. Chairman: Thank you for this opportunity to submit testimony advocating appropriation of funds for two vital purposes:

- (1) Soil Conservation Service activities, and
- (2) the support of research necessary to control the Gypsy Moth.

My Congressional District, the 39th District of New York State, includes part of the city of Buffalo, but is largely a mixture of Buffalo suburbs and agricultural countryside all falling within the Erie County Soil and Water Conservation District. The citizen directors who govern this locally organized and operated district are therefore working to solve not only the environmental problems of farmers but also those of urban residents.

Soon after the district was created in 1943, the Soil Conservation Service agreed to assist in conservation planning and practice establishment activities, and shortly thereafter began to make the soil survey for that purpose. Since then, community planners have learned that soils information is just as important in their work as it is for farmers. As a result, they told county government that the survey urgently needed acceleration. Local funds are given to Cornell University to provide a soil scientist to work with the SCS soil scientists. As the mapping in each town is finished, it is interpreted for use by local people, and usually is published by the town.

Unfortunately, the demand for this information still cannot be met—despite the fact that it is extremely important that this data be available for the decision makers in this rapidly urbanizing district before they make too many mistakes which cannot be corrected. I feel that the Soil Conservation Service should be given additional funds to complete this vital job more quickly—and since District directors tell me that the same need exists around most cities, I am asking for national appropriations for this agency.

I am also much concerned that other operations of conservation districts are being curtailed because of reduction in Soil Conservation Service personnel at a time when the public has become more conscious of the need for environmental improvement. Erie District needs two man-years of additional professional manpower to keep up with the workload. My directors say that this agency needs 93 extra man-years of technical assistance in New York State alone, and in the country as a whole, 2,300 man-years. It will take \$23 million in additional appropriations to meet the expectations of district co-operators.

There is no active watershed project in my District, but I am conscious of the flood control needs of others because we were the recipients of benefits from a project finished years ago. Buffalo Creek, the first to be completed of the eleven flood prevention watersheds authorized in 1944, is contributing so

much less sediment to Buffalo Harbor that there are considerable savings in dredging.

I believe it is important that Soil Conservation Service appropriations for watershed planning and construction be increased, and that more new starts be authorized.

The best and most economical solution to environmental problems is to prevent their happening in the first place. Increased appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service activities which I have briefly outlined will be an investment in the prevention of future environmental crises and I urge your favorable action.

The second part of my testimony concerns a destructor of our natural resources, small in size, but a very real threat to our environment: the Gypsy Moth.

This insect is a menace to the public welfare as well as to all the hardwood forests of the eastern United States. The pest is marching through State after State devouring tree foliage, defacing homes, interfering with the use of yards, streets, playgrounds and parks by our citizens, and causing health problems where people are sensitive to the caterpillars.

For example, Gypsy Moth is a real nuisance on Long Island and elsewhere in the South-eastern part of New York State. Caterpillars drop down onto children and others from defoliated trees. The insect crawls over and into homes, which must be cleaned or repainted after the attack. Visitors leave the area because trees are denuded and the pest crawls into their belongings.

In the northern part of the State, Gypsy Moth has crossed our border into Canada and threatens to circle Lakes Ontario and Erie and move into Michigan. It is ravaging choice oak and other hardwoods in Broome and Tioga Counties in the South. Continued defoliation, year after year, will cause the death of these beautiful forest giants in the suburbs and in the adjoining cities and woodlands.

The Gypsy Moth epidemic last summer constituted a severe crisis. Widespread defoliation of the forest canopy and understory exposed the forest floor to intense sunlight, scorching it and increasing the danger of forest fires. Watershed values were lost and temperatures disrupted the entire ecosystem. Wildlife was driven out of the forest, and in parts of New Jersey timber rattlesnakes escaped to the lowlands, turning up in populated valley communities.

The Gypsy Moth was brought to the United States in 1869 by a biologist interested in crossing it with the silk moth to produce a race of hardy, silk producing insects. Several of these imports escaped from the scientist's laboratory in Medford, Massachusetts and formed the entire basal stock responsible for the present infestation in the Northeast. Being native to the forests of Europe and Asia, it had no natural enemies or other form of control mechanisms on this continent. At first, its spread was gradual, but by 1906 it was recognized as a major threat and a Federal quarantine was established. Of only limited effectiveness, these early control measures did not prevent the eventual spread of the moth throughout New England. True control was achieved only by the use of DDT after World War II. Since 1963, however, recognition of the environmental hazards of DDT have led to restrictions on its use, with a subsequent rapid proliferation of the Gypsy Moth.

It is important to know something of the life habits of this insect to truly appreciate the potential impact threatening our forests. The adult Gypsy Moth causes no damage. In the Fall, each female lays an egg-mass containing 100 to 800 eggs. Overwintering in this stage, they hatch out in the Spring as caterpillars about 1/16 of an inch long. After feeding for 40 days, each of these caterpillars grows to a length of 1½ to 2½ inches long, an increase in biomass of many thousand-

fold. As they have no natural controls, it is easy to see how they can spread rapidly and destroy huge areas of valuable forests.

A brief look at some recent statistics verifies our worst fears concerning the destructive potential of the Gypsy Moth. Last year, in New York alone, more than 240,000 acres were defoliated. In an eight-state area, a total of 796,563 acres were ravaged. Connecticut suffered damage on 468,706 acres, New Jersey on 129,835 acres, and Pennsylvania on 10,500 acres. These numbers are especially frightening when we look at some historical records. In 1969, Pennsylvania suffered defoliation of 800 acres; in 1970, 10,500 acres were affected. New Jersey presents a case history which illustrates what can happen when the infestations of Gypsy Moths go unchecked. Until 1966 no damage had occurred. In that year, a single 5 acre patch was detected. In 1967, 1,035 acres were defoliated; in 1968, 5,025 acres were damaged; in 1969, the area afflicted multiplied tenfold to 51,525 acres; and last year the outbreaks covered a total of 129,835 acres.

Concentrations of the Gypsy Moth were found last year in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, indicating that it might be on its way to the commercial forests of the Appalachian and Ozark Mountain ranges. The New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey will probably be the hardest hit again this year, but concerned scientists are looking for it as far west as California, and as far south as Florida where its egg cases have been found. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that if the moth spreads throughout the 340 million acres of forest land in the eastern United States, 112 million acres would be susceptible to defoliation. And with the absence of DDT, there is nothing currently available which would stop it from continuing to spread. G. K. Iverson, Deputy Director of the U.S. Agricultural Research Service recently summed up the situation: "The sad fact is that available tools cannot effectively control this destructive pest."

Although the State of New York is suffering a serious attack of Gypsy Moth, the menace of this insect is not New York's problem alone; its path of destruction is rapidly spreading from State to State and action must be taken now to halt its advance. President Nixon took note of this serious problem by recommending funds for Gypsy Moth control in his May 2 speech outlining agricultural proposals.

I am appearing today to advocate appropriations which will provide for research to increase our arsenal of tools to fight the Gypsy Moth. We are duty bound as legislators to act quickly and vigorously to provide for a scientifically and environmentally-sound program of control. I urge this committee to act favorably on the measure and to provide funds for research into methods of controlling the Gypsy Moth.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW
LONG?**

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 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 1600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

STAND UP FOR AMERICA

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow one of my colleagues from Ohio is receiving an award that I believe is worthy of special note. The Honorable WILLIAM H. HARSHA of the Sixth Congressional District in Ohio is being presented an honor certificate by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for his outstanding radio program "Stand Up For America."

A ceremony similar to the one being conducted tomorrow is held annually to honor those who have contributed in building a better understanding of our constitutional government, the dignity and worth of the individual, our free enterprise system, and the precepts embodied in the American credo.

It is especially appropriate that this is the second consecutive year BILL HARSHA has been honored by the Freedoms Foundation. He is a devoted patriot who has long been a proponent of the freedoms and ideals he so ably expressed in his July 4, 1970, broadcast. At a time when we are overwhelmed with unjustified criticisms of our Nation and Government, I commend the text of this program to my colleagues and congratulate BILL HARSHA for his positive, cogent remarks:

STAND UP FOR AMERICA!

When, in 1776, the representatives of the 13 colonies convened in Philadelphia to sign the Declaration of Independence, they endorsed a most profound document which forever ended our political bonds from the rule of Britain. In doing so, they burst the shackles of tyranny and oppression and struck a blow for freedom which has endured for 194 years.

Indeed, the United States of America has endured, but her history has not merely been a record of endurance. From the independence of the 13 original colonies to the union of the 50 states, from the landing of the Mayflower to the launching of the Apollo, America has expanded and progressed as a Nation. But, most important of all, she has rendered a convincing testimony to the belief that man—whatever his race or creed—can unite with his fellow man to further the common cause of freedom and equality of all men and that she can succeed in doing this.

There are those, however, who would have us believe that America no longer serves this purpose, that she is only a shadow of the democracy she professes to be and that she cannot endure much longer. They would have us believe that the American Dream of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness which brought many of our forefathers to her shores is only an illusion. Rather than advocate peaceful, responsible and progressive change, these dissidents clamor for violent revolution.

In the face of such criticism and under the sobering influence of the turbulent sixties, many—who truly love their country and who firmly place their belief in her democratic traditions—find themselves confronted by these troublesome questions: What is happening to America? What can be done to soothe the violent tempers bent on tearing this country down rather than building it up?

I have asked these same questions of myself and in contemplating them I cannot convince myself that America is dying nor that

the ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution are beyond her grasp. These questions are not new to Americans—nor are they unanswerable. Listen, for example, to those asked by President Abraham Lincoln almost 100 years ago in his First Inaugural Address on the eve of the Civil War:

"Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step while there is any possibility of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to are greater than all the real ones you fly from, will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?"

Would Americans risk so fearful a mistake today? I do not—for the moment—think that this is the case. America is not perfect, but she has never admitted to be without fault. Yet, she still is the greatest nation on earth—the greatest form of government yet conceived—compared to any other past or present. The very nature of her Constitution and Declaration of Independence is such that it allows for the possibility of human errors and provides a means for correcting them. Americans have the right of free speech, the right of dissent, the right of protest and the right to vote to effect change, when warranted, through peaceful means. The fearful mistake is when these means are abandoned and replaced by violence and destruction, or equally as tragic, when complacent citizens ignore any existing injustices in our society.

In both of these cases, the dissatisfied and the complacent Americans have sadly forgotten what happened and what was intended on July 4, 1776, when 13 colonies united "to form a more perfect union". They forget that we are still striving and must continue to strive for that purpose. America is the greatest experiment in human dignity and freedom ever attempted by man. But, it is an experiment not yet completed and we must continue to endeavor to make it better.

As we commemorate the birth of our Nation on this July 4, 1970, we must not only recall the basic tenets on which this country was founded; we must also reapply them to America today. And we must remember that we have succeeded thus far as a Nation only because we have believed in the unalienable rights of every man and upheld them in times of crisis in the past. It is the time to remember—not just on July 4 every year, but on every day—that 194 years ago America made known her declaration to tyranny and injustice that she will not surrender to their dictates anymore than she will surrender to the dictates of those who would destroy her. It's time to "stand up" for America and the principles America represents.

EDUCATION REVENUE SHARING

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on education revenue sharing charts a new course for Federal involvement in the business of aiding elementary and secondary education. The size of the Federal role in education has grown geometrically over the last 10 years. Unfortunately, we cannot point to convincing evidence that these enormous expenditures have relieved the crises in our classrooms.

Throughout the years, the goal of parents, school administrators, legislators, and Federal administrators has been to secure quality education for all our children. But their good intentions, supported by generous Federal funding, have not produced the results we all want and expect. Almost daily we read reports of the failures of educational reform, and of expensive programs that produce few measurable results. Most alarmingly, we read of unhappy classrooms. We read that we are failing our children by falling short of providing meaningful experiences in the one institution—education—that all Americans recognize and support as being the key to rewarding and successful lives.

Part of the problem, as the President's message recognizes, is that our growing programs of Federal assistance have been accompanied by a growing amount of Federal strings and redtape. State and local educators, in their quest for additional support, have been diverted from their primary responsibility—education of children—as they sought to understand Federal guidelines and fill out Federal forms.

Education revenue sharing would provide State and local officials with the flexibility and responsibility they must have if our educational system is to respond to our changing times. The challenges facing educators, public and private, are great. Existing narrow, categorical programs of assistance to elementary and secondary education do not always provide the proper responses to these challenges. Education revenue sharing, with its emphasis on development of local programs to meet local needs, would do so.

Reform of Federal programs in the field of education is long overdue. The President's message strikes a bold—and much-needed—note of such reform. I hope my colleagues will join in this reform, for the benefit of all the schoolchildren in the country.

NEW YORK TIMES ASKS PASSAGE OF MILITARY PAY BILL TO INSURE EQUITY FOR OUR GI'S

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in my testimony on the draft before the Committee on Armed Services, I noted that the legislative history of military pay increases reveals that our current pay structure relies heavily on the power to compel young men to enter the military at subsistence wage levels. I also noted that this policy of deliberate neglect has resulted in many of our servicemen living in poverty.

There is simply no logic to a system which compels young men to leave civilian life, and then forces them to choose between poverty and welfare. Moreover, the difference between military entry pay represents a tax-in-kind of nearly \$2 billion on those who are compelled to join the Armed Forces.

Strong support for the concept of competitive wages came from the Committee on Armed Services, under the leadership of Chairman HÉBERT. As the committee stated in its report on H.R. 6531:

We should not use the draft as a means of compelling young men to serve at substandard pay.

The House united behind this principle and overwhelmingly passed the compensation portions of the committee bill.

The legislation now faces an uncertain fate in the Senate. I hope the other body will take note of the support for the House pay bill stated in today's New York Times.

I commend this item to your attention:

A TAX ON GI'S

If the Administration were to tell Congress that since the nation cannot afford its new \$76-billion defense budget, the cost of new arms would be taken out of the pay of privates and other low-ranking G.I.'s the lawmakers would be rightly indignant.

But such an indirect tax on servicemen is, in effect, what the Secretary of Defense has proposed and the Senate Armed Services Committee has accepted in endorsing the Administration's cut-rate draft bill, calling for military pay raises of only \$987 million. Secretary Laird vigorously opposed much larger increases recommended by a Presidential commission and endorsed to a substantial degree by the House because, he said, the money would have to be taken from other defense funds and would have "a very adverse effect on our budget."

The Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force last year urged increases totaling roughly \$3.2 billion as a means of achieving the peacetime goal of an all-volunteer force. In making its recommendations, the commission argued that the pay raises are justified on the grounds of equity alone. Existing pay scales in the lower ranks are so low, the commission noted, that they amount to a "tax in kind" on draftees and draft-induced volunteers who are compelled to serve for wages substantially below what they could expect to command on the civilian job market.

For example, the current monthly salary of recruits is \$134. Under the Administration proposal which is now before the Senate, a recruit's pay would be raised to \$201 per month. The Presidential commission recommended a figure of \$301. The Senate should at least match the increase voted by the House, which would raise recruit pay to \$268 per month.

A Government that pays defense contractors billions of dollars in "cost overruns" for weapons can surely afford to pay a living wage to the men it asks to lay down their lives in the nation's defense.

SST VERSUS POLLUTION?

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a popular misconception that those who favor the development of the SST, as I do, are either ignorant of or indifferent to environmental hazards. In fact, there are many who equate a vote for SST development with a vote for pollution. It is difficult for them to comprehend that one can be in favor of clean air and technological advance.

I was interested to hear that point of view defended most eloquently by an outstanding scientist, aeronautical engineer, and airplane designer who is also the inventor of an antipollution device which he claims is capable of making the air of New York City cleaner than that in the countryside.

I refer to Maj. Alexander de Seversky, a pioneer in aviation and a member of the Aviation Hall of Fame, an honor he has earned by a series of important contributions to aviation, including an all-metal amphibious plane with the first fuel-carrying wing, the first long-range all-metal fighter plane, the Thunderbolt fighter plane of World War II, and many other refinements and innovations that have helped to make air travel what it is today.

In a recent interview on the Today Show, Major de Seversky demonstrated his new invention to clean the air by a process of electrostatic precipitation, which he claims will be a breakthrough in the battle against air pollution and will, in time, pay for itself. It was an exciting demonstration and a reminder of the creative genius that has made this Nation great.

In the same interview, Major de Seversky made some predictions about airplanes of the future, which he says will rise vertically, eliminating the need for long runways, and will travel at supersonic speeds. He considers the development of supersonic transport both essential and inevitable, and points out how the research in space technology trickles down to everyday life, contributing "new materials, new methods," and new developments in related fields.

In answer to a question, Major de Seversky said:

I think we should have built the two first (SST) airplanes. Because, you know, the scientific mind does not produce until it's under duress.

He backed up that perceptive statement by pointing out that we made greater technological advances in 1 year of war than in 20 years of peace. But he does not believe that war is the only necessary pressure for scientific development.

He pointed to the peacetime challenges of space exploration and the need to provide more efficient air travel. It is research of this kind, he says, that will inspire the scientist to overcome difficulties—including the difficulty of pollution.

On this broadcast, he stated his view that scientists would come up with acceptable solutions if they were told that the SST could never go into production unless they made it pollution-free and noise-free. These goals, he believes, are possible—and given these goals, in Major de Seversky's words:

Every scientific mind would strain itself to accomplish this.

Like Major de Seversky, I have great faith in the inventive genius of man, and I believe as he does that the problems of air and noise pollution are not insoluble if men have the goal and incentive to solve them.

The incentive is provided when we are working toward a long-range goal—as we

worked toward the goal announced by John F. Kennedy in 1961 to put a man on the moon by the end of the decade. Not only was that goal realized, but the "spinoff" from the technology developed in the process has far-reaching implications for all Americans. That bold decision, made 10 years ago, advanced us not only into the space age, but into the computer age. In this massive effort of teamwork, we multiplied our store of knowledge in the whole range of physical and biological sciences and broadened our concept of the universe of which we are a small part.

Mr. Speaker, we learn by doing. To limit endeavors is to limit our acquisition of knowledge.

In the long-range goal to develop an SST that is pollution-free, we would be promoting research that will provide us with different materials, new techniques, and broaden our outlook on countless other problems. Major de Seversky mentions housing as an example, predicting that "lovely homes could be mass produced" with the new plastics that are being developed for air travel.

"Research," he says:

Is everything. We cannot afford to slow down on research because this will solve our problem on earth. And it will decrease our poverty and make a better life for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, that is my goal for America—not merely to create jobs for a handful of people, or to produce a means of rapid global travel for a handful of people, but to give free rein to the inquiring mind and to scientific research that will make a better life for everybody.

THE GREAT HIGHWAY ROBBERY: VICTIM, THE HOMEOWNER

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial comment prepared by KSD-TV and radio in St. Louis and aired on April 25, 1971.

The editorial follows:

FOLLOWING THE GREAT HIWAY ROBBERY: VICTIM, THE HOMEOWNER

With St. Louis facing the most severe financial crisis in its history, KSD and KSD-TV call for a moratorium on further hiway expansion within the city limits. This eating away of property tax must stop. After all, the schools, the hospitals, the parks, the city services, all depend on what has become a constantly shrinking tax base.

As the panel stated, almost three million dollars a year, of property taxes, has been wiped out by hiways. In addition, as soon as news of future freeways gets out, we see a slow depreciation in neighborhood tax base. Owners refuse to make repairs, properties run down, and tax returns drop, years before the construction starts. On I-44, there was a 12 year downward tax trend in the areas affected.

Citizen protest is mounting all across the country . . . 16 months ago, the Gov. of Massachusetts declared a 3 year moratorium on all freeway construction within greater Boston, until such time as the builders could

prove compelling need. Citizen protest stopped city freeways in New Orleans and Memphis.

We believe this is the time for the Mayor, the Board of Public Service and the Board of Aldermen to place a moratorium on any further highway expansion within the city until the State of Missouri finds a way to refund to the city the property taxes lost through highway construction. As Mr. Sansone stated, this would be an immediate revenue sharing measure, with the greater portion supplied to Missouri by federal road funds.

We urge the city at this time to refuse approval to the planned North-South Distributor Highway on the basis of citizen protest. We urge the Mayor to appoint a study committee to suggest alternate plans, to assess the environmental loss, the hazards to schools, the threatening of historic areas like Lafayette Park and the displacement of residents. Such a committee should have members representing the Board of Public Service, the City Plan Commission, parks and city services, school administrators, citizens' groups, business interests, architects, environmentalists and urban planners.

Finally, for long-range planning, this station believes the state gasoline tax should be earmarked not only for highways, but for mass transit within cities and for rapid transit in cities and suburbs. We urge the Legislature to work toward this end.

THE COLD WAR, REVOLUTIONARY WAR, AND U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, that some segments of our populace, both silent and the theoretically vocal, are in a grave state of confusion concerning the realities of our world, particularly Vietnam, the two imperial complexes, the U.S.S.R. and Red China, and the incessant cold war, is perhaps the understatement of the year. Except for the backstage manipulators of most of the so-called antiwar demonstrations, they have scarcely a comprehension of the long list of captive nations that has been established over the past 50 years basically by the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists. The present threat to South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia is no exception to this captive nations list-building by Moscow.

The fundamental interrelationship of the cold war, revolutionary warfare, and Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism is strongly and clearly suggested in three contemporary works that neatly supplement each other and produce a pattern of thought and background which are well nigh indispensable to the challenges and threats confronting us today. The first for one's serious reading is the "History of the Cold War" by André Fontaine, Pantheon Books, N.Y., 1968; the second is Robert Thompson's "Revolutionary War in World Strategy, 1945-1968," Taplinger Publishing Co., N.Y., 1970; and the third is "U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth" by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, Devin-Adair, Greenwich, Conn., 1971.

The following reviews, two of three written for the Ukrainian Quarterly by Dr. Dobriansky and one which appeared recently in the Santa Ana Register, give an impressive indication of the complementary of these three works and the need for our examining them to understand the psycho-political warfare aimed at us:

[From Pantheon Books, New York, 1968, page 432]

HISTORY OF THE COLD WAR

(By André Fontaine)

Unquestionably this work is "must reading" for anyone seeking to understand with perceptive meaning the phenomenon called the Cold War. As the reviewer, one will not agree with the author's many expressed opinions, but he will be impressed by the scholarly treatment provided in the world. The author is the foreign editor of *Le Monde* and brings all his literary skills and experiences to bear on an exposition that is a basic source of reference in this vital field. The book covers the period from the October Russian Revolution in 1917 to the Korean War in 1950, and its well-documented data are a mine of essential information for any student of the problem. The volume is a translation from the original French.

To offer an adequate indication of the rich content of this work, it is perhaps best to relate in staccato fashion the highlights and essentials that impressed this reviewer most. First and foremost is the author's sound thesis that the Cold War really commenced back in 1917 and not in 1947, as most analysts and observers mistakenly believe. Thus the title of the book. His historical accounts of Russia from 1917 to 1921, China, the Stalin-Hitler pact and many other phases are impressively done, but the book seriously suffers in its patently inadequate treatment and coverage of wars for national independence by the many non-Russian nations and peoples in the former Tsarist Russia Empire. This defect is unfortunate because the newly independent states were the first to feel the pangs not only of Russian cold war strategy and techniques but eventually were victimized by the first aggressions of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Philosophically, the writer evinces a strong pragmatism toward man's problems in the age of "the airplane, the atom, space, mass communication, automation, decolonization and the population explosion" (p. 8). "Neither so-called scientific socialism nor so-called liberal capitalism furnishes a ready-made solution to the problems of our poor world," he continues. In the end, he says, be prepared "either to compromise or to perish." One wonders whether the author was prepared to compromise with Nazi imperialism thirty years ago, or was that an entirely different age in mankind's development? His de-emphasis of ideological rivalry, such as capitalism vs. socialism, Marxism vs. Christian sociology, etc. is well taken, but his failure to assign adequate weight to the force of Soviet Russian imperialism, regardless of its form and degree of intensity, leads us into a rather murky area on how to deal with the Russians. As Marx himself pointed out time and time again, compromise with the Bear long enough and you'll end up in its belly.

Many interesting historical insights are recorded throughout the work. Napoleon in exile on Saint Helena saw the world becoming in time "either an American republic or a Russian absolute monarchy" (p. 12). In a tradition of such insight Henri Martin, Jules Michelet, De Tocqueville and others "believed that the decisive battle between despotism and liberty would be waged between Moscow and Washington." The naïveté of Secretary of State Seward is shared by many

of our contemporaries in State and elsewhere: "She [Russia] has our friendship, in every case, in preference to any other European power, simply because she always wishes us well and leaves us to conduct our affairs as we think best" (p. 13). Seward in 1862 viewed the emancipation of the serfs as heralding a long era of Russian-American friendship for world peace; almost a century later Franklin D. Roosevelt "would use similar language" (p. 14).

In addition to others, the illusions of Woodrow Wilson are well quoted, as, for example, this message to Congress on April 2, 1917: "Russia was known by those who knew it best to have always been in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relations of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure . . . was not in fact Russian in origin, character or purpose" (p. 17). In sharp contrast to such illusions the author quotes, among others, Gogol's *Dead Souls*: "And you, Holy Russia, caught up in a whirlwind, like a troika that no one can catch. You raise dust storms, bridges crash down and everything recoils . . . You surpass everything! . . . And he who contemplates you stops as though transfixed by a divine miracle . . . the troika cleaves the air, inspired by God . . . Every living thing on earth flees and disappears, and the other peoples and empires draw back and leave the way open to you, Holy Russia!" (p. 18). The Dostoyevsky of *The Devils* observed, "The only 'God-bearing' people is the Russian people . . . A truly great people can never reconcile itself to playing second fiddle in the affairs of humanity, not even to playing an important part, but always and exclusively the chief part . . ." For good measure, the anarchist Bakunin in 1848 saw that "from an ocean of blood and fire, the star of the Revolution would rise in Moscow, high in the sky, to become the guide to humanity."

The account on the Bolsheviks, Mensheviks and Lenin is absorbing and revealing. Lenin first declared himself as a Communist, rather than remaining as a Social Democrat, in Switzerland. In 1914 he was so fed up with socialist bickering that he "came within an inch of giving up politics." The legend that Lenin was sent by the Germans in a sealed train to the crumbling Russian Empire is scotched. As the narrative shifts to 1917-18, a fairly accurate description is given of the non-Russian peoples throwing off the Russian yoke. The author's insights are also keen. He writes, "Although Soviet Russia could if necessary put up with the existence of a totally independent Finland, it could not put up with an independent Ukraine, which was both its breadbasket and its coal bucket" (p. 29). Yet, what is disturbing to the careful reader is that though the writer is familiar with the essential facts of the Russian/non-Russian problem and his perceptions are clear, in many places one finds the conceptual confusion of the USSR as "Russia" or a "nation." Such imprecision causes one to wonder about his manageable grasp of the facts.

As far back as 1918, Churchill expressed the fear that Bolshevism's victory would lead to a "powerful Jacobin military empire, animated with the Russian national spirit" seeking "to reconquer all the lost Russian provinces" and "to divide the peoples of the Entente by revolutionary propaganda supported by the financial resources of a powerful state" (p. 40). In a nutshell, this is the story of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Employing early the Russian tricks of trade, Lenin sought in 1919 "an economic agreement with all countries, but particularly with America" (p. 71). The operations of the Russians in the Spanish Civil War are well described in this work, as well as Russian maneuvers in China.

The selected quote for chapter five on "Two Irons In The Fire" further indicates the author's sense of the Russian imperialist problem and Moscow's skillful cold war tactics, though his conceptual framework still leaves much to be desired. Marx, in a letter to Lion Phillips on June 25, 1864, observed, "The only ones in this tragi-comedy who imperturbably pursue their old objectives and who play masterfully are the Russians" (p. 97). This quote applies so well today on all continents. In this same chapter the author furnishes an excellent account of the importance of Ukraine, the role of Stalin, and the weakness of the Western powers. For example, in testifying on the validity of the Franco-Polish treaty of 1921, Georges Bonnet in 1938 stated it was, provided Moscow and Warsaw could restrain "a strong autonomist movement aimed at the constitution of an independent Ukrainian Republic" (p. 104).

These are only a few of the salient parts of this important work. The book deals adequately with the curious courses of Polish foreign policy, the Stalin-Hitler pact and the hypocrisy involved in diplomatic negotiations prior to it, the unbelievable naïveté of Roosevelt in his relations with Moscow, and the consequences of Yalta and Teheran. His adulation of Kennan and the policy of containment is subject to a few worthwhile strictures. However, all that has been given above, should make it quite evident that the work is a valuable one. We're looking forward to the next volume dealing with the period following Korea. To what extent the author will cover Khrushchev, Nixon, Eisenhower and Congress' Captive Nations Week resolution, will indicate his feel for non-Russian nationalism in the USSR.

[From Taplinger Publishing Co., New York, 1970, p. 171]

REVOLUTIONARY WAR IN WORLD STRATEGY,
1945-69

(By Robert Thompson)

By all odds, this compact and lucid work on revolutionary warfare is a veritable bible for anyone who seeks a solid background to this type of warfare since the close of World War II and an incisive understanding of its requisite conditions for success as well as pointed requirements for the defeat of the enemy employing it. No excessive enthusiasm over this work is indicated by a humble suggestion that copies of this highly expert study be placed in the hands of responsible but uninformed "doves" in Congress and elsewhere, in used libraries throughout the country, and on lists for mandatory reading by all sensitively concerned with national security. It is no exaggeration to state that the book's treatment of Vietnam makes the "doves," the publicity-seekers, the demonstrators and the dupes appear as silly exhibitionists, many of them influenced and manipulated, to be sure, by communist propaganda and political warfare artisans.

The author possesses credentials for handling this not so complex but nevertheless new subject, at least to most Westerners, that by far surpass those of our officials, baby doctors, and university professors who, ad nauseum, have been vocalizing about Vietnam. He played a key, cooperative role in the annihilation of communist insurgency in Malaysia, was the head of the British Advisory Mission in Vietnam, and has been an adviser to President Nixon on Vietnam matters. Not only on the level of direct experience are his credentials outstanding, but one can say they are also exemplary on the level of scholarly research, extraordinarily lucid exposition, and a keen grasp and insight into world realities. It is with good cause that the jacket of the book emphasizes "World Realities."

In coverage, the work rigorously defines the essence and nature of revolutionary war, the aims and content of Russian foreign policy, and the Cold War. It then deals very concretely and essentially with all the major examples of revolutionary warfare in the

1945-69 period. The treatment is factual, dispassionate, maximally objective, and with penetrating interpretations and cool judgment. Throughout the work, the primacy and power of the USSR in supporting crucial revolutionary war manifestations are emphasized. To the reviewer, this study of a given, specialized area furnishes a most vital ground of justification and empirical support for his thesis on the number one enemy of the Free World, namely Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, as developed from numerous angles in his works on *The Vulnerable Russians* and *U.S.A. and The Soviet Myth*. What the author provides is impressive and conclusive data for the third part of what the reviewer dubs as Moscow's global Troika policy, the so-called wars of liberation in the Third World. And as the foreword of the work, Vera M. Dean, observes, "The same policy would have been followed by the Tsarist Empire had there never been a Communist revolution."

Before enumerating several of Sir Robert's major observations—and there are many that simply cannot be adequately mentioned in the scope of a review—three critical points deserve expression at this juncture. One, those who tend to develop a parochial interest in given nations or states, be it China, Israel, Poland or Ukraine, or in area studies, be they Latin America, Africa or the USSR, can profit immensely from the global study presented here. It is integrated, logical, factually based, and intellectually compelling. Covering all continents from the focal point of Russia's expanding global influence, the study illumines and enhances the relative meaning of each of these nations, states or areas. Far too many analysts tend to view Vietnam, Egypt, Ukraine, Cuba etc. in virtual isolation from events in other areas. As the author strongly emphasizes for the future, "The rules of the game, as laid down by Russia, would be that communist countries are off-limits, that the remainder are a free-for-all, and that, in any free-for-all, a communist party only has to win once" (pp. 161-162). This global formula for the totalitarian Russian imperio-colonialists underscores the inter-relatedness of all areas and, indeed, the depth and strength of the captive nations thesis.

The second important point is the inevitable significance and primacy of the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR as Russian expansionism proceeds in this decade. Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan and so forth will unavoidably take on new meaning and stature in Western studies and policy. There is every reason to prepare solidly for this development as the opportunities will be boundless with the pressures emanating from Moscow and felt more discernibly in all parts of the world. Sir Robert is correct in holding that the "containment of China both physically and ideologically, i.e. the imposition of 'limited sovereignty' is essential if Russia is to retain control in achieving her general goal of eliminating American influence from the European-Asian land mass and substituting her own. This control is necessary if Russia is to develop her strategy of gradual penetration, low-level contact and avoidance of confrontation" (p. 146). He adds, "For this strategy to be successful, Russia needs to keep the West confused and reluctant to become involved and to isolate the United States." With the opening of Sino-American relations and "victory" in Vietnam, developments in Asia may assume an entirely different light as Chinese national interests against Russian imperial sway exert themselves and the entire character of the Eurasian land mass becomes a focal point of world interest and inquiry, particularly that of the USSR.

Finally, of a negative nature, despite the acuity and sharpness of analysis in this work, it is evident that the author doesn't seem to have a firm grasp of the realities within the USSR itself. His constant use

of the term "Russia," as indicated by the quotes here, appears to synonymize it with the USSR. Factually, it is Russian policy at work, not Byelorussian, Ukrainian or any other non-Russian national policy in the USSR. But to avoid analytic confusion and also to convey an appreciative understanding of the critical Russian/non-Russian complex in the USSR, a preliminary statement to this effect could have been made. His comments, for example, on Russian partisan warfare during World War II—"Initially, however, the German forces were well received and welcomed by the peasants in Russia, but partisan activity and the mutilation of German prisoners soon provoked German reactions against civilians which, in turn, created a hostile population" (p. 36)—are rather weak and faulty in the light of historical evidence. He is unaware of the UPA, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, and his seeming thesis on the origin of revolutionary warfare in 1945 indicates an equal unawareness of its uses by Moscow against the non-Russian republics in the 1917-22 period, despite its inchoate features.

Having said this, one cannot possibly use these strictures as a detraction from the work and its brilliant analysis and observations. For one, the author is careful in making all necessary distinctions as, for example, "Out of the 149 various outbreaks of violence between 1958 and 1966 communists were involved in only fifty-eight and in seven of those they were themselves the target of uprisings" (p. 2). The two Vietnam wars are marked by communist leadership: in Cuba, it expressed itself after victory; in Algeria, it was denied and opposed, though the communist cause was advanced by sheer events. On the specific plans of revolutionary warfare, the writer is equally discriminating and clear: (1) that of communist party organization build-up; (2) "is a period of guerilla warfare starting at a very low tempo but gradually rising in scale" (p. 5); and (3) when "a point of equilibrium with the government has been reached, in effectiveness rather than numbers, then . . . the whole revolutionary movement goes over to the offensive and is prepared to engage in more open warfare until the government collapses and victory is won." An important point that is repeated throughout the study and which most Americans fail to understand, in Vietnam and elsewhere, is that the aim of revolutionary war is always political.

Almost all of the writer's perceptive observations on what the reviewer calls the world's "Russian problem" are well-grounded in fact and evidence. For instance, he minces few words in his overall observation that "Since 1917 Russian foreign policy has been dictated by two basic aims, the domination of the world through revolution and through the rise to power of communist parties in all countries, and the absolute necessity of defending the Soviet base" (p. 26). More accurately, the Soviet Russian base in the USSR. His comment on superficial negotiations with the Russian Empire, such as the SALT talks, consular conventions etc.—what the reviewer has called "confetti diplomacy"—are choice. As he says, "an atmosphere of illusion will be created because none of these subjects is relevant to the real field of conflict—which is people" (p. 146).

If one seeks a provocative exercise in complementary reading for a coherent comprehension of global realities, it is modestly suggested that he consume his book first, then Andre Fontaine's *History of the Cold War*, and both *The Vulnerable Russians* and *U.S.A. and The Soviet Myth*.

[From the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register, Mar. 21, 1971]

BOOK URGES U.S. CAPTIVE NATIONS CAST OFF
RUSS YOKE

"U.S.A. and The Soviet Myth" by Lev E. Dobriansky, Devin-Adair \$6.50. Reviewed by Ann Terrill.

The theme for this somewhat confusingly written but highly cogent book is that the United States should take the initiative in helping the captive nations of the USSR to overthrow their Russian masters in the Kremlin. Primary among these would be the Ukraine, major breadbasket of the Soviet Union.

Dobriansky has enough credentials to make this theory interesting, and they're all listed on the book jacket. Among other things, he has been on the faculty of the National War College, consultant to the House of Representatives' Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, vice-chairman of the Task Force on National Security and Peace, and strategy staff member of the American Security Council.

The author comes to his task in a state of thorough disenchantment with what he calls the "myth" of Soviet Russia and its actual status, aims and aspirations. This "myth," he claims is not only perpetuated in high places too often for comfort, but is spread widely by an uninformed or deliberately misleading press.

Dobriansky gives chapter and verse substantiating his charges. He quotes liberally from the nation's press and its politicians.

He believes that Ukraine, Georgia and many other "republics" that have been engulfed during the centuries of Russian imperialist-expansionism, will ruin Russia, which actually constitutes a minority both in statute miles and in population within its own closely held and ruthlessly dominated sphere.

Dobriansky takes the long view of Russia, as well. The "Russian problem" as he terms it, has little to do with whatever current political regime is in power. He sees the Muscovites as a barbaric breed, cunning, sly and totally without conscience in their drive for world domination. It is at the "Russian menace" rather than the "communist menace" that we must look.

The author, who is currently on the staff of Georgetown University, insists that Russians have always been totalitarian in outlook and philosophy and that the commune as a way of life has been accepted easily by the majority of true Russians. But the other members of what is often wrongly referred to as "Soviet Russia" are not quite that way. Dobriansky says the record shows them to be freedom loving individuals and nations, who would love nothing more than to break loose from Moscow and its regimentation. If they once broke loose, eastern Europe would follow.

He shows that aggression, accompanied by duplicity in diplomatic and other spheres has been Russia's cup of tea since Ivan the Terrible. He seeks to show that the average Russian has an almost mystic belief that his nation will come to own the world. This belief was first observed by a foreign writer more than 100 years ago, according to Dobriansky.

In Dobriansky's view, the future looks black indeed, but is not without hope if we as a nation, act now.

INTERNATIONAL WALK FOR DEVELOPMENT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, again this year, I would like to give enthusiastic endorsement to the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation which, along with over 40 other participating nations, is sponsoring a hunger walk in 300 cities across the Nation on behalf of the Inter-

national Walk for Development which is to take place on May 8, 1971.

In soliciting sponsors to contribute a designated sum of money for each mile completed, the walking participants of the project raise donations for both domestic and international projects designed to provide for the basic health care and educational needs of the less fortunate.

The primary purpose of this program is to make the problem of hunger and development, both in America and in the neighboring nations of the world, an issue sufficiently meaningful to encourage active involvement on the part of the private sector of the American public. As the purposes of the project itself demonstrate, alleviating the problem of hunger and poverty extends beyond actual donations of food and money. An equally critical aspect rests with the need for expanded and continuing education.

I join with the young people participating in the Walk for Development in hoping that this program will, as it has in the past, continue to awaken increasing numbers of the American public into an active concern for our own national needs. We must, at all costs, avoid the affliction of nearsightedness with respect to our own American poor.

DEMONSTRATIONS, TRIBESMEN, AND RATIONALITY

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Chief of Police Jerry Wilson, the District of Columbia Police Department, the Capitol Hill Police, and other law enforcement agencies involved, including the military, for their professional conduct in the handling of the May Day "tribesmen" who unsuccessfully sought to disrupt our Government.

On Sunday, May 2, in the Washington Sunday Star there appeared the following editorial which, I feel, is worthy of note by the entire membership of this body. Additionally, the editorial states my own feelings and opinion better than I can about this whole unfortunate episode in our history.

The editorial follows:

DEMONSTRATIONS, TRIBESMEN AND RATIONALITY

This past fortnight has been a curious one for Washingtonians. And the next few days could become somewhat trying, given the stated and illegal plans of Mayday "tribesmen" to block 21 key intersections here and in suburban Virginia during peak rush-hour periods.

It all began with the dignified week-long protest of some 1,000 members of an organization called Vietnam Veterans Against the War. The veterans made it clear that they want the war ended immediately, without regard to the consequences, a proposal with which we cannot agree.

More than 2.5 million Americans have served in Vietnam, most of them (it can be assumed) without a pronounced degree of enthusiasm. The surprising thing is that only 1,200 of them should have become sufficiently radicalized to make the trip here.

But those who did had a right to be heard and, as President Nixon observed at his Thursday night press conference, it was "rather hard not to hear them." Those who had shed their blood in Southeast Asia had a particular call on the American conscience which would in no way have been diluted had some members of the press made a more earnest effort to establish both the validity of the decorations their comrades discarded and the fact of their service in Vietnam. If Mr. Nixon's acts and words are not to be accepted at face value—and they should not be—then it follows that those of his foes also should be examined.

There followed the massive outing of April 24, an all-purpose anti-war protest, love-in, freak-out and rock session to which virtually anyone who was for or against anything was welcome. The revival, which bore a curious similarity to the camp meetings with which our ancestors were wont to relieve the tedium of frontier life, was, in the main, good-natured. It is always disappointing, however, when the highest political statement of which some people are capable is the defilement of their country's flag and the provision of aid and comfort to their nation's enemies.

Those who feel strongly enough to wish to petition their government on behalf of pacifism, union lettuce, a \$6,500 guaranteed annual income, black power, gay liberation or any other cause have the right to do so as long as they do not interfere with the rights of others. The April 24 crowd's record in this respect was generally good.

But this past week's scag carnival and the events scheduled for tomorrow through Wednesday are a different matter which deserves a different response. President Nixon addressed himself to the subject Thursday evening:

"The Congress is not intimidated; the President is not intimidated. This government is going to go forward . . . those who come and break the law will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law."

We are glad to hear it and we support that position to the fullest. Rennie Davis & Company have no constitutional right to prevent government employees from entering federal offices. They have no right to splash paint around congressional offices. They have no right to damage government or private property. They have no right to prevent other Americans from going about their lawful business. They have no right to inflict the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars in trade on District businessmen. They have no right to make hardpressed taxpayers finance their freakouts in the form of police overtime and cleanup services.

This is the capital of the United States, which is why the Mayday "tribesmen" are here. It is also a place where people live, where they work and try to make ends meet. Those of the poor who are unable to work these next three days will not thank the "tribesmen." And, in our view, the tab for these shenanigans should be covered by a special grant from the federal government to the District Building.

To date, both the police and the administration have acted with admirable restraint, for which we congratulate them. It is our earnest hope that it will be possible for the police to handle the situation this week, without the assistance of the Guard or federal troops. We do not want a Kent State here. But we do want, we insist on, order. To that end, the authorities will have to add firmness to restraint. Above all, the people should take no action against the demonstrators.

Our support of the people's right to petition the government, as opposed to our distaste for the acts of our present visitors, does not mean that we support the recent demonstration's goals, that we believe such action is desirable or that we are incapable

of evaluating the worth of one cause as opposed to that of another.

Insofar as the war is concerned, we believe that massive American involvement in it should be terminated as quickly as possible. But this must be done in a reasoned, orderly and honorable way. Mr. Nixon, who in little more than two years has cut American casualties in half and made parallel reductions in both troop levels and draft calls, is doing just that. Therefore we support his Southeast Asian policy, not that of this past fortnight's demonstrators.

It may be (undoubtedly is) cathartic to stand on a street-corner bellowing "bring the brothers home" and "get out now." But it is hardly a substitute for a rational policy. Such a policy could not be implemented unless our troops were to abandon their equipment, leaving behind a situation of chaos which would be an indelible stain on this country's record. To press for such a thing is to become part of the problem, not (as they say) part of the solution.

And while mass demonstrations may provide an escape valve for legitimate dissent, amusement for teen-agers, solace for the emotionally distressed and a fertile field of activity for political extremists, we do not think the streets are a proper forum for the conduct of public affairs. This is not a banana republic. We hold elections here at regularly stated intervals. One such was held in 1968. It brought to office Mr. Nixon and several hundred senators and representatives. Mr. Nixon's mandate is rooted in his election, that of the members of the Congress in theirs. Neither has the obligation, constitutional or otherwise, to add the prestige of high office to a demonstration designed to discredit the occupants of those offices.

Nor can it be maintained that the quality of oratory or thought characteristic of such demonstrations is calculated to contribute to the already debased currency of political debate and intellectual exchange. Has any one of the demonstrators of the past fortnight said or done anything likely to improve race relations, heal generational scars, bring a just peace to Southeast Asia or solve any of the myriad problems which each of us faces daily? If so, we did not hear it.

When he was inaugurated, President Nixon called for a lowering of voices. We have taken him and his vice president to task when they have violated this sensible suggestion; both have been doing much better of late. And so, in the main, have the American people. We need more of the same.

Mr. Nixon has made good on every promise he made in respect to Vietnam. We urge the people to give him (and the country) the chance to complete what has been begun, to allow him to end the Southeast Asian venture in a rational fashion. If not with victory, without defeat; if not with honor, then without disgrace; if not with democracy assured, at least with tyranny denied. He must, of course, be judged. But the time and the place for that judgment are not now and in the streets but in November 1972 at the ballot box. That is the American way and it is a good way.

We do not expect those encamped now at West Potomac Park either to hear this appeal or to act favorably on it. They do not revel in the feast of reason. They would destroy what others have built, replacing it with nothing better than their own fantasies. But they are not the Nation, and life—although it sometimes seems that way—is something more than a comic strip; they will not succeed.

For the next three days, let each of our actions be guided by common sense and restraint. Let the authorities act with coolness and firmness, with the knowledge that they have the public's support. In the end, both this city and this Nation will survive. Both have too much going for them to be shaken by the likes of Rennie Davis and his misguided followers.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, since the coming of the automobile in the early 1900's, traffic accidents have claimed the lives of nearly 2 million Americans—nearly twice the number as have all the wars in U.S. history. The toll in disabling injuries and subsequent economic loss is also staggering—now running at an estimated \$9 billion each year.

While the Federal involvement in highway and traffic safety dates back to 1924, it has been only recently that the Congress has zeroed in on the automobile as a target for new safety standards. In 1966, Congress passed the landmark National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, which authorized the Transportation Secretary to set standards and grading procedures for tires, conduct safety research and develop standards on automobiles, and to require manufacturers to conform to safety standards set by the Federal Government. The act created the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—NHTSA—which is an independent agency with two major responsibilities—administering the Highway Safety Act and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Act.

Under the Highway Safety Act, NHTSA sets the standard and allocates Federal matching funds for State and local traffic and driver safety programs. Under the Traffic and Motor Vehicle Act, the agency is authorized to set safety standards for motor vehicles and equipment.

While its ultimate goal is the development of a safe automobile, the NHTSA's more immediate concern is the reduction of highway accidents, the reduction of severe injuries in accidents, and improved probability of surviving and recovering from injury in highway accidents.

To date, NHTSA has issued 34 motor vehicle safety standards. These standards have triggered a growing debate among automobile manufacturers, insurance companies, the consumers, and Members of the Congress. The auto industry charges that the Government is moving too fast, imposing new and expensive regulations without regard for time, or the industry's know-how in meeting those requirements. The insurance industry, which in 1970 paid out \$8 billion in auto accident claims, says the Government is moving too slowly, and that even tougher standards should be imposed. The consumer lobby, which in the past has been surprisingly docile about automobile safety, also is a growing force, urging that new safety standards be implemented quickly.

The most controversial of the standards ordered by NHTSA is the passive-restraint device—a system to protect front-seat passengers in automobiles from serious injury in head-on crashes at 30 miles an hour. The primary device now being considered is an "air bag" which is inflated milliseconds before a

crash by a sensing mechanism in the car. Auto manufacturers have complained that it is too expensive, it has been unreliable in tests, and has little value in collisions other than head-on crashes.

Another device of particular interest to insurance companies is a shock absorbing bumper, to protect vital systems of the car and reduce minor collision damage. Auto manufacturers, who have allocated only about 25 percent of recent price increases to new safety features, still complain they are not being given enough time to develop and implement the change.

The NHTSA is asking that the new bumpers be installed by August 1, 1972, on all new cars. The agency wanted the passive-restraint devices on 1972 models, but postponed the effective date until 1974. Starting with the 1976 models, NHTSA will require that automobile occupants be protected against side collisions, rollovers and angular collisions.

NHTSA has some compelling evidence that motor safety devices are working. In 1970, the agency says, there were 55,300 motor vehicle accident deaths—1,100 fewer than in 1969. At the same time, there was a 5-percent increase in motor vehicle travel in this country, indicating that more people were traveling more miles with more safety in 1970. About a third of those lives which were saved, NHTSA says, were because of collapsible steering columns, improved windshields and by lap and shoulder belts.

HOW MUCH LONGER CAN WE BURN OR BURY?

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post recently published an editorial on the increasingly critical problem of solid waste management and disposal. While the focus of the article is on the difficulties faced by local governments in the Washington metropolitan area, it is symptomatic of the nationwide search for better methods of disposing of mounting piles of solid waste.

My colleague, Hon. GILBERT GUDE, who represents suburban Montgomery County, Md., strongly believes that we need to speed up the development of advanced solid waste technology. Today, in testimony before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, he has urged approval of a substantial increase in funding under the Resource Recovery Act. Congressman GUDE points out that—

A new technology is emerging and local governments are ready to try it if they are shown that advanced methods can work in full-scale systems.

He concludes:

We have a rare opportunity to leapfrog existing technology and to come out on top of the solid waste problem before it buries us.

There is no question but that we must develop a national framework to attack this serious problem. Later this week, I will be reintroducing my Solid Waste

Management Act. Among other things, this legislation would establish a nationwide system of solid waste processing and recycling centers. These regional recycling centers would be financed through a system of disposal taxes, to be levied on products or containers which pose disposal or recycling difficulties. The measure also authorizes an ongoing program of research and development, aimed at improving solid waste disposal techniques and equipment.

Representative GUDE has already indicated his strong support for this type of approach to the solid waste problem and his help in this effort is greatly appreciated. Mr. Speaker, the Eighth Congressional District of Maryland is most fortunate to have as their Representative a man who has repeatedly shown deep concern over the problems of pollution and continually suggests and supports constructive responses.

Mr. Speaker, I include the April 1 editorial from the Washington Post and a copy of Congressman GUDE's May 4 testimony before the House Appropriations Committee to be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1971]
HOW MUCH LONGER CAN WE BURN OR BURY?

According to field correspondent Alex Ward, who has just returned from mostly foliated Forest Heights, Md., there has been a set of secret negotiations between Washington and Prince George's County—also attended by representatives of the two concerned superpowers, the United States and Maryland—that may bring about some sort of detente in the Oxon Cove Jurisdictional Trash War.

Though the session was closed to the press for some ill-defined reason, reliable sources say that officials of the District of Columbia have reportedly agreed tentatively not to dump trash on the section of landfill nearest Forest Heights—whose citizens had complained that the site is a health hazard. You may recall that the war intensified earlier this month when the District government decided on an incursion onto land that Prince George's had barred from city use. Now the land really belonged to the National Park Service, which in turn had said the District could go right ahead.

As we understand it, the latest proceedings were amicable, and Forest Heights sources—namely, Mayor Clifford R. Armhold—said the only area of disagreement is the date on which the District should withdraw from the entire landfill site. (The town and county are holding out for March 31, 1972).

Well, all these tragicomic aspects aside (including any domino theories to which you may subscribe), Greater Washington is likely to experience more skirmishes in the future for solid waste disposal is now a serious national problem that, as much as anything, threatens to undo our environment. As it stands, the nation is generating about 350 million tons of household, industrial and commercial waste each year; some 15 million tons of scrap autos alone are discarded annually.

A comprehensive study of the problem made last year by Automation Industries, Inc., of Los Angeles, estimates that increases in population and per-capita waste generation will increase the amount of household waste 80 per cent by 1982.

What will we do with it all? If we continue as we have for the last 5,000 years or so, we'll make more primitive attempts to burn or bury what we throw away. That would mean groping about for more landfill sites—which we've come to discover are, more often than not, unsanitary. Or, we'll continue to build fancy incinerators that spew any manner of questionable particulate matter—dust, ash,

or maybe worse—into the air that we try to breathe.

That's the grim and expensive outlook unless immediate attention and money are directed to the urgent goal of reducing the volume of wastes, and encouraging their constructive reuse. The first serious effort in this direction came with the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which was aimed at funding a national research and development program and aiding state and local governments in planning and developing new disposal programs.

Since then, ideas and experiments have begun to show that waste may be significantly reduced or reused. The need now is for some regional pilot programs to work out successful systems for the collection, transportation and recycling of waste in forms useful to industry and individuals.

An approach to such a system has been proposed by Automation Industries, whose largest facility is the Vitro Silver Spring Laboratory here. The proposal points out that existing techniques permit the recovery of some 40 per cent of the materials in solid waste, with possibilities for using the rest to generate heat and power. The envisioned system would convert waste into usable cellulose fibers; metal and glass would be separated; and a residue would be fed to a "fluidized bed reactor" for special burning into carbon dioxide, water and a small amount of ash.

New research could then be concentrated on the residue portion of the process, to convert organic materials into things such as cell protein, alcohols and so on; ash could be made into building blocks; and in the long run, other changes in packaging and social habits might even reduce the amount of waste generated in the first place.

We're in no position to know whether this particular proposal contains the best approach to these problems. But the need to speed up experiments in new solid waste disposal systems is becoming devastatingly obvious. Rep. Gilbert Gude (R-Md.) says he intends to push for more legislative efforts in this direction—and certainly the Washington area would be a fine place to begin.

TESTIMONY OF HON. GILBERT GUDE OF MARYLAND

Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful for the opportunity to appear before your subcommittee to discuss the appropriations to implement the Resource Recovery Act of 1970. This legislation was passed unanimously, and was intended to promote the development of advanced solid waste management systems through a program of research and development and assistance to local solid waste projects using new and improved technology.

We authorized a total of \$172 million for this fiscal year. This authorization includes \$152 million for the Office of Solid Waste Management. Funding of about \$29.3 million is proposed in the budget. The remainder of the authorization, \$20 million, was for the Department of the Interior's functions under the act, principally the work being done by the Bureau of Mines. No funds have been requested for the Interior functions under the act. I realize that this item is the responsibility of another subcommittee, but I thought I should mention it to present a complete picture of the proposed appropriations under the act.

I am here today because I do not believe the recommended funding is enough to begin to come to grips with one of our biggest and surely most neglected environmental problems at all levels of government. I hope the committee will consider providing the full funding authorized in the Resource Recovery Act.

Solid waste disposal is costing us \$4.5 billion per year, and the job is growing every day. Fifty years ago, the average American generated a little less than 3 pounds of

trash per day. Now he produces nearly 5.3 pounds and he is expected to produce 8 pounds by 1980. In 1970, we threw away 28 billion bottles, 48 billion cans, 30 million tons of paper, 4 million tons of plastic containers, 100 million tires, and 6.3 million automobiles, to say nothing of mountains of garbage.

Added to this is the ironic fact that cleaner air and cleaner water are going to mean more solid waste as more particulate matter is extracted and better sewage treatment produces more sludge. What on earth are we going to do with it all?

American industry is taking a fresh look at the possibilities of reducing waste by-products through reclaiming and recycling materials, and reinstating returnable containers. These efforts by industry are vital, but they are not what I wish to talk about today.

The critical need for federal funding is to encourage better management of municipal solid wastes, which the President's Council on Environmental Quality calls "the clearest threat to health and the environment." We have been disposing of solid waste in the same old way for about 5,000 years. The Director of New York City's Environmental Protection Agency recently observed that there are only two real differences between our system and the Romans: The Romans wore togas and the trash was dragged off by horses. Instead of excavating old wine jars, tomorrow's archeologists will be digging up pop tops. Today, about 46% of our solid waste is handled by open burning. Another 16% is burned in incinerators, and the remaining 38% becomes so-called "sanitary" landfill or is dumped in the sea.

Not one of these techniques can pass muster in a society that calls itself modern. All are stop gap methods. For example, some believe that landfills in rural areas are the answer. Perhaps we can put Penn Central to work hauling our trash to hinterland. But it seems very doubtful to me that Americans in the countryside are going to be willing to tolerate dumping grounds in their backyards to bail out the cities.

The solid waste problem here in the Washington Metropolitan Area is acute and is repeated across the nation. People are protesting the proposed D.C. incinerator because of potential air pollution. Nobody really likes the idea of more landfill in Prince George's County, or in Montgomery County next to the Gude Nursery—and that includes me!

Local officials are finally looking for alternatives, but there are now no full-scale plants to test and demonstrate the economics of advanced recycling technology. I believe it is essential to fund the Resource Recovery Act at authorized levels that will soon produce more live options in this field.

There are some promising ideas and pilot projects. Let me list a few:

The Bureau of Solid Waste Management has provided grants to a California Company which is developing a system, the CPU-400, to shred solid waste, remove and recycle the rock, metal and glass components, and to use the remaining organic material as a source of energy. I understand that about 3 million of the Fiscal 1972 request is allocated to this project.

I would like to point out that this firm, the Combustion Power Company, was formerly in aerospace engineering. We are all familiar with the employment problems resulting from the winding down of the war and by recent shifts in domestic spending priorities. In hearings last year before the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, on which I serve, we asked representatives of aerospace firms whether they were able to move into environmental fields. Most said that the major problem was the lack of adequate levels of funding for research and development in these fields. The

market is not yet large enough, and government funding is at comparatively low levels in the research and development, as opposed to the construction end of pollution control. The appropriation we are considering today is precisely the kind of program needed to utilize the talents of scientific and engineering personnel no longer employed in defense and aerospace industries.

The Bureau of Mines Metallurgy Research Center at College Park, Maryland operates a pilot project which sorts incinerator residues into various components, using modified mining equipment. This is the Interior Department's project for which no funding has been requested, but it deserves mention as an important part of the federal research effort in this field. Glass ferrous and non-ferrous metals and even gold and silver of marketable quality are sorted out. And the problem of space for disposal is greatly reduced. The whole operation of shredders, grinders, and giant magnets looks like one of Rube Goldberg's wildest dreams. But it works for a plant which could serve a community about the size of Montgomery County. It is claimed that operating costs will run about \$3.52 a ton to process and the reclaimed material can be sold for at least \$12.00 per ton. The Tuscaloosa Metallurgy Research Laboratory is working on developing means of making structural products from glassy materials in the residues.

In my own district, the Vitro Laboratory of Automation Industries has developed a proposal for a total solid waste management system, which would create a national public corporation to handle the collection, transportation, and recycling of waste for return to industry as useful products. The company has sought funding to a comprehensive study of what legislation, economic incentives, and recycling techniques would be required to implement a national system.

These are only a few of the ideas waiting to be tried, and our local governments are looking for new approaches. The Delaware legislature has voted \$1 million for planning in design of a waste recycling plant. They will need \$10 million more to follow it through. Columbus, Georgia is looking for assistance to find an advanced incinerator which would produce usable metal and glass and steam energy. They even hope to sell the incinerator's excess warm water to catfish farms. Apparently catfish thrive on warm water.

My own state of Maryland is looking into pyrolysis techniques proposed by Monsanto Corporation which involves shredding solid waste and heating it to high temperatures in the absence of oxygen. Since there is no oxygen, there is no burning and most of the material is converted to gas. Then the gases are burned, greatly reducing their volume and producing virtually no air pollution. Disposal costs are estimated at about \$10 a ton, but reclaimed materials and heat sales could bring the cost down to between \$4.50 and \$5.00 per ton. Maryland, too, is seeking help from the Office of Solid Waste Management.

In summary, I hope the committee will consider recommending full funding for the Resource Recovery Act. Only education and highways take a larger share of municipal budgets than solid waste disposal. Breakthroughs in this field could mean significant relief to local governments, by improving performance and ultimately cutting the cost of providing an essential service.

Plenty of top flight scientific and technical people are available for an expanded research and development effort where their talents are needed. Some promising new approaches are already emerging, and local governments at last seem ready to try them if they can be shown that advanced technology will work economically in full-scale systems. With adequate funding of the Resource Recovery Act, we can exploit a rare opportunity to leapfrog existing technology and come out on top of the solid waste problem before it buries us.

MIKVA SPEAKS FOR HATCHER

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today is the primary election for Mayor in Gary, Ind. A number of us in the House are supporting Mr. Richard Hatcher primarily because he has given new leadership in the fight to save our cities. His continued efforts to revitalize Gary have encouraged all who are committed to this fight, whites as well as blacks. The great work he has been doing under the toughest of circumstances is known around the country, but especially in our Nation's Capital. This leadership is extremely important to the citizens of his city because in Washington D.C. Mayor Hatcher's voice is heard and respected. I am hoping that today's vote will bring his re-nomination so his voice will continue to be heard.

Dick Hatcher's impressive record in creating low- and middle-income housing in his city is ample testimony to the realism of his order of priorities—his first objective has been to directly improve the lives of the citizens of Gary. His concentration on manpower programs to reduce unemployment further shows his responsible leadership in combating urban poverty. He has been a politician who has truly been for the people. His courage and dedication in defying the machine wanting to control him or kick him out is a model for all with political aspirations.

A survey of the programs he has initiated makes it obvious that Dick Hatcher will continue to strive toward the improvement of the individual, providing him with a job and a decent place to live, with adequate education for his children. He has been a Mayor every city would be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, one of our most able colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mikva, was recently in Gary as the featured speaker at a testimonial dinner for the mayor. His moving statement stands as a tribute to Richard Hatcher and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE ABNER J. MIKVA OF ILLINOIS, AT THE TESTIMONIAL FOR MAYOR RICHARD HATCHER, GIVEN BY THE MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES OF GLEN PARK IN GARY, IND., ON APRIL 21, 1971

I am here tonight to talk about your Mayor, Mayor Hatcher. As some of you may know, I come from a city which is famous for its mayor. In fact, we just re-elected him for his 5th four year term, and so, after 20 years of observing this Mayor cum laude I consider myself something of an expert on the subject of Mayor-watching. And I'm here to tell you that yours is one of the best.

It is not easy, this sport of evaluating Mayors. How do you determine whether he is a good one or not? It seems to me there are several ways to measure how good a job a Mayor is doing, one which is irrelevant, the second of which is useful but unreliable, and the third of which is the one that really counts.

First, you can sit in your living room or on your porch and look around and count

up the problems of the city, and blame them all on the guy in office. To the extent that the city approximates your idea of perfection, that's how perfect or imperfect the Mayor must be.

By this standard there isn't a public official in the country worth a nickel—mayors, Congressmen, Senators, and even Presidents—because life in America today is far from perfect. But government is the art of the possible, and it is neither realistic nor very constructive to pretend that the men in office are responsible for causing all the problems of the city or the country.

A second way to measure a Mayor is to ask "what's he done for me lately?" By this approach, each community or area of the city adds up how many dead trees have been cut down and replaced with new seedlings, how many parks have been built or refurbished, how many streets have been repaved, and so on. Presumably, the higher the total, the better the mayor. On this scale, Mayor Hatcher has done an admirable job in his freshman term.

He has repaved 924 blocks, more than 7 miles of street. He has built additional housing for the senior citizens of Gary. More than 500 vacant lots and alleys have been cleared and cleaned. Numerous parks and playgrounds have been improved, including quite a few here in Glen Park. Pitman Square has been blacktopped, and additional recreational facilities installed. Gilroy Stadium has been substantially improved. The playground at 51st and Indiana has a new sun-shelter.

More than 3,000 dead elm trees have been cut down around the city, and replaced with an equal number of new trees. Something like 11,000 abandoned cars, which are not only unsightly but represent a potential danger to children as well, have been removed in 1970 alone.

In the area of housing, the Department of Housing and Urban Development reported in 1968, when Mayor Hatcher first came into office, that 47% of all the housing in the city of Gary was substandard, meaning that it did not even meet the minimum standards of livability set by the federal government. Since his election, Mayor Hatcher has built 2,687 new housing units, with 800 more planned in the near future. In addition, 2,397 substandard units have been rehabilitated and now meet the federal government's criteria for a decent place to live.

When Mayor Hatcher took office, he inherited one of the worst crime problems of any city in the country. At that time, Gary had a violent crime rate higher than that of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and several other larger cities. Since that time, the crime rates in those cities have risen steadily, and are now as much as 30% higher than they were in 1968. During the same period, Gary's crime rate has remained fairly constant, showing a statistical increase of about 6%, virtually all of which can be attributed not to additional crimes being committed but to more efficient detections and reporting by the police. And speaking of policemen, Mayor Hatcher has increased the number of policemen in the city by almost 50%, and has provided them with a \$1000 pay raise.

The trouble with this second approach to evaluating mayors is that it is inadequate. First of all, there will never be enough to go around. If there were an unlimited supply of funds and of competent administrators, it would be reasonable to judge a mayor on how effectively he utilized those resources to solve the problems of the city. But in reality, there is never enough money or manpower to properly deal with all the problems, so a certain failure rate is built into the job. Mayor Hatcher has done an outstanding job of obtaining the maximum resources available, thus making it possible for him to do the things he has done. The art of grants-

manship, of knowing what federal funds are available and applying for them in a manner calculated to obtain approval, is a difficult but essential art for an urban mayor these days. Mayor Hatcher has been very successful in bringing federal funds into Gary, money which would be very much more visible to you if it weren't forthcoming. Admittedly, it hasn't been enough to solve all the problems, but it never will be. Without the funds which have been obtained, Gary's problems would be far worse.

Let me finally get to the third criterion for evaluating urban mayors—the one which I think is the only really sound one in the long run. It is an intangible one, a spiritual one, almost. That is, whether the mayor really cares; Cares about the city and the people of the city and the problems of all the people of the city, and whether the city he seeks to build is one that is only alabaster, or whether it has a soul. Whether he seeks to move toward a single society—or whether he is willing to pit race vs race, ethnic group vs ethnic group. In this regard, you are fortunate to have a mayor of the dedication of Dick Hatcher.

You may be troubled about the problems of Gary (and I hope you are, for I know Mayor Hatcher is). You may feel that more should be done to improve your own neighborhood, Glen Park. But you at least know that your mayor cares, and that his dream is worthy of a decent city.

More than anything else, our cities need hope. They need people and Mayors who love the city and who want to make it a better place to live and work in. Unfortunately, too many city dwellers in the past, including public officials, have been people who never really liked cities. They came to the city from the country because that is where the jobs were, or at least the hope of a job. But they continued to hold to country living as the ideal, and so sought to make the city more like the country. The culmination of this anti-urban bias among urban dwellers has been seen in the revolutionary migration to the suburbs in the 1960's. At long last, increased affluence and better transportation to and from job sites made it possible for a lot of people to live as they had always wanted—living in a non-urban setting while maintaining their job in the city, which provided the money to pay for the second car and the lawn mower and the landscaping and the various costs of life in suburbia. But an interesting thing has been happening. The people who fled to the suburbs have been finding out that suburbia was not all they had cracked up to be. The homogeneity of living on a tree lined street full of houses filled with people just like themselves set a tone of boredom and blandness which the children recognized and rebelled from even before their parents had figured out why they still weren't happy. This new environment lacked the vitality, the crazyquilt variety, the constant activity and experience provided by the city. The problem now is where do we go from here. Because of the rapid and extensive flight of the upper middle class and professionals (most of whom were white) out of the city, the problems of the cities worsened rapidly. More people, with less money, in less housing, and fewer jobs. The people who migrated to suburbia took the tax base of the city with them. Moreover, in most instances they continued to work downtown and to demand and deplete the city's services without contributing proportionately to its resources. Because in many instances these people had little stake in the living conditions or the schools in the city, they allowed them to deteriorate.

The problem for most cities today is how to reverse the deterioration of the inner cities. A recent study warned that our big cities are in danger of becoming ghost towns if we do not act to prevent this. To do so, two things are necessary. First, understanding of the

real problems, as opposed to the symptoms of those problems. And second, the dedication and application to finding solutions. Mayor Hatcher has offered leadership on both these fronts, and as a result Gary is far from a ghost town today. Unemployment in Gary is not as severe as in many other cities. Industry is not fleeing the city as it is in New York for example, thus compounding the city's problems by removing jobs and tax funds, both of which are in short enough supply already.

The problem of today's cities must be attacked from the bottom up, much as a doctor must treat a victim of an auto accident. If the man has cuts and bruises, broken bones, and has stopped breathing, obviously the most severe problem must be dealt with first. Stopping the bleeding and setting the bones will be to little avail if oxygen is not immediately restored to the brain and the blood cells. First he must begin breathing again, then the bones can be set and the cuts treated. Similarly, when a limited amount of federal money or local tax funds are available to deal with a whole range of complex urban problems, someone must be in a position to identify and understand the entire condition of the patient, not just one or another symptom or injury. He must then insure that the first efforts made are directed to the most severe conditions, in order that the other efforts are not futile. Then, when the patient's critical condition is stabilized and the breathing is restored to the body, additional attention can be directed usefully to the remaining woes of the patient.

This is perhaps the most difficult, and certainly the most unpopular part of a Mayor's job. He must maintain broad perspective, and avoid catering to one group or another simply for political considerations. He must objectively examine the patient as a whole, and decide where the emergency aid is first to be applied. It is in the nature of things that each group, each neighborhood, each industry is acutely aware of its own problems, and is not so concerned with those of the others. It is the job and the responsibility of the Mayor to transcend sectional or special interest considerations, and to attack the problems in a coordinated, logical fashion. He will not make a great number of friends this way, but it is the responsibility of the citizenry to understand and appreciate that hard choices must be made and that the needs of the city must take precedence over the needs of any single area or group. To the extent that these fundamental needs of the city are attended to all the residents benefit, either directly or indirectly. Any other approach would leave us like the patricians of France who devoted the entire resources of the country to gratifying their own desires and needs, at the expense of the peasants. Then when the peasants arose in 1789, the ruling class sat in their houses amid the flames and the bloodletting wondering why everyone was so upset.

Gary has a great deal to be proud of in the stewardship of Mayor Hatcher. He has refused to ignore reality and has avoided the politically expedient course of attending to ignore reality and has avoided the politically expedient course of attending to the needs of the powerful at the expense of the city and the populace. I am pleased to be able to offer Mayor Hatcher this tribute of words tonight, and I envy all of you, who are in a position to pay tribute to your mayor in a much more meaningful fashion—by joining hands with him in making Gary a great city in which every citizen can live in peace, in prosperity, and in happiness, and together with his brother.

To quote from the Talmud: "The day is short, the work is great, the Master of the household is urgent. It is not incumbent upon thee to finish the job, but neither art thou free to desist therefrom."

LEADERSHIP

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of attending the southern regional meeting of the Federation of Republican Women held in Gatlinburg, Tenn., in my district.

Mrs. Gladys O'Donnell, president of the National Federation of Republican Women, was guest speaker of the session, which was the ninth in a series of workshop-type meetings the NFRW is holding throughout the country this year.

Mrs. O'Donnell, a native of California, has been actively involved in politics since 1936, when she served as an alternate delegate to the Republican National Convention. Since then she has attended several conventions and in 1968 she addressed the convention in Miami Beach, Fla.

Delegates from Tennessee, Kentucky, and Arkansas participated in the 2-day session in Gatlinburg, with Mrs. Dorothy Clawson serving as general chairman.

The Republican Party in Tennessee has always known Mrs. Clawson to be a hard and dedicated worker—one who can be counted on to get the job done.

The success of the recent meeting in Gatlinburg is due in large part to Mrs. Clawson's untiring efforts. She and other Republican women from my district and my State joined hands to make the meeting a memorable occasion.

I submit for inclusion Mrs. O'Donnell's speech, entitled "Leadership," available for readers of the RECORD:

LEADERSHIP

(By Gladys O'Donnell)

General Mark Clark, in describing leadership, said:

"All my life, as a soldier and educator, I have been engaged in a search for a mysterious intangible. All nations seek it constantly because it is the key to greatness—often to survival. That intangible is the elusive and electric quality known as leadership. However you define this quality, one thing is certain—there is never enough of it available."

Leadership is not necessarily good. Within the span of our memories there are many men who led their followers, and their countries, into monstrous dead-ends of no return—Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Mao, Castro—and many a lesser man on a lesser scale. People—especially young people—often mistake notoriety, boldness of action, and eccentric and erotic violation of accepted standards of conduct as leadership—a kind of courage—when actually it is a cover-up for personal failure.

We have seen these people in action with many of our young protest groups—men whose youth is rapidly vanishing and is in some cases long gone—have been mistaken as leaders simply because they believe in nothing—reject everything.

The quality of life in our country, and our image before the world, is diminished every time the Abbie Hoffmans, Jerry Rubins, Wm. Kuntzlers, S.D.S., or Black Panthers appear on our campuses or on television as representatives of dissent in America.

There has always been dissent in America and it is a good and healthy thing. Each generation has felt it as the impelling force to action—to improve our way of life. They

have worked within the framework of the Constitution and democratic processes to advance our nation. And we have succeeded to a degree never before equalled. This is not to say that our problems have all been solved—far from it—but it is to say that we are aware of our shortcomings and work to conquer them. So, while we know that much remains to be done, let us never hesitate to put down those whose quest for personal power is rooted in the destruction of everything Americans have built.

It is small comfort to review our own mistakes—but a necessary exercise (especially concerning youth).

We have tried to give our children happiness by surrounding them with all of the things indulgent parents could provide.

We were so eager to give, we denied them the satisfactions of achievement—those personal triumphs—however small—that build character and give zest and fulfillment to life. In the procedure they *lost their "worlds to conquer"*. The strong will survive our good intentions—but many have taken tragic detours.

Dr. Rolf A. Weil, President of Chicago's Roosevelt University, recently wrote:

"This generation, for better or for worse, has been raised in a highly permissive environment. Values are not accepted on faith or by parental authority. There is an experimental and questioning spirit—a desire to learn from experience."

"It may be costly to reject the wisdom of the ages, but the young have a desire to make it on their own—even if it means rediscovering the wheel. They tend to reject materialism, at least during their college years. This is particularly true of young people from middle and upper class backgrounds who can enjoy a short period of simulated poverty, secure in the knowledge that their families will be standing by to shower them lovingly with necessities or luxuries whenever called upon to do so."

And that is exactly what we do—rush in to rescue them from reality—again—dismayed afterward to be rejected—again. No wonder they say insanity is hereditary—you can get it from your children.

There are some very important things you cannot give to people, things money cannot buy—like self-confidence, self-respect, honor, dignity and pride. Without them nothing else means very much.

Now, when we need it most, we hear from Dr. Gallup, and whatever your opinion of polls, you will like this one:

1. Students in the great majority shun extremism.

2. Students of the new left give a favorable rating to the *Ku Klux Klan*.

3. Students of the far right think highly of the Weathermen and the Black Panthers.

Which means that extremism brings people full circle—the far right and the far left *can't really tell the difference*.

This survey may indicate that change is in the air—what *TIME* magazine calls "*The Cooling of America*." Or it may mean that the economic slow-down is bringing home to youth some of the *hard* facts of life. Whatever it is—it can only be beneficial.

There is no way to have the good life without carrying responsibility—it simply does not roll ready made off a government production line. Ours may *not* be the best of all possible worlds, but as long as we have freedom to aspire, to work, to dream, and to achieve, we can hope that we may eventually make it so. It was Robert Browning who said: "Ah, that man's reach should exceed his grasp—or what's a Heaven for?"

So it has been since the beginning of time and so, we pray, it may be until the end of time, for herein lies the hope of all humanity.

If this sounds idealistic, it is. But it is essentially what leadership—as we speak of it—is all about. Individuals with what General

Clark called that mysterious intangible, that electric quality, can translate idealism into reality. They are leaders—and leaders have been performing this alchemy since the dawn of history.

We have no reason to believe that America, which has been so richly blessed with genius and talent, should suddenly stand helpless before the problems of today. A people with the imagination and creativeness to master the air, harness the tides, control the atom, and land men on the moon, possess strength and resourcefulness in heroic measure. Whatever our problems are, in the vernacular, we may not "dig it", but we can "cut it." Triumph over adversity is "our thing"!

We begin with leadership. Not the guidance of one man or one group of individuals, but the collective force of a free people galvanized into action on common problems—what President Nixon has endeavored to build. The history of America is not a history of what government has done for people, but of what people have done for themselves and for each other. Today's problems demand action in the same tradition and in splendid measure. They require mobilization of the social and economic strength of every sector of our society and a special mandate to the Nation's women. This is where *our Federation possesses enormous potential*. A half million women can exert decisive influence in all of our problem areas—if we are united and *work together*. Can you think of a single problem that could hold its own against 500,000 determined women?

In my over three years as president of the NFRW I have been impressed by the inherent strength of our membership—the genuine talents in so many, the vision and innovation of their leadership. Our challenge is to bring the full force of this ability to focus on the problems of our time and a victory for our Party in 1972.

At our recent Board Meeting in Denver a full day of reports by State presidents and chairmen reflected the range of club activities. Great emphasis was rightly given to our greatest national resource—our fine *young people*—and bringing them into the mainstream. And beginning early to create an awareness of who they are—since this seems to be in question. *They are Young Americans*—young citizens—heirs to all this country's greatness as well as our weaknesses—and architects of its future. Eleven and a half million of them between 18 and 21 will be eligible to vote in the Presidential election in 1972.

YOUNG VOTERS CLINICS

Who could be better qualified than our Republican women to guide them in:

1. The value of this privilege of self government.

2. The need to know what they are voting for and why.

3. The responsibility to exercise their votes.

4. I would like to suggest that each club provide these young voters with an Election Calendar on a 3 x 5 card carrying the dates of the elections in their states plus some words to inspire respect for the privilege.

Another Area—Special Emphasis—Community Service—Only if the people address themselves to modern problems—crime, drugs, environment—can they be solved.

This is where leadership in our own neighborhoods must be mobilized and polarized. We have long been aware of the destructive force of nuclear weapons—by now we should be aware of the danger of poisoning by the wastes of our affluence. *Every citizen can do something*—and every citizen is morally responsible to help.

Read our *Community Service Manual* for ideas—and read FOCUS for news about what clubs in other states are doing.

There is no other area where results are so immediate, where the goals are so achiev-

able or more rewarding. This activity especially lends itself to involvement of young people. Recruit them for week-end assaults on littered areas—shopping centers—picnic grounds, etc. Start a plant-a-tree campaign.

Burt Bacharach sings "What the World Needs Now is Love, Sweet Love." Actually what the world needs now is a good clean-up job—in every sense—physically, morally and spiritually.

3 *Legislative Areas*—where voices and leadership of America's women should be paramount, for upon women rests responsibility for survival of the moral values of our society.

First—Two Bills introduced by the late Senator Everett Dirksen:

1. *Voluntary School Prayer Amendment*.

2. *Anti-Pornography Bill*.

Both bear directly upon the moral climate of our country—both are bottled up by two professional bleeding hearts of the opposition:

Congressman Emanuel Celler, Chairman, House Judiciary Committee.

Senator Birch Bayh—Senate Subcommittee on Judiciary.

Hearings on both issues—refused by both Committees. If they are ever held—*bundles of petitions* bearing thousands of names—which were circulated by Federation women across the nation that I shall present as evidence of public concern in both areas, and support for action.

Third Legislative Objective upon which we should target is the Equal Rights Amendment. This has been both misrepresented and misunderstood. It too is a bill which Democrat Representative Celler denied hearings, saying that it would get out of Committee over his dead body. Well, we did get it out of Committee—with a discharge petition—and the Congressman is still around—but *he is 84 and we have hopes!*

The Equal Rights Amendment is essentially economic. Women represent 40% of the nation's work force, and if you wonder why they are unhappy, take a look at any payroll.

These are some of the things women can do in these times of dislocation, uncertainty and confusion—to restore order and sanity.

The women of our nation *can change the world* and we can save our values—our society. We are a vital part of today. We must be a *moving force* for tomorrow. Instead of submitting passively to the destructive litany of what is wrong with America, let us miss no opportunity to tell what is good and right about this great nation. And whatever needs to be done to *improve the quality of life* and provide *opportunity for the less fortunate*, let us do those things remembering that we will accomplish nothing by destroying what we have.

Let us remember too, that only by helping people to help themselves can we build the self-reliance, self-respect and sense of fulfillment that truly give purpose to life, and keep our nation strong, and keep us free.

There is a great tendency these days to miss the first article of faith in America's beginnings. It was to create and sustain an environment in which mankind's universal longing to be free could be realized. We have grown so accustomed to this blessing as a matter of course, that we abuse it and ignore it.

Maxwell Anderson wrote a great play, years ago. It was called "*Valley Forge*". In it he had George Washington saying "this liberty will seem easy by and by when nobody has to die to get it."

Countless Americans have died to preserve it, and in a hostile, suspicious and dangerous world, we dare not forget the price paid for the "rights" we enjoy. This responsibility rests upon the shoulders of every American—and our generation will accept it in full measure.

DONALD T. REGAN ADDRESSED THE EXECUTIVES CLUB OF THE GREATER BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, Donald T. Regan, chairman of the board of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner, and Smith, Inc., recently addressed the Executives Club of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce. I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues. My reason will become quite clear when Mr. Regan's remarks are read. He is a man who is aware of the need for policing his own industry in order to prevent unnecessary Government intervention. He is a man who realizes that his is the type of industry which necessarily requires a certain amount of Government regulation. It is chairmen of boards around the country that have made our American free enterprise system the best system in the world.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY DONALD T. REGAN

Good afternoon. I'm delighted to be back in Boston again. As some of you know, I went to that small university across the river about 30 years ago. I recall the experience with great pleasure, probably heightened by two intervening developments—a long absence, and residence in New York. There's nothing new about discontent with New York life—about 75 years ago, William James called New York "the permanent earthquake condition." But coming back here reminds me that cities can have virtues as well as deficiencies.

Today, I would like to start my talk with someone else's words rather than my own. So, let me quote: "I don't think we have a capitalistic system now. There are too many government controls over the market mechanism, too many subsidies, and far too much oligopoly and sharing of monopoly over the market mechanism." The speaker went on to argue that government power should not be used to protect corporations from competition, which led him to the intriguing and very capitalistic conclusion that "if power is going to be responsible, it has got to be insecure."

Now, if you had to guess the identity of the man I am quoting, I suppose you might pick the head of a great corporation—perhaps you might choose James Roche of General Motors. In fact, the man I quoted is a kind of a walking anathema to Roche. He is Ralph Nader. You can see that, philosophically at least, Nader oscillates on our wavelength.

The trouble with those of us who defend capitalism is that we don't appear at the bulwarks until the bugles sound. When we see the capitalistic system under full-scale attack, we rush to the battlement to defend it. But we do not give sufficient and continuous time and attention to explaining and, if you like, to preaching capitalism's merits. Thus there comes a sense of slack, instead of the dynamic tension that I believe is necessary. I do not suggest that we should seek to glorify ourselves. In the old Pennsylvania Station in New York stood an imposing statue of a railway president, with his overcoat over his arm and a blueprint rolled up in his hand. Incidentally, the man was A. D. Cassatt, grandfather of Tony Cassatt, whose firm merged with Merrill Lynch some years back. Monuments such as the one to A. D. Cassatt would be ludicrous today—

especially since today's railroad executive would have to be depicted with a bag and an airline ticket in his hand, probably going to Washington.

You may recall Winston Churchill's famous remark about democracy: "It is the very worst political system in the world—except for all the others." Much the same can be said for capitalism. And when the system acquits itself well, we businessmen should be the first to point that out.

Let me be more explicit. Just about a year ago, if you happened to work on Wall Street, you had to hack a path to your office through the gloom. Alarm was in the air. The most cited statistics on the Street was not the Dow Jones Industrial Average, although that was gloomy enough, but rather the number of firms in the securities business that were failing. One hundred and fifteen firms—or 70 or 80, the number varies—were being forced out of existence, and it was all very frightening. We were told we were living in "a state of anomie," defined as "the anxiety of feeling there is no bottom." I recall a character in a Joseph Conrad novel who went around with a charge of explosive in his pocket. He was all wired up, prepared to blow himself to bits—and, of course, to take a few bystanders with him—the moment anything went wrong. For a while, Wall Street had that kind of mentality: it could not change or adapt; in case of trouble it could only go up in smoke.

The atmosphere now is quite different. Few except the people personally damaged are lamenting the passing of those 115 firms. Indeed, the current view about those recently departed is typified by a remark made by Voltaire, when asked for comment on the death of a contemporary. Voltaire said: "He was a staunch patriot, a talented writer, a loyal friend, and a devoted husband and father—provided he is really dead." This change of attitude can be easily explained. Last year was bad. This year looks pretty good. The difference accounts for the restoration of the old confidence.

But the competitive, free enterprise system has not gotten its due. What was at work last year was a deep and significant force: the self-correcting mechanism of a market economy. Wall Street was riddled with inefficient firms, many of them comparable to Mom and Pop candy store operations. They were under-capitalized. What capital there was had poor quality. Many firms lacked professional management. All were protected by a fixed price structure, which effectively prevented the more efficient from passing the savings on to their customers.

But the mechanism managed to work despite all the protective layers. And the process was surprisingly misunderstood at the time. Many people then seemed to believe that the capitalistic system was supposed to be riskless. But of course if it were that, it could not correct itself, and so it could not work. We would then have to live with the planners of a controlled economy. To my mind, that would be the greatest risk of all.

Looking at the present in the light of all this, we can see that lots of debris has been blown away. We are re-building with mechanisms that are markedly improved. Stronger firms can afford new capital investment, and that will mean more improvements still.

The cause of a lot of 1970's troubles dated back to the big volume years of 1968 and early 1969. Wall Street firms were bringing in lots of business through the front door, but they could not process it properly through the back. A costly and sometimes fatal log jam built up.

Let me explain for a moment how we measure the dimensions of the log jam. Securities owed to others following a sale must be delivered on the fifth business day from the initiation of the transaction. At the worst point on record, December of 1968, these "fails to deliver" came to the total of

\$4.1 billion. To keep the matter in perspective, you have to remember that what these figures represent is a fail to deliver securities within five days—in other words, delays beyond the legally set five-day limit. The great majority of such fails are resolved within a few days after that time.

Now look at where we are today. The first quarter of 1971 saw the largest volume for three months on record on the New York Stock Exchange—a total of 1.1 billion shares changed hands. You may also be interested to know that the ten biggest trading days in history, on which 21 million shares or more were traded, also came in the first quarter of this year. The quarter's total of 1.1 billion shares compares with around 845 million for the second biggest quarter in history—the second quarter of 1968. Yet in March of this year fails to deliver came to \$1.74 billion, compared with that \$4.1 billion in December 1968.

Now I draw two conclusions from the present level of fails. One is that the securities industry has a lot of improvements yet to make. The other is that it is working better than it did two years ago.

Wall Street's difficulties in processing paper track back to the continued existence of that decorative but destructive piece of paper, the stock certificate. That piece of paper is encumbered with traditions that concern not only brokers, but also bankers and lawyers; its physical possession is essential in myriad ways to fiduciary, secured lending, taxation and bankruptcy practices. In its seemingly endless journeys, it drags a long train of related pieces of paper. It has more potential offspring than a Delaware shad.

Today, member firms of the NYSE subscribe to a growingly effective mechanism called the Central Certificate Service. This service handles stock certificates somewhat in the way gold is moved at Fort Knox—that is, although ownership of the certificate changes, they never actually leave the vaults in which they are stored. Over \$23 billion worth of certificates were handled by the Central Certificate Service in the first quarter of 1971. A lot of excess movement of paper is thus eliminated.

A committee called BASIC, made up of members of the banking and brokerage industries, has been at work on this matter of the stock certificate for some time. Much too slow at first, it now seems to be picking up speed. I get somewhat impatient when I hear that several years may be required before more processing is done electronically. It did not take the banks anything like that long to move to the use of magnetic ink on their checks. But the point is that the strings tying us to the stock certificate gradually are being cut. That spells revolution.

So do changes in our pricing structure. Partly because of the fixed-price system, a good deal of brokerage business has been escaping the floor of the New York Stock Exchange and going to other markets. As water finds its own level, so customers go where the price is right.

This movement away from the Big Board has led us all to re-think our concept about what a stock exchange really is. Essentially, we are discovering, an exchange is not a building or a floor or a geographic point. It is really only a system of communications about prices and trades—communications that must move in milliseconds, and prices that must be published, true, but still essentially only a system of communications, enabling people to buy and sell in public. We foresee a central marketplace, a kind of coalescence of all markets, adequately regulated to assure customers of the best prices, with no secrets kept. And I, for one, don't care much where they put the computers.

A step is being taken in this direction with the advent of Nasdaq, a quotation system that is centralizing the vast and scattered

over-the-counter markets. Nasdaq brings customers quick quotations on some 2,500 stocks, significantly including 32 that are also listed on the New York Stock Exchange. In existence only a few months, it is working very well, and it also spells revolution.

All this has far-reaching importance. What we are discussing here are the basic workings of our capital-raising markets, the heart-beat of our economic system. Keynes found that the free enterprise system's most glaring deficiency was the failure of savings, by which he also meant profits, to pass over smoothly into new investment. It is just that critical conjunction that I am now talking about—that is, the way Wall Street handles the money that becomes new investment, and the price that it charges for the handling.

Obviously, we have a great deal further to go before we can even begin to be satisfied. Permit me to become technical for just a moment to illustrate the point. Right now, Nasdaq does not carry instant information on actual transactions, so that the last sale price of a stock traded over the counter is still not immediately available to a customer. In the absence of such information, a regulation of the New York Stock Exchange that forbids short sales on what we call a down tick—meaning when the last trade took place at a lower price than the previous trade—cannot be applied. That is dangerous. Ways must be found to apply even-handed regulations to all these markets, these communication centers as they emerge.

In terms of our pricing structure, also, more must be done. The rates for brokerage services are still mostly fixed. Recently, rates were cut free, and became competitive, for transactions with a value of over \$500,000. Above that level brokers are competing—not without a certain amount of confusion, but still competing. Firms are posting different prices and offering different services—a healthy forward step. It has long been my view that we must be entirely free of this fixed price system, all the way up and down the line, so that the benefits of competition will not be extended to one group and denied to another.

But the fixed-price system still hobbles us. A year ago, when we were afflicted by that mood of anomie, the industry wrung a pricing concession from the SEC. A service charge of \$15, or 50% of the commission rate if that amount were smaller, was imposed on all transactions. That was intended, of course, to keep those sinking firms from going down for the third time. Now, however, with the volume of transactions at record highs, the service charge, which is still in effect, is inevitably coming in for a good deal of criticism. John Moss of California, one of the most competent and effective members of the House of Representatives, who has for years served on various committees that affect our industry, is pressing the SEC either to justify or to eliminate the service charge.

That service charge has meant tens of millions to Merrill Lynch. Despite my respect for such a sum of money, I call now for the end to that service charge. Let us indeed end it. And at the same time let us be rid of the whole artificial and encumbering structure of fixed prices. Competition, and the corrective mechanism of free enterprise, will see that the price is right.

As for that security blanket, the stock certificate, more has to be done there, too. I won't be satisfied until it is eliminated completely. When you receive your bank statement, you know the bank holds for your account the total that the statement shows. You need no certificate of ownership beyond that. You don't ask to see your pile of money stashed away somewhere in a little box. I believe the ownership of securities must someday be validated in the same way.

You understand that Wall Street is by

no means in agreement with me in all these matters. But naturally I believe I am right. You may recall the story about the difference between a neurotic and psychotic. The psychotic contends that two plus two equal five. The neurotic says: "no, two plus two equal four—but I can't stand it." That kind of reluctance to face reality—in this case, the simple reality that the time of club mentality and protected market has passed—can still be found on the Street. But the cracks in the monolith are showing up every day.

So, the on-going operation of the self-correcting market mechanism has done Wall Street a lot of good. But let me add quickly that this corrective process is like an ever-flowing river. I am most assuredly not saying that Wall Street has no more troubles, or that no more Wall Street firms will collapse. Perhaps they will—I don't know. I only suggest at the beginning of 1971, we have succeeded at least in seeding the old with the new.

Still, the whole job cannot be accomplished by the industry alone. For good and sufficient reason, we are a very closely regulated industry. And I believe we are straining against the bonds of regulation, in the same way as the communications industry and the banking industry and the energy industry are doing. This is not because we seek to throw off regulation, and mulct a helpless public. It is because we are changing at a revolutionary pace—yet we are regulated by methods belonging to the era that we are leaving behind. As good capitalists, I think we have the right to ask the regulatory bodies to change along with us, in everyone's interest.

Over the next couple of years, the securities industry is likely to be caught in the glare of government investigations. The two chambers of Congress and the SEC are all pledged to throw the spotlight on us. In the interest of fairness, and for the sake of the public and our industry, the probing spotlight should swing wide enough to light up some of the government's own musty corners. Business claims no immunities. Bureaucracies should claim none.

The form, organization, and methods of the SEC have been essentially unchanged for too long. It is made up of an appointed chairman and five commissioners, each of whom has one vote. The commissioners are served by a staff of civil servants, many of whom have what amounts to lifetime tenure. For years now there has been a kind of underground debate going on about whether the commissioners or the staff wield more power. The commissioners themselves are unhappy. One of them, James Needham, recently called for a single administrator to replace the multi-member mechanism, which he said, "impedes the ability of the agency adequately to respond to the growing needs of the securities industry." Similar recommendations were made by the Ash Commission. And Manny Cohen, a distinguished former chairman of the SEC, pointed out last month that the SEC is "in bad shape" because of "budget and personnel problems."

The President has just appointed a new chairman of the SEC, William J. Casey. With his advent a new opportunity opens up for new and better relationships between the SEC and the industry it oversees. The brokerage industry is changing and accommodating, is prepared to admit its mistakes of the past and is eager to gear for the markets of the future. The challenge to the commission is to respond in kind—to regulate for the future, not the past.

Of course the SEC cannot operate properly, if as Manny Cohen said, staff members "can't get on a train to conduct an investigation outside of Washington" because they can't afford it. That sounds a bit too frugal to me. For fiscal 1970, the SEC had a total budget of \$21.9 million. But, unlike most

other government agencies, the SEC also generated revenue: it submitted to the Treasury about \$15.5 million from fees charged for registration of securities, for charges on the volume of transactions on stock exchanges, and for fees for certain broker-dealer registrations. In the past, for example in fiscal 1969, the SEC has actually turned into the Treasury amounts larger than its total budget—in business terms, it made a profit.

Still, the fees charged are very modest. For registration of securities, the fee is one fiftieth of 1% of the total amount of the offering. I believe the industry is in a position where no one would be materially damaged if those fees were doubled. In that event, the SEC might feel free to ask, and to get, more money from the Congress. Staff members could afford to take trains. I think that would mean better regulation for a changing industry, and I favor it. Merrill Lynch won't object—perhaps strangely, we are willing to feed the hand that bites us.

Let me conclude with a word about the economy and the markets as we read them now. You'll be pleased to hear that we do not predict the stock market at Merrill Lynch—we have not been in the business all these years without learning something. It is said of mules that they will work for you for ten years in return for a chance to kick you once. Some such understanding of life's hazards, I think, lies behind our policy of refusing to guess where the Dow Jones Industrial Average is going to be at the end of the year. Our prediction would only come back to kick us later on. Also, our caution comes from agreement with the sage who said "there's nothing stable in the world; uproar is your only music."

Still, perhaps I can shed a little light. Generally, despite some disappointments in the last couple of months, we still believe that the fundamental trends of demand in the economy are strong. Final sales of cars and the rate of housing starts are both moving upward in an encouraging pattern. The gap between real disposable income and real purchases is narrowing—which is another way of saying that the volume of consumer goods buying is advancing to a level of about 3% above a year ago. Disposable income is growing in real terms despite the recession. And the rate of increase of the consumer price index has come down to an annual rate of less than 3 percent.

If the consumer shows more confidence, that will give the economy a big boost.

On the less exuberant side, we are worried about the prospect of an escalating budgetary deficit. We do not agree with the Administration's "1065" target for the GNP for this year; our estimates run closer to 1045. That brings us to a projected budgetary deficit of around \$21 or \$22 billion. While there is no doubt that the economy needs considerable budgetary stimulus, that strikes us as just about as much as it can take. If the deficit gets greater, either because of a tax cut or added government expenditures, we'll be worried that the increased profits and decreased inflationary pace that we project for the third and fourth quarters of this year may be jeopardized.

The key to sound growth is productivity. Although it is perking up, with about a 3% increase in the first quarter, we have yet to see the strong, sustained improvement that is needed. If productivity were to go to 4 percent, for example, that would bring labor costs down to a 3 percent rate—a sound basis for future expansion. Productivity more than any other indicator will be the determinant of the immediate future.

Interest rates right now are at a critical point. Short-term rates fell sharply all during 1970, and then dropped another 160 basis points to their mid-March low. Now, they are rising again, to about 4 percent levels. Guessing about rates is as dangerous as predicting

the market, but with increased demand from the government and the demand from business that will be the corollary of economic revival, we expect short-term rates will probably rise somewhat.

The spread between long and short-term rates is narrowing. The Federal Reserve Board is still increasing the money supply at a high rate—an annual rate of 8½% for the first quarter, 10½ percent for the four weeks ending April 7. Savings institutions have a good supply of money, and so do commercial banks.

On the demand side, corporations are entering the market with bond borrowings whose volume will very nearly match the huge borrowings of 1970. Mortgage demand, business loans, consumer credit, and government borrowings to cover that deficit I spoke of, will all be high. Still, Lionel Edie's experts think the supply is sufficiently plentiful so that long term rates will soon head somewhat lower.

What I have said about Wall Street does not add up to a prescription for the millennium. None of us is looking for that. It would hardly suit our character. Alexis de Tocqueville said that "life would have no relish for Americans if they were delivered from the anxieties which harass them." New anxieties would doubtless take the place of the old, even if all my suggestions were carried out. But I'd be happy to cope with some new ones.

THE 1052-CLASS DE'S AND THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable disparagement in the press of the 1052-class destroyer escorts. One of these ships, the U.S.S. *Hepburn* (DE-1055) was commanded for 26 months during precommissioning and commissioned service by Comdr. S. D. Landersman, U.S. Navy.

On April 29, Commander Landersman was relieved by Comdr. J. W. Sellers, U.S. Navy, in change of command ceremonies in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Commander Landersman's remarks on that occasion present an eloquent case for this class of ships as well as testimony of this officer's dedication to his service and his country. The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY COMDR. S. D. LANDERSMAN, USN, AT CHANGE OF COMMAND, APRIL 29, 1971, U.S.S. "HEPBURN" (DE 1055), GULF OF TONKIN

Today I am completing 26 months of duty on this ship, I have taken her from the builder's yard, through commissioning, acceptance trials, fitting out, shipyard availabilities, shakedown, fleet exercises, and deployment to the combat zone. No officer has had command of a ship of this class as long as I have. No one has operated a ship of this class as much as I have. No one has made as many landings. One of the other skippers of a ship of this class called me the "Dean" of the 1052 Class Commanding Officers. When I speak it is not only for this ship, but for the entire class of ships.

There are many people who do not think well of these ships. They are uninformed. There are many people who waste time and words calling these ships a mistake. They are foolish. The ships of this class are in the fleet now. The time for talk about trying

to do away with them is past. They are here, with us now. This is the time to learn how to use them, not abuse them. Rather than criticize these ships, we must employ them in the roles of the destroyers they are replacing, and to do this, operators on all levels must know their strengths, their weaknesses, and their differences and how to utilize them. We must learn new operating standards and techniques and accept new concepts of shipbuilding and ship employment.

When I reported as Prospective Commanding Officer of this ship I had the same reservations and doubts that many of the detractors of these ships espouse. I did not enjoy satisfaction from my time in precommissioning through the first months of duty with this ship. But I had decided on a philosophy which is, after all, the only philosophy for a commanding officer. "I will do everything in my power to make this ship the best that it can be. I will do everything possible to make it work. And after I have thus tried, if it still does not perform adequately, then I will know that it cannot be made to work, that the ship is a gross mistake, and I will bring appropriate attention to this fact."

Criticism of the ship and its class, especially by a commanding officer is inappropriate until the ship has been given time to operate at sea, where a ship belongs. An evaluation based on less is meaningless.

A commanding officer has to have the attitude that "this is my ship, I am in command of it, which means that it commands me totally, every minute of every day. I must make it function, or else prove that it cannot function."

To make the ship function properly required constant analysis of problems and every conceivable action to correct these problems. In this new ship we constantly analyzed the problems. We recommended solutions. We made, in many cases, our own solutions. Most importantly, we made the ship go.

I wrote official and personal letters and messages, made phone calls, and visited people, pointing out problems that existed in this ship and in the ships of this class, and recommending solutions. It took a long time. There were many problems. There were many people who did not want to act to correct the deficiencies. There were too many people who opposed change. A few people did respond. But progress was very slow. It still is, but progress has been made. Many of the deficiencies of this class ship have been corrected, and many are being corrected. We still have a ways to go.

But the reservations and doubts that I had in the beginning are gone. The frustration and the lack of satisfaction have been replaced by the finest sense of accomplishment, self satisfaction, and inner personal reward. I have no reservations and doubts about this ship. I have full confidence in it and would welcome the opportunity to take it anywhere on any assignment. It is strange that the only Navy people who criticize the ships of this class have never deployed in one. The press hasn't taken the trouble to ask any of us out here in the Western Pacific about these ships.

During this deployment with the U.S. Seventh Fleet *Hepburn* has performed in more varied duty assignments than most destroyers, perhaps more than any. Naval gunfire support, surveillance, escort, plane guard, and patrol are just a general indication of these duties. A more exact listing includes 12 different destroyer type duty assignments. The ship has proven that it is capable of meeting every commitment. Could this be done in a ship as deficient as our libelers would have us believe?

The class deficiencies and problems of these ships are well advertised, but the most important ingredient in making a ship per-

form is not the steel, aluminum, hardware, electronics, and equipment. It is the people, and good people can make almost any-ship work. This ship has excellent people; the Best Crew in the World.

Just before we deployed to the Western Pacific a knowledgeable officer asked me if I were hesitant to go to a combat area in a ship which was supposed to have so many deficiencies. I replied that my crew could go in a bathtub with an outboard motor and get every job done.

We live in an era of change which calls for an open mindedness to new ideas and an acceptance of change. The detractors of these ships suffer from the same malady that causes so much difficulty between the old and young of today; opposition to change. Just because we have operated destroyers with four boilers and two propellers for the last 60 years is no reason to say we must do so now. "We've always done it that way," is by itself a poor reason.

The destroyer men of these new DEs are a new breed, and I like to think that we in *Hepburn* are pioneers of this new breed. The new breed of DE destroyer man comes with a new fresh attitude, "we only need one." One boiler operation of our one propeller, one rudder, and one gun. The new breed of DE destroyer man is more proficient at taking care of his equipment, because he has only one. He makes it work because he only has one and he has confidence in it. More than that may be a needless use of the taxpayers' money.

I like that attitude displayed by the Commanding Officer of one of the other ships of this class when he was asked by a former destroyer skipper if it was difficult ship-handling these new DEs. He snapped back, "I can put it right in your pocket!" How many officers have had the challenge and thrill of backing a 4000 ton single screw DE with a large sensitive bow mounted sonar dome into a berth alongside another ship? How many officers who sit behind desks and find time to malign an entire class of ship without ever operating one, will ever be in such a position? Only the new breed of DE destroyer man has had the opportunity, and he does it on one boiler, with one engine, and he'll probably use one tug. It's a challenge, but is being done, as are the hundreds of other evolutions necessary to make these economical ships operate.

I would enjoy seeing a disparager of these ships stand here in the Gulf of Tonkin, and tell this crew that this ship is a great mistake, that it cannot defend itself, that it is unreliable, slow, or unable to perform adequately. He would be laughed over the side, if not thrown.

This ship has fired her gun at the enemy in Vietnam, the first ship of the class to do so. We were the first to plane guard for an attack carrier and the first to embark a helicopter detachment, to name just a few of our firsts. We have also steamed more miles, and more days between refuelings than a destroyer can, and in a long transit where fuel is so precious to a World War II destroyer, we can operate faster than those older ships. When more speed is needed, our second boiler can be brought into use and provide enough speed for any assignment. These new DEs are among the fastest ships on two boilers in the destroyer force. And I'll tell you a secret; no one really knows just how fast they will go. We only know that they will beat anything on two boilers.

Some time ago we were told that this ship couldn't be ready for shakedown training and that we couldn't get through shakedown training. We not only got ready, but we finished so well that the compliments and congratulations from higher authorities flowed in for months. We were told that this ship couldn't fire night illumination and destruct at the same time in naval gunfire support because we didn't have the necessary equip-

ment. We fired night illumination and destruct with what we had, the first ship of the class to do so, and taught the others how it was done.

This crew in this ship can accomplish anything they put their minds to. All that it takes is for someone to tell them they can't do it.

For that reason I am grateful to those who calumniate, deprecate, and malign this class of ship. It will result in even greater performance from this new breed of DE destroyermen.

Among the many accomplishments of this ship of which I am particularly proud is the fact that we have never had a man killed or seriously injured, and I hope that that record will continue.

Commander Sellers, who is about to relieve me, is a destroyer man of extensive experience. He has previously commanded 2 ships, has operated in all parts of the world, and has served in duties which have prepared him well for this command. I know that *Hepburn's* accomplishments will continue. My last order to this crew is serve him with the same devotion and provide him with the same support you have given me. I know that you will.

My thanks to you officers and men for making this ship one we have all been proud to serve in. My thanks for your respect, for your patience with my idiosyncrasies, for your tolerance of my moods, for your trust, and for your long hours of hard work and watch standing. Being your Commanding Officer has been a rare honor, a privilege few men are fortunate enough to experience. You are the best crew in the World. I salute you.

ANTIWAR TELEPHONE DIRECTORY AND PLANS FOR STOPPING THE GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, just as the Communist Daily World promulgates the party line to be followed by its faithful in the United States in attempting to undermine and eventually destroy the family, religion, free enterprise, and other basic and traditional institutions; so does the local Quicksilver Times, member of the Communist-oriented Liberation News Service Underground News Syndicate, disseminate orders and instructions to the antiwar fascist brown-shirt-like shock troops now creating tensions and agitating in our Nation's Capital. Never since Hitler's Brown Shirts have any "cobble boots" been heard in any nation's capital. For the most part it is the same old program with the same people—just different names and more extreme goals.

So that our colleagues may be made aware of the various groups aiding and abetting the hard-core commies, their dupes, sympathizers, and allies who are precipitating the turbulence, thereby causing a denial of constitutional rights, an inconvenience, and an injustice to the peaceful, law-abiding citizens, I insert a telephone directory of cooperating organizations at this point in my remarks:

[From the Quicksilver Times]

PHONES

Quicksilver Times, 483-8000.
Abortion Counseling, 483-4632.

- Amazing Grace Church, 333-1210.
- A.U. Draft & Vocations Center, 686-2385.
- American Civil Liberties Union, 483-3830.
- Catholic Draft Counselling, 832-1176.
- Catholic Peace Fellowship, 529-9704.
- Consumer Help Center, 362-4357.
- Citizens Grievance Center, 393-3333.
- Committee for Returned Volunteers, 667-3776.
- Community Bookshop, 833-8228.
- D.C. Central Library, NA8-6776.
- Drug Offenders' Rights Committee, 244-6688.
- DRUM, 726-7405.
- DMZ GI Coffeehouse, 737-3250.
- Emmaus House Draft Counseling, 529-9704.
- Fabrangen, 667-7829.
- Free Advice, 333-5596.
- Free Clinic, 965-5476.
- Food Coop, 462-2818.
- Gay Liberation Front, 387-3134.
- Georgetown Legal Interns, 347-7518.
- GI Office, 244-2831.
- G. W. Univ. Draft Center, 338-0182.
- High School Information Center, 338-6318.
- Insurgent Printing, 882-5229.
- IPS (Institute for Policy Studies), 234-9382.
- Jews for Urban Justice, 547-8852.
- Job Coop, 387-3390.
- Legal Aid, 629-5179.
- Maryland Student Union, 654-6312.
- Mattachine Society, 363-3881.
- Mont. County Hotline, 949-6603.
- National Lawyers' Guild, 667-4567.
- National Tenant's Organization, 347-3358.
- National Welfare Rights Organization, 347-7727.
- No. Va. Hotline, 527-4077.
- No. Va. MayDay Collective, 321-7790.
- Newsreel, 833-3775.
- Peace Center, 234-2000.
- People's Law Institute, 387-5760.
- People's Peace Treaty Office, 347-7613, 347-7614, 347-7615.
- People Power Unlimited (Job Coop), 234-6664.
- Pilot District Project, 332-6595.
- Off Our Backs, 462-4142.
- Rap House, 234-8011.
- Rap Shop, 667-3500.
- Rap-Id-Rescue, 676-7221.
- Rockville Free Clinic, 424-3928.
- Runaway House, 462-1515.
- SANE, 546-4868.
- Second House, 483-0622.
- Switchboard, 387-5800.
- Third World Coalition, 234-5566 or 844-0525.
- United Farm Workers, 587-0510.
- Vietnam Veterans Against the War, 638-3321.
- Washington War Tax Resistance, 546-6231 or 546-8840.
- WAFU, 387-5437.
- Woman's Liberation, 232-5145.
- Young Socialists' Alliance, 833-9560.

I have pointed out on several occasions that the Institute for Policy Studies—IPS—has planned and served as the strategic command post for anti-American activities such as the present antiwar demonstrations—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, volume 115, part 28, page 38598; volume 116, part 28, page 37417; and pages 12475-12477 of April 28, 1971. I, therefore, find it difficult to understand how President Nixon can continue to tolerate as chairman of his White House Conference on Youth a man who has served as an associate fellow of the Institute for Policy Studies.

I am sure that the hard-working taxpayers of this country find it hard to comprehend why the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has favored the Institute for Policy Studies with a tax-

exempt status. To grant such a status to any group which aids and abets the enemy in its effort to overthrow the U.S. Constitution should be considered an act of treason and not an act deserving special privilege by tax exemption.

A good project for Secretary of the Treasury Connally who is the superior of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or for the President who is Secretary Connally's boss would be to determine which of the organizations listed above in the telephone directory are enjoying a tax-exempt privilege; and to immediately hold public hearings directed toward revoking such favored status of any organization found to be so privileged. It is an insult to every taxpayer and every serviceman for their Government leaders to place such radical and extreme groups in a tax-exempt category.

Every effective army has to have an organization, be trained, be provided logistic support, and know what to do in case of capture by the enemy. I insert at this point in my remarks such vital information passed on to the antiwar troops:

EVERYTHING YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT MAY DAY

PEOPLE'S CITY

West Potomac Park, site of People's City, has been liberated since the Vietnam Vets moved in April 19. A 24 hour-a-day permit has been granted until May 10.

The roots of our community are communes and collectives and tribes which together form the regions and constituency groups. Each region is going to have to initiate programs and activities for everybody else, too . . . helping it all come together, bringing the war home.

Each region should choose representatives to be responsible for working along with the services and activities already set up. These include food, medical, day care, movement centers, information, communications, resistance training, and a daily newspaper. Specific information can be gotten at the reception centers.

Each region should divide into groups and have those groups take care of the specific jobs around the regional camp—security, food, thinking about tactics and discussing it with everyone, etc. Tactics means knowing the city, knowing the park and your own location in the park, and how you plan to move together as a group.

People's City is going to be our home for a while. We'll all get together in Town Meetings; announcements will be made on the latest information; a message board will be put up; and, mimeographed sheets will be put out to pass the word around.

We should build our community and decorate it. Put up flags and banners and signs—try to define your areas so that we give shape to the space. Make bulletin boards and walls for murals and writings and posters and notes. Paint the sidewalks. Silk screen our own clothes. We'll have movies at night and plays, skits and music all the time.

RECEPTION CENTERS

For information in Washington, people should contact the two reception centers. The main reception center will be located at the Friends' Meeting House, 2111 Florida Ave. NW and may be reached by calling 265-5842 or 265-5838. This center will have all information on specific topics—such as information about housing, medical and legal aid. (Other numbers for information on specific topics—such as legal aid are available in the May Day phone list, see page 8).

The second reception center will be a tent marked by balloons, flags, and signs at People's City, West Potomac Park. It will have all relevant information except housing. Both reception centers will be open 24 hours a day.

CAMP SECURITY

The overall community security is being taken care of by the Vietnam Vets. Each region should choose a collective to help the Vets. Regions should also set up security for their own campsites.

Sanitation and land care

Toilet facilities will be provided by the Park service. Trash cans are plentiful at the campsites (why not bring one of your own anyway), so there is no need to clutter our community. Daily trash pick ups will be made.

FEEDING THE AMERICONG

Raintree Tribe of Indiana and David Martin and crew from New Hampshire will prepare, distribute, serve and with the help and work of our brothers and sisters, clean up. Communal, tribal feasts will nourish us with granola for breakfast, peanut butter for snacks, and a vegetable, rice, bean salad dinner. Serving time is not yet set but a gathering gong will call us together. We will serve food that will liberate our bodies from unnutritious and poisonous foods, and build us up for the action which we will be involved in. As we eat, so we will become.

Notice—Much, much, much food is needed. Please bring all you can to 2111 Florida Ave. NW, the main Reception Center. Rice, rolled oats, honey, oil, raw vegetables, carrots, celery, cabbage, bouillon, and if people are bringing canned goods, contents should be green beans, kidney beans, chick peas (garbanzo beans). Anyone wanting to donate money, write a check to People's Peace Treaty and send it to 1029 Vermont Avenue NW.

CHILD CARE

We couldn't have a community without our children, so plans are in the making for a child care center at the campsite itself. This facility would probably be in use until May 3rd. On May 3rd we will take our children to Ebenezer United Methodist Church, 4th and D Streets SE. For complete information, the day care number will be listed in the telephone directory (call 411) as the Spring Little People's Center.

The Ebenezer Church day care center will remain open til 9:00 p.m. each evening; after that children may be taken to the main reception center at Quaker House, 2121 Decatur Place NW.

MOVEMENT CENTERS

Movement centers are divided into two categories: regional centers and training centers for the People's Lobby and the May Activities.

TRAINING CENTERS

Why training? The war continues on poor people in this country and in Indochina. The Spring Offensive for peace and justice is committed to intensive non-violent actions: People's lobbying, demonstrations and civil disobedience May 3, 4, & 5. For these actions we need organization, discipline and training. The training will be of the demonstrators, not marshals, who will work out their own actions and discipline. Trainers will pose situations and questions, not solutions or authoritarian positions.

Training will be an exciting, experimental, reflective learning process, not a top down process as some people might read the word. Some of our actions to stop the war might lead to civil disobedience and police attack or jail. Let's be prepared.

Information will be available at the reception centers on the time and location of meetings on training in organizing the following kinds of actions: sitting in; creative

rapping; police attack; non-violent self-defense; civil disobedience and jail; affinity groups; target strategy & tactics; creative lobbying. Training is also available on first aid and legal self-defense. Trainers can come to your region or locality for training.

There will be five target training centers for the People's Lobby. Each center will stay open all week, for informational purposes and to plan smaller actions on the days when their target is not in focus.

Congress (April 26)—Lincoln Memorial Congregational Temple, room 203, 1851 9th St., NW.

Selective service (April 27)—Science Bldg., Georgetown Univ., 37th & O Streets, NW.

Internal Revenue Service (April 28)—First Congregational Church, 10th & G Streets, NW.

Health, Education & Welfare (April 29)—William Penn House, 515 East Capitol St.

Justice Department (April 30)—St. Joseph's Priory, 4200 Harewood Ave., NE.

The phone numbers of each of these centers will be available from the main reception center at 2121 Decatur Place, 265-5838.

Also, one or two mass lobby centers will provide daily afternoon training, early afternoon mass meeting, later evening training on the day prior to the mass lobby schedule. People will be training into Life Action Teams of 10 people each for the specific scenario. (See Calendar for April 29 and 30 lobby actions.)

Some specific May Day target training will go on during this week at the camp site and other training centers. But the major training will be done over May 1 and 2. Hopefully each target group will have at least 6-8 hours of training before May 3rd. Contact the Reception Centers for further information.

REGIONAL AND GROUP CENTERS

These movement centers will provide information on regional activities and have available space for small meetings and discussions. The following movement centers have been set up (if your group or region isn't listed, contact the reception centers for its location):

Region and movement center

Upstate N.Y., So. Virginia, North Carolina, Florida: Dumbarton Methodist, 3130 O Street NW, FE3-7217.

Pittsburgh, Ohio, Vermont: St. Paul's Episcopal, 2430 K Street NW.

New Hampshire: FE7-2020.
Boston: St. John's Church, 3240 O Street NW, 338-6677.

Washington, D.C., No. Virginia: 1750 Columbia Rd. NW, 387-1617 or 780-1235.

New York City, Long Island: 2000 P St. NW, Rm. 410, 462-3232.

Michigan: 1st Baptist, 1326 16th St. NW, 667-5092.

Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, So. Carolina, Mississippi: 15th St. Presbyterian, 15th & R Street NW, 234-0300.

Connecticut, Chicago, Maryland, New Jersey, Western Mass., Rhode Island: None.

Central & Eastern Penn.: 1st Congregational Ch., 10th & G Streets, NW.

Indiana, Wisc., Minn., Missouri, Kansas, Downstate Ill., Neb.: 628-1443.

Women's Center: St. Stephen's Church, 16th & Newton Sts., NW 265-0142.

Gay May Day: All Souls Unitarian, 16th & Harvard NW., 462-0005.

ROCK AND SOUL FESTIVAL

Free music! Free dope! Free food!
Celebrate the people's struggle against sexism, war, racism, and repression. Come to the MayDay Festival of Life and the Sunday Soul Meeting on the Washington Monument grounds May 1 and 2. Music will be provided by Johnny Winter, Phil Ochs, Arlo Guthrie, Jay Giles, Mandrill, Holy Modal Rounders, Tim Hardin, Dreams, Third World, Wilderness Road, Mitch Ryder, Pride, Richard Pryor, Elephant's Memory, Swallow, Jonathan Ed-

wards, and many more (we're still waiting to hear from James Brown, the Jefferson Airplane, and the Grateful Dead, for sure).

PHONES

Reception Center, 265-5838 or 265-5842.
MayDay, 347-7614 or 347-7615.
Legal, 833-9480.
Medical, 546-0024 or 546-0025.
People's Coalition, 737-8600.
Quicksilver Times, 483-8000.
Switchboard, 387-5800.
Free Clinic, 965-5476.
Women's Liberation, 232-5145.
Gay Liberation Front, 387-3134.
Vietnam Vets, 638-3321.
Third World Coalition, 234-5566 or 844-0525.

The Medical Committee for Human Rights is providing medical care for all the spring demonstrations. Their number is 546-0024-25.

Teams of medics led by MD's will be present at all actions. A church basement staffed by internists and psychiatrists will be open for prolonged care. A schoolbus with first aid supplies will be placed at a strategic location. Portable telephone communications will be maintained with hospital emergency rooms, the Mayor's command center, and the Mayday command center. Ambulances will be provided by the Red Cross.

The Medical Committee for Human Rights hopes to hold training sessions in first aid and medical consciousness during free time, probably in the church basement. These will not be to train medics for these demonstrations but for the future.

The number for medical information is 546-0024 or 0025.

BUSTED: WHAT TO DO

The following is a list of things for someone to do if he or she gets busted:

- (A) When you get busted:
 - (1) Remain calm and be observant.
 - (2) Once you are busted do not resist because assault on a policeman is a felony. Resisting may now be treated as assault in D.C.
 - (3) Make your name known clearly and loudly so that those around you will know who you are.
 - (4) Get the name and/or badge number of the arresting officer.
 - (5) In the police wagon get the name and phone number of those who are there with you—especially if they witnessed your bust.
 - (6) When you get to the station, you only have to give your name and address if you want to. You have a right to a lawyer before you say anything. Give them your name and address, and do not answer any other questions.
 - (7) If you have the money to post collateral then you can pay it and get out but you should ask for a court date. You can change your mind later and forfeit the money by not showing up. This will result in a conviction, however. If you are wanted, on probation, or being prosecuted elsewhere, pay the money and get lost.
 - (8) Keep your mouth shut!! You can only do harm by talking, so keep quiet!! Do not talk!!
 - (9) You only are entitled to one phone call so call the number of someone whom you are sure will be home or the arrest number. That number is 833-9480. Write it on your forearm now in ink.
- (B) When someone else is busted:
 - (1) Get the name of the person busted.
 - (2) If possible get the arresting officers name and/or badge number, the charge, and where they are being taken.
 - (3) Get the name and phone numbers of other witnesses. Later get this information to the legal aid office at 833-9480.
 - (4) If you can raise collateral (usually \$10.00 to \$25.00), you can go down to the cellblock yourself and get the individual out. If they have the money, they can get themselves out. If the court date is set then the money will be refunded if the individual

has the charges dropped or is found not guilty. (It usually takes about an hour after a bust for the police to know whether or not they have someone.) If you are going down to get someone out there's not any point in extreme haste.

(5) Whether or not you get the person out, let legal aid know.

(6) Be observant of what is happening when you see a bust and write down what you see. (dates, time, etc.)

(C) General Information:

(1) Carry some dimes so that you can make phone calls.

(2) Carry a pen and some paper or index cards so that you can write down the arrest information mentioned above.

(3) Do not carry any address books, names, or phone numbers or the like that you do not want to give the authorities.

(4) If possible carry about \$25.00 in cash as the police will not accept checks of any kind as collateral. It is best to conceal the money on your person as they may take your personal effects when they place you in a cell and they are often not returned.

(5) Do not answer any questions!! Keep quiet!!

(6) Remember that you have a right to a lawyer. If you are unsure as to what to do then do nothing and wait for a lawyer. (ask for one of course.)

(7) Lawyers will be available in cellblocks as well as in court. If you wish to speak to a lawyer, contact bust central.

EMERGENCY BAIL FUND

Bail money collected by groups may be kept by the groups for individual members or transmitted to the Emergency Bail Fund for general use. For direction to the Emergency Bail Fund collection people, call 347-7518.

Observe that the troops come from various parts of the Nation and are from communes, collectives and tribes which together form regions and constituency groups.

As revealed by the above communication to the troops, a permit was given to the "People's Army" to bivouac in West Potomac Park from April 19 to May 10.

Tourists visiting the Nation's Capital and residents of the surrounding area are not permitted to camp overnight in Potomac Park since to do so would be a deprivation of the rights of others and therefore a violation of the law. Why then are rabble with designs to disrupt the orderly operations of Government granted a privileged sanctuary in the heart of the Nation's Capital for their campsite?

The permit, according to a press report, was revoked Sunday since there would have been a threat to the safety of the general public if the camp permit had been permitted to continue in effect. While the revocation was in order, many question why the permit was issued in the first place.

At any rate, the Commander in Chief certainly bears the ultimate responsibility for allowing the potentially explosive situation to develop as he now seeks to gain respectability as a champion of law and order. However sincere the demonstrators may have felt their cause to be, by now they should understand that they were used by the administration just as the Quebec Liberation Front was used by Trudeau to gain public support for himself as a strong advocate of law and order in Canada.

It is also of interest to taxpayers to

CXVII—847—Part 10

know that they are paying the full costs of the operation including ecological damages and toilet facilities for the "People's Army."

Before engaging in combat an army must have a mission and be well instructed regarding overall strategy, tactical procedures for specific skirmishes and the targets to be attacked. I insert instructions of this nature provided the antiwar troops:

MAY DAY STRATEGY, TACTICS, AND TARGETS: SHUTTING DOWN THE GOVERNMENT

STRATEGY

Washington, D.C. is a colony. It is ruled by a committee of Congress made up of racist white southerners. The overwhelming number of people living in Washington are black. Virtually the only industry in Washington is the Federal Government with the overwhelming majority of the employees being white and with a few exceptions, all upper echelon employees being white. This means that most employees of the Federal government commute to work each day from the suburbs of Virginia and Maryland.

Because of the racist nature of the Federal Government, closing down the apparatus that controls the War against Indochina and America's oppressed is a relatively easy operation if it is coordinated.

Twenty-one targets have been selected for the Mayday actions. The targets (see map) are broken into two general categories: (1) traffic circles and (2) bridges. These targets if blocked during the early morning rush hour will seal off the Federal Triangle area of Washington and the Pentagon. All of the targets selected deal directly with the Federal Government and blocking these targets will have a minimum impact on the surrounding black community. These targets were specifically chosen to minimize disruption of the black community. No disruptive actions will take place North of Massachusetts Avenue NW or East of 6th Street, SE and NE, which are the borders of the black community.

Our disruption of Washington must be seen as an attack on the Federal Government, specifically those sections dealing with the war against the people of Indochina and America. It must not be seen as an attack on the employees of the Federal Government. We wish to win them as allies and so we need to minimize their antagonism towards us.

By May 3 every government employee will know that to attempt to get to work he or she will have to brave a six hour traffic jam. We are attempting to create a "four-day weekend" consciousness among government employees. If this is successful, any employees caught in traffic jams will blame themselves for attempting to get to work and therefore, not us.

Our tactical approach to stopping the government is decentralization and concentration. By this we mean that the targets are decentralized and our demonstrators are concentrated. No target will have less than a thousand demonstrators and no major target (See map. Targets bearing asterisks will have more than three thousand demonstrators.) Our targets are decentralized to (a) insure the total halt of traffic and (b) to increase the difficulty of Federal forces containing our demonstrations.

Our numbers are concentrated in an effort to defeat the Federal forces' primary defensive tactic which is dispersal (dividing us into small units) and containment (isolating the small unit).

COMMUNICATIONS

For communications, we suggest regions to secure bull horns and short range walkie-talkies. The walkie-talkie operators need to be familiar with the equipment and establish

codes to prevent interception and false information from being beamed in on their frequencies. The radios can be easily jammed or be made useless by false messages being beamed in, so you should establish an alternate system such as runners. The May-day collective will maintain several coordination centers and is setting up several alternative means of communication. We will monitor all police and military frequencies to provide up to date information for all participants. The information will be sent out over AM radio frequencies from special mobile transmitters. These transmitters will broadcast May 3 and 4 over clear channels and cover all twenty-one target areas. Every participant should bring a transistor radio.

Our own logistic preparation should be oriented towards individual self-contained units. People should bring wire cutters for fences, squeeze bottles of water for gas, bamboo flutes, tamborines for people's music, balloons and flowers for joy, dope and food to share with the GIs and fellow demonstrators.

TACTICAL APPROACHES

The following are a few of the nonviolent civil disobedience tactics being planned by various regions.

Waves.—The regional groups will be broken into units of 10-15 people. Monday morning the units will move in waves one unit in each wave, onto the road. They will sit down in a circle, and pass the pipe and play music until traffic is stopped. The next wave will then move to the road. This will last until noon when people will return to the Liberated Zone (West Potomac Park). The same thing will happen Tuesday. People will move on Wednesday to the Capitol and stay. This tactic is particularly effective at traffic circles where there are many roads leading into the circle.

Street party.—The regional group will move in mass to their circle target playing music and dancing getting as close as they can to the target. They will disperse if gassed or charged with batons but always regroup. They stay put if threatened with arrest.

Troop teach-in.—The region will encircle troops guarding a circle or line up several deep along troop lines protecting bridges. They will establish a one to one relationship to GIs and demonstrate solidarity. Food and dope will be passed out. If a large group of GIs come over to our side the breach will be filled with demonstrators moving through and sitting in on the target road. The Mayday legal facilities will have special sections to serve troops who join us and a special GI counseling center will be located in the liberated zone. These regions are bringing wire cutters to get through fences to the GIs. Wedges and other formations sent to break up the concentrations of demonstrators will be absorbed amoeba-like and given intensive arguments about why they should join us.

Sit-in.—The region will march up a street towards a circle or bridge and when confronted by police or troops will sit down. They will maintain their ground.

LAY OF THE LAND

The District of Columbia is most likely one of the easiest cities to understand and travel within, for it was one of the few which was laid out by a city planner.

The district is sectioned off into four areas, designated North West, North East, and South West and South East. Base lines for these sections are North, East, and South Capitol Streets and an imaginary line extending West from the Capitol Building.

Numbered streets run north to south; the lettered streets travel east to west. House and buildings number for each section start at each base line. For example, the 900 block on "C" Street, NW is between 9th and 10th Streets, NW. The 300 block on 7th Street, SW is between "C" and "D" Streets, SW.

As one travels North, and the singled lettered paths and trails in D.C. and, a new sequence appears, of one syllable words, starting with "A" begins. For instance, in one part of NW Washington, Benton, Calvert, Davis, Edmunds, Fulton, Garfield, etc. appear, following "W" Street.

Pennsylvania Avenue is numbered the same as lettered trails; Connecticut Avenue is the same as a numbered path. Most other diagonal paths and trails have no standard pattern.

TARGET SITES

1. Site one, Rosslyn Plaza, is on the Virginia side of the Francis Scott Key Bridge, which connects George Washington Parkway, Lee Highway, Route 66 and Fort Myer Drive. It is probably one of the most heavily traveled single areas in the entire Metropolitan area.

Site one affords excellent, low flat, open areas which are adjacent to or near all the aforementioned major highways from Northern Virginia.

Just North of Rosslyn Plaza is the Marriot Hotel, where it was found, the "High Command" of the Pentagon regularly dine. As one leaves Key Bridge, travelling West, the Marriot Hotel is clearly visible on the right and it provides an excellent staging area and superb parking facilities.

Traffic, during rush hour is normally stalled, and it is believed that it would present extreme problems for the defense forces of the Federal Government to prevent any disruption of traffic from not occurring. Massive defense of Rosslyn Plaza would normally disrupt traffic, one-third of which travels to the Pentagon, and the defense forces would thus be doing our job.

Also, use of gas in Rosslyn Plaza may be prohibitive since it is directly adjacent to the business section of Arlington and the "prestigious" Marriot Hotel. Their reluctance of using gas, however, is naturally not certain; we are merely speculating on probability.

2. Site two, the D.C. side of Key Bridge is restrictive in area and severely limited in mobility. "M" Street can be easily secured by defense forces.

Thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth streets are extremely steep, and can be easily blocked by police without affecting the flow of traffic at all.

The traffic both to and from Key Bridge is intense; congested traffic is normally a problem during rush hour. Whitehurst Highway, which travels under Key Bridge is a major thoroughfare and can be relatively easily disrupted from a flat, open area which is directly adjacent to Key Bridge, "M" Street and Whitehurst. One word of caution: this open area is extremely small, perhaps supporting only several hundred people.

3. This area is a comparatively isolated region, leading to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge from the Virginia side. There is a very great expanse of open grassy plains which lies next to the George Washington Parkway, Arlington Blvd., which leads directly to the Pentagon, and Route 66, which directs traffic onto the TR Bridge.

This area, normally, carries relatively little traffic. However, if Rosslyn Plaza is disrupted, there is the possibility that traffic could be diverted to TR Bridge via Route 66.

4. The D.C. entrance to the TR Bridge has one open land area which can accommodate large numbers of people. This area is the grounds for the Kennedy Performing Arts Center, presently under construction.

The Kennedy Arts Center lies adjacent to Rock Creek Parkway, a major interchange.

5. The Virginia side of the Arlington Memorial Bridge contains acres upon acres of open space leading to the bridge. In the event that Fort Myer Drive is disrupted at Rosslyn Plaza (see site 1), Memorial Drive may be used as an auxiliary road to Fort Myer by Federal Authorities.

Also, in the event all points South are effectively disrupted, Arlington Ridge Road, which changes into Route 110, may be utilized as one of the prime access roads from Northern Virginia to the Pentagon.

6. There is much land which can sever the Arlington Memorial Bridge entrance from the Lincoln Memorial grounds and the entrance to Rock Creek Creek Parkway, and Ohio Drive South. There are very large grassy areas west of Lincoln Memorial facing the Potomac adjacent to Ohio Drive.

7. Washington Blvd., containing the only direct access roads to the Pentagon from northern points, contains large expanses of flat open areas.

Specifically, the first access route, fed from Arlington Blvd. leads to the Pentagon North Parking Area, where tens of thousands of cars arrive daily. The terrain is flat and open and is bounded from the north by the Boundary Channel.

The second access route, Highway 110, leads from the area near Rosslyn Plaza directly to the Pentagon grounds itself. It travels under Washington Blvd, and splits off into a small operational access road which leads onto the Pentagon ground itself.

There exists in and around the Pentagon grounds, very large flat open spaces, particularly the area just north of the Pentagon.

Resistance from authorities is expected to be very rough, although it will be difficult to execute without a general disruption of traffic which achieves a potential goal.

8. The loop just west of the Pentagon serves the Naval annex, the U.S. Marine Corps and the Pentagon personnel via Washington Blvd. "North to South", from the Arlington Bridge, Columbia Pike, and Shirley Highway, East and West.

Just south of the loop, massive road construction is underway. There are acres upon acres of flat open space at the loop on Washington Blvd. and the access ramp from Shirley Highway "West" are vulnerable to disruption particularly.

The Loop, specifically, is the main feed-in to the Pentagon South Parking Area, and disruption of this general area could have demonstrable effects.

9. Shirley Highway, just south of the Pentagon South Parking Area boasts large bushes which tend to obscure visibility of the Pentagon Parking Area considerably.

Shirley Highway is probably the key road to the Pentagon, the U.S. Naval Annex and Henderson Hall, headquarters for the U.S. Marines, the latter two both off Washington Blvd., west of the Pentagon South Parking Area.

Expect, however to find tight restrictions on mobility, as Federal, local and military authorities will attempt to keep these areas, particularly Shirley Highway open.

10 & 11. The Rochambeau Bridge and George Mason Bridge are possibly the two most heavily traveled bridges leading to and from Washington, D.C. The Rochambeau Bridge directs traffic into D.C. and the Mason Bridge delivers traffic into Virginia. Both bridges, for simplicity, are known as the 14th Street Bridge complex.

In addition, the 14th Street Bridge is added greater importance because over 70% of the traffic flows to and from the Pentagon.

The two main arteries are the George Washington Parkway and Shirley Highway. This is a large open area of several acres between both the Rochambeau and Mason Bridges, which also shares its borders with the George Washington Parkway and the Potomac River.

Just south of the 14th Street Bridge is the Marriot Hotel which offers a large parking lot. East of the Marriot Hotel and south of Shirley Highway, an additional several acres of open flat land exists.

There appears little likelihood that gas would be utilized here, because of the proximity to the Pentagon and the Marriot Hotel.

12. The D.C. side of the 14th Street Bridge is one of the more heavily travelled thoroughfares in D.C. Approximately 70% of the traffic here will be Pentagon Personnel.

The Jefferson Memorial grounds provide low level open spaces for massive gatherings. The area, however, will provide many logistical problems as the dispersal and containment tactic the federal authorities can employ can be ideally implemented at the Jefferson Memorial grounds.

The importance of this juncture is the fact that an enormous rate of traffic flow will be traveling to the Federal Triangle, where most of the government operates.

Specifically, the most vulnerable area is the exit of the 14th Street Bridge leading to the Case Memorial Bridge and 14th Street. There is one intersection which joins both immediately following the exit of the Bridge.

13. Washington Circle itself is massive and can accommodate large numbers of people. However, other than the Circle, there is little room for . . . gathering. Adjacent to the circle is the George Washington University Hospital, with its emergency entrance facing Washington Circle.

There are several prestigious luxury apartments north of the circle which occupy most of the immediate land. "K" Street, in addition to intersecting with the circle, travels under the circle which might provide other complications.

It is, however, a major site, intersecting Pennsylvania, six blocks from the White House, with main artery, New Hampshire Avenue.

14. Dupont Circle, a crucial intersection where much traffic flows from the downtown "Federal Triangle" to the affluent, predominantly white NW section and Maryland suburbs.

The circle itself is open and provides easy accessibility to any of the particular arteries joined at Dupont.

Some of the more notable landmarks at Dupont are the Iraq Embassy, Riggs National Bank, the Washington Club and a Peoples Drug Store.

Some caution must be exercised at Dupont Circle for Connecticut Avenue travels under the circle, from north to south.

15. Scott Circle, three blocks from Dupont Circle sports much open land not only on the Circle green itself, but also in front of the Gramercy Hotel, which is south of the Circle on Rhode Island Avenue. Also, there is a small lot adjacent to Scott Circle where the abandoned Philippines Embassy stands.

The main arteries, Massachusetts, Rhode Island Avenues and 16th Street are often heavily travelled.

There is also much open space in front of the Australian Embassy and the infamous National Rifle Association, which are at opposite ends of Scott Circle on 16th Street.

16. Thomas Circle is a key junction for Massachusetts and Vermont Avenues. Massachusetts Avenue runs beneath Thomas Circle, yet there is a large open area, capable of sustaining several hundred people, directly south and adjacent to the Western end of the Massachusetts underpass.

Thomas Circle green is long and thin, divided into three separate areas by the circle access roads.

The Sonesta Hotel provides some area for mobility, which lies directly north of Thomas Circle.

Between 14th Street and Massachusetts Avenues, just east of the Circle green is a large parking lot which is unrestricted.

17. Mt. Vernon Square, joining Massachusetts and New York Avenues with "K" Street, provides a large area for maneuverability in the green itself, where the D.C. Public Library is located. Directly west of the Library there is much land, which is increased by a church on "K" and Massachusetts Avenues, overlooking the library.

18. The Commodore intersection, near

Union Station has a large open area directly across from the U.S. Post Office and the National Guard Headquarters.

The two main arteries at Commodore, Massachusetts Avenue and North Capitol Street, lie adjacent to this open area, where perhaps 1/2 acre of land is available. The area is also several blocks from the Senate Office Building.

19. Stanton Park, a lower-middle class residential area, two blocks east of the Senate Office Building, is a small open area, measuring approximately 75 yards in length and 21 yards in width.

With the exception of Massachusetts and Maryland Avenues, which intersect at Stanton Park, there is little of importance. A gas station, a small church and a laundromat fill its borders.

20. Seward Square, two blocks away from the 5th precinct of the D.C. Police Department, and three blocks away from the House of Representatives Office Building, has a small area of open land, where North Carolina and Pennsylvania Avenues intersect.

It is one of the major crossroads into the Federal Triangle from points east and southeast of D.C.

One disadvantage is that Seward Square is divided into 4 sections, thus forcing any large group to be vulnerable to the dispersal and containment strategy of the defense forces.

21. Folger Park, although seemingly insignificant, does serve a vital purpose. Should the Seward Square disruption succeed, all eastbound traffic would prevent much traffic arriving from eastern points to the Federal Triangle from reaching their destination.

Folger is a small park in a semi-residential, semi-commercial area. It is relatively isolated and is two blocks south of the House Office Buildings.

REGIONAL TARGETS

The following regional targets have already been determined by participants from those areas. Further information and developments are available at the MayDay information tent in People's City.

Regions and targets

Upstate N.Y., So. Virginia, No. Carolina, Florida—Key Bridge (1 & 2).

Pittsburgh, New Hampshire, Ohio, Vermont—Roosevelt Bridge (3 & 4).

Boston—Arlington Memorial Bridge (5 & 6).

Washington, D.C., No. Virginia—14th St. Bridge (11 & 12).

New York City, Long Island—Dupont Circle (14).

Michigan—Washington Circle (13).

Texas, Ark., So. Carolina, Louisiana, Miss., Georgia, Alabama—Scott Circle (15).

Conn., Chicago, Maryland, New Jersey, Western Mass., Rhode Is.—Mt. Vernon Square (17).

Central & eastern Penn., Indiana, Wisc., Minn., Mo., Kansas, Downstate, Ill., Nebraska—Intersection of Pennsylvania & Constitution.

Gay May Day—Surprise target.

It is my opinion based on facts available and personal first-hand observation that the so-called nonviolent "antiwar" demonstration is intended as a trial run—a rehearsal or training exercise—for the shock troops to ascertain their reaction under nonviolent conditions, and to determine just how much the troops would be permitted to get away with in their "peaceful" maneuvers.

The entire operation provides a classic exercise of the tactic of pressure from below and pressure from above which Communists used so successfully in Czechoslovakia and other subverted countries in gaining control of those once free countries. The invading hordes of degenerates and misguided young ideal-

ists from collectives and communes throughout the country provide the pressure from below while their cohorts in positions of power in government, religion, news media, and other areas—who cooperate with the enemy by granting them special privileges, carrying on public relations, supplying them with money and logistic support or aid and abet them in other ways—provide the pressure from above. The great majority of decent, law-abiding citizens are caught in the middle between these two pressures.

President Abraham Lincoln once said that if the United States ever succumbed as a nation it would not be as a result of invasion from without but rather subversion from within. I was disappointed over the recent vote to reduce funds to the House Internal Security Committee which has performed such a creditable task in keeping Congress and the American public informed with regard to subversive forces in our country.

What must be done now to strengthen our internal security is the enactment and enforcement of effective laws to curb subversives, Communists and to punish traitorous activities. Freedom must be considered in the light of prudence. We must no longer grant freedom to those who use their freedom to destroy freedom of others.

However, there is another problem. We have had statutes in the past to protect our internal security but the Supreme Court has knocked them down. Since the High Court continues to act as if soft on subversion and international movements which undermine American institutions; Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, must assert its constitutional power to remove from the Supreme Court any appellate jurisdiction in cases emanating from laws made by Congress to protect the internal security of the country. This is our power to do.

It is time for Congress to consider a bill such as my H.R. 390 to impose restrictions upon the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. I insert the text of H.R. 390 and several pertinent newsclippings:

H.R. 390

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1259. Appellate jurisdiction; limitations
"The Supreme Court shall not have appellate jurisdiction to—

"(1) decide that any provision of a statute of the United States, a State statute, or a State constitution, is invalid because it is in violation of any provision of the Constitution of the United States, or

"(2) reverse, alter, or modify any decision or rule of law made by the Court,

except upon the concurrence of the full membership of the Court."

(b) The section analysis at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1259. Appellate jurisdiction; limitations."
[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 3, 1971]

PEACE CITY EXODUS: END OF EASY LIFE
(By Jim Mann and Tom Huth)

At dawn's light, yesterday, about 45,000 people were dancing, smiling, nodding their

heads to music, making love, drinking wine and smoking pot. They had succeeded in turning downtown Washington into a smaller version of Max Yasgur's Woodstock farm.

Less than an hour later, the surprise announcement came: the police had revoked their permit and ordered them to vacate the premises.

And by 1 p.m., after the police had arrested the remaining stragglers, all that was left of the encampment was a dusty parkland with smoldering bonfires, crumpled blankets, a few discarded boots, soda and wine bottles, and a sign scrawled in blue paint in the dust: "We shall return."

It was the end of 10 days of Peace City. Born amid protest on a small field in West Potomac Park, it suffered drug problems among its youth, turned to politics in its maturity, swelled its ranks with rock music in middle age—and then died a day before it reached its life goal: to become a staging ground for a massive political blowout.

During the past week, it had been a small community, confined to the southeastern tip of the park near the Jefferson Memorial. At first it was inhabited by a predominantly teen-aged crowd of self-styled "street people," seemingly more interested in drugs than in politics.

Later in the week, however, an older and more politically active group had moved into the park, singing songs, chanting slogans and organizing for the attempt today to stop the government and, symbolically, the Vietnam war.

On Saturday, the camp that had held only a couple of thousand people suddenly grew to about 60,000, as youths from all over the East Coast and beyond—a modern-day Sherman's army of youth, traveling by thumb, feeding its belly with rock music and assorted liquors, and little else—swarmed into the city for a much-advertised rock concert.

They were not runaway "street people" or full-time political radicals, but young people from colleges and high schools and factories and communes.

Peace City outgrew its boundaries. The rock concert was held on a polo field originally outside the camping area. The overflow wandered over the entire park area from the Lincoln Memorial to the Washington Monument and onto the Mall beyond.

It was mind bogging. The kind of rock festival—with thousands camping out all night—that had been rejected by authorities in rural cow pastures across the nation was taking place in the nation's capital in and around the country's picture-post card tourist attractions.

The night had brought the bad drug trips, stretchers and ambulances, that were familiar sights for those who had been present earlier in the week. There were also warnings from the stage of the rock concert that there had been rape attempts against some of "your sisters." (Police yesterday had recorded at least two rapes at the concert Saturday night.)

By daybreak yesterday, it was a vision, a Washington of the absurd. People were sleeping on the ground, in their cars, on the top of vans, in the bushes, down by the Potomac and by the Tidal Basin.

Everything that was combustible had been used as firewood: construction materials, shrubs and bushes, snow fences, wooden shacks, park benches.

Slogans in red and blue paint covered construction equipment, fences and parts of monuments, proclaiming revolution, demanding peace, denouncing the President.

Just before 6 a.m., with the sky becoming pink behind the Washington Monument to the rear of the rock concert, people began to stand up and dance to the continuing rock music.

VIBRATING BONES

"Just a little music to keep them bones vibrating for a new day," intoned Claude

Jones as he began a rendition of Bob Dylan's "I Dreamed I Saw St. Augustine."

The Tidal Basin was full of discarded wine bottles, cigarette packs and milk cartons. There were enormous piles of trash in the middle of the campsites.

Just after daybreak, two new D.C. police department helicopters began to zoom over the area, lending an odd warlike atmosphere to the dawn. No one had any idea then of their significance.

Just after 6:30 a.m., as Claude Jones began to play "When the Roll Is Called Up Yonder, I'll Be There," the police began to appear on the edge of the park, unnoticed by most of the campers.

Within minutes, the announcement came: "People, we have bad news. We have just been told that our permit is revoked. The police have asked us to leave these grounds and to pick up our trash and remove it from the area. . . . Everyone just stay together and stay cool."

Perhaps because of the early morning hour, the first announcement produced surprisingly little up-roar. There were a few angry shouts and obscenities, but many people left immediately, heading toward the Washington Monument and then up 14th Street and Constitution Avenue.

Some began promptly to hitchhike back home, asking directions for the expressways or putting out signs bearing the names of states. They seemed to be those who had come primarily for the weekend rock concert rather than for today's demonstrations.

"We never heard about blocking any bridge," explained Jim Lima and Steven Shaughnessy, two high school students from Levittown, Long Island. "We were planning to leave today (Sunday), anyway."

Those who had come to hear the music were a little annoyed with the concert. By word of mouth or through leaflets and flyers, they had been led to believe that some of the biggest names in rock music—the Jefferson Airplane, James Taylor, Arlo Guthrie, Country Joe and the Fish—would play at the concert. One youth even said he had heard that ex-Beatle John Lennon would be there.

Down the dusty main road of the camp came a slow stream of campers moving out—shuffling people with bedrolls; one with a bugle; another with a tambourine; one with a back pack draped with an American flag, one man with frayed jeans, one leg and crutches. A few dogs wandered about.

As the morning wore on, tents came down one by one, with the stakes rolled into the canvas and the bundle hefted onto someone's back. Timber that served as tent poles and benches was tossed into bonfires that sent stacks of smoke into the gray sky.

Just before 10:30 a.m., 100 to 200 who had decided to stay beyond the noon deadline gathered at the main tent, Rennie Davis spoke, then others, then David Martin in blue overalls with a toothbrush in the pocket and a work cap. He said:

"I called my wife last week, and I told her to come and bring the baby, because I'm going to stay. This is my home, and they're going to have to carry me out."

Those who were staying were not talking of staying to fight. They were staying simply because it was their city, and they would be arrested.

30 TO 40 LEFT

Only 30 to 40 were left when noon came, and the long police line in the distance started moving forward. The group, sitting cross-legged in the dust, was happy and cool, and Martin led them in song. They sang "Power to the People," "Give Peace a Chance," "Michael Row the Boat Ashore."

Raymond Arlo from New York City, wearing a black ribbed sweater, instructed his fellow lawbreakers once more not to resist arrest. When the police move in, he said, "We're going to love them so much they're going to be people."

Then the police moved in. "Man, here they come. I've never seen that many police," said a blonde girl.

The group, encircled by newsmen greater in number than they were, chanted, "The whole world is watching" and "Peace and love, peace and love. . . ."

The police took them, one by one, firmly under the armpits and walked them to the waiting police buses. They were frisked and their pictures were taken. One youth stood against the bus putting Chapstick on his lips. A headlock was applied to one protester who did not go as easily as the rest.

Another youth, waiting his turn to be arrested, held a burning red candle in his hand and sang. A sheep dog tried to follow the protesters toward the bus and was tied to a tent pole. Police Insp. T. E. King patented him on the head.

The television newsmen sat calmly on folding chairs watching as the last of the group was led away.

The policemen, their helmets on and some with face-guards down, walked silently along with their nightsticks and tear gas guns. At the front of the line, Officer M. J. Cullinane read the Quicksilver Times as he strolled.

A phone in the demonstrators' headquarters tent rang without answer.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 3, 1971]

JUSTICE CALLED SHOT ON CLOSING CAMP (By Paul W. Valentine)

The decision to close down the vast antiwar encampment in West Potomac Park at dawn yesterday was made 12 hours earlier at a closed-door meeting in a fourth-floor office of the Justice Department.

In the office of Deputy Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst, a handful of ranking officials from Justice, Defense, Interior and Washington metropolitan police departments met from 5 p.m. to about 6 p.m. Saturday to discuss the action.

A basic decision was made to revoke the permit for the encampment and to fly in federal troops as possible support for police who would handle the actual closing down of the park.

The result: an estimated 45,000 persons were quietly expelled from West Potomac Park, and those few remaining were arrested without violence.

The reason stated by police for revocation of the permit for the park's use was that the continued presence of large crowds whose leaders have vowed widespread disruption of the city today and Tuesday "constituted a threat to general public safety."

Police tried to take precautions for almost every possible contingency. Police brought tear gas and shotguns to the park. They were never needed.

Dupont Circle, Montrose Park and the Washington Monument grounds—all favorite gathering spots for young activists—were closed to the public yesterday. Foot policemen were stationed along downtown business streets to prevent window-breaking or "trashing" by youths leaving the park.

These plans were kept under wraps overnight. Few officials beyond those at Kleindienst's office Saturday were informed of the new strategy, and government spokesmen generally refused to discuss details yesterday.

President Nixon, in San Clemente, Calif., was kept informed of developments.

Rank-and-file policemen, many of whom were kept on alert overnight Saturday in downtown hotels and motels, did not know what was planned until they were awakened before dawn and deployed to the park. Only Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson and some deputy chiefs, inspectors and captains knew of the plan in advance.

Kleindienst, the No. 2 man in the Justice Department, was the highest-ranking official of his department at the Saturday meeting. Spokesmen would not say what other officials were present.

Protesters at the park, led by the militant antiwar group called the Mayday Tribe, had been authorized by the Justice Department to use the parkland near the Lincoln Memorial until May 9. They had planned to use it as a launching point for mass traffic disruptions this morning and Tuesday.

Police spokesman Paul Fuqua outlined yesterday five factors he said contributed to official determination that the encampment posed a threat to public safety:

The unexpected large number of persons present.

Repeated public statements of protest leaders vowing widespread disruption of the city.

The pattern of smaller-scale disruptions (causing more than 1,000 arrests) in the previous two weeks of demonstrations in Washington.

Continuing violations of the permit since the protesters arrived more than a week ago, including use of tents and fires and camping on the parkland.

Violation of public laws such as those prohibiting possession of marijuana and other drugs.

Justice Department sources also said privately that government officials figured that closing down the encampment would scatter the demonstrators and fragment their efforts to regroup for the planned disruptions of traffic this morning.

A spokesman for the Interior Department, which has jurisdiction over national parklands, said the Justice Department "called most of the signals" in planning the camp shutdown and in dealing with the protesters earlier.

Wilson said, however, that once the basic decision had been made, "I had latitude to do whatever happened to be necessary."

After the meeting in Kleindienst's office, Wilson said he met to map specific tactics with his own assistant and deputy chiefs, plus Secret Service representatives, General Services Administration officials and suburban police officials.

He acknowledged that the move against the park at 6:30 a.m. when many persons were asleep or winding down from an all-night rock concert, was done in part because of its surprise element.

"There was always the potential for trouble and (the dawn notice) had the advantage of not giving a lot of time for crowd organization," he said.

Mayday Tribe organizers reacted angrily to the police action, contending they had not been notified in advance as provided in the permit agreement with the Justice Department.

The six-page agreement said that if revocation of the permit was planned by the government, consultation would be sought first "if possible or reasonable," with Mayday organizers. Philip Hirschkop, attorney for Mayday, and other leaders said they were not notified until after the action was taken.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 3, 1971]

CAMPERS OUSTED, STILL PLANNING TO SNARL CITY TODAY

(By Bart Barnes and J. Y. Smith)

Police cleared West Potomac Park of an estimated 45,000 antiwar demonstrators early yesterday in an effort to foil the protesters' plans to bring government operations to a halt today and Tuesday.

By last night, National Guardsmen had taken up positions in Georgetown and some other parts of the city. Their purpose was to take over normal police functions so that the police force would be free to deal with today's scheduled protests, spokesmen said.

The principal tactic advocated by the Mayday Tribe, the organizers of this week's protests, is to block the major arteries leading into the city and thereby prevent government workers from reaching their jobs.

Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson said in re-

sponse to a question that it was a logical conclusion to assume that the revocation of the permit to camp at West Potomac Park was aimed at heading off the planned traffic tie-up.

The Guardsmen last night patrolled at first on foot. Later, they confirmed their activities to jeep patrols in Georgetown, around George Washington University, the White House, DuPont Circle and elsewhere.

Georgetown University appeared to attract the largest number of those evicted from West Potomac Park. A university spokesman said last night that about 3,000 persons, apparently potential demonstrators, were on the campus. A Georgetown University official said they were "not welcome to return" after last night.

But yesterday's major event was the clearing of West Potomac Park. It sent at least three-fourths of the 45,000 back home—to the suburbs and to points as diverse as Florida, Indiana and Massachusetts.

But there were estimates that as many as 10,000 protesters organized by the Mayday Tribe, had regrouped at the universities, churches and elsewhere to plan for the fourth and most militant stage in the spring peace offensive in Washington.

The demonstrators still planned to stop traffic at the bridges over the Potomac River and at key intersections this morning and to march from the Washington Monument grounds to the Pentagon.

How successful they would be was uncertain. Including the National Guardsmen on patrol last night, an estimated 10,000 federal troops and Guardsmen were on alert at nearby military installations ready for street duty. Wilson has promised that any traffic tie-up that occurs will be minimal.

The appearance of Guardsmen on the streets last night was their first in the current series of protests.

In the course of the police action at West Potomac Park and related incidents elsewhere, about 300 persons were arrested and were being given bond hearings at Superior Court last night. There were no reports of violence.

Yesterday, to back those clearing West Potomac Park, other policemen were stationed along downtown streets to prevent possible violence. The U.S. Capitol, Washington Monument grounds, Dupont Circle and Montrose Park were closed to the public.

In regard to possible tie-ups today, the federal government announced that normal leave policies are in effect today, meaning that employees are expected to report for work as usual. Some departments suggested that employees report early, and there were persistent reports, unconfirmed last night, that top agency officials were told to come in at 5 a.m. today.

Today's traffic-blocking activities are to start a third consecutive week of antiwar protests in Washington that began last month with an encampment of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War on the Mall.

At one point the government won an injunction, upheld by the Supreme Court, against the veterans' encampment, but then declined to use it.

The veterans' protest was followed by the massive and peaceful antiwar rally April 24 and then last week by a series of marches, picketing and sit-ins at the entrances to various federal agencies downtown. More than 1,000 were arrested and detained briefly during last week's activities.

Today's planned actions represent a new and untested tactic, according to protest leaders.

On the premise that peaceful demonstrations such as the one April 24 have failed to achieve peace in Southeast Asia, leaders of today's action have said they plan to create "a level of social chaos that America's leaders will be unable to accept."

They reason that the majority of Americans favor immediate peace in Southeast

Asia and contend that they will blame the government and not the demonstrators, for any inconvenience.

A Pentagon spokesman maintained yesterday that the movement of federal troops here, from as far away as Ft. Benning, Ga., was "precautionary." He said the troops would not be used unless the Justice Department requests them.

As of yesterday afternoon, Justice Department officials said "it's still a metropolitan police activity," but Army spokesmen conceded that deployment plans are ready for this morning if troops are needed.

The number of troops on alert in the area was the largest since the riots of April, 1968, when 11,600 were brought into the city to quell rioting that followed the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

Over the weekend, the troops were airlifted or conveyed here from Fts. Eustis, Lee and Belvoir in Virginia; Meade in Maryland; Bragg, Pope Air Force Base and Camp Lejeune in North Carolina, Ft. Benning, and the Marine base at Quantico, Va.

They were stationed at Andrews Air Force Base, the Soldiers Home, Ft. Myer, and the Anacostia Naval Air Station. By 3 a.m. yesterday, planes were seen landing at Andrews every three minutes with armed troops.

A contingent of about 200 soldiers, presumably part of the 3d Infantry assigned to guard the White House, was seen entering the basement of the Executive Office Building at 5:25 a.m.

The 515th Military Police Battalion from Ft. Meyer was the first unit to go on stand-by alert Friday night. Yesterday, 2,000 troops of the 82d Airborne Division arrived from Ft. Bragg.

Other units brought to the area included the 1st Field Army Support Command from Ft. Lee, the 91st Engineers Battalion from Ft. Belvoir, the 7th Transport Battalion from Ft. Eustis, a battalion of 850 marines from Quantico, the 519th Military Police Battalion from Ft. Meade and the 44th Aviation Battalion, which arrived with five helicopters from Ft. Benning.

The Pentagon's deployment, military spokesmen said Saturday, came "in response to the determination by the federal government that illegal conduct, breaches of the peace and attempts to close down government services will not be permitted."

Metropolitan police cancelled all days off and leaves today and men were put on staggered, 12-hour shifts to cope with any disruptions. An undisclosed number of policemen was being billeted for a second night at hotels within the city.

The decision to move on the West Potomac Park campsite was made Saturday afternoon in a private meeting at the office of Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst at the Justice Department.

Those attending included "ranking officials" of the Departments of Justice and Interior, the Pentagon and the Washington police department.

Reasons given for revoking the permit were assessments by government officials that there would be a threat to the safety of the general public if the camp permit were to continue in effect.

Police plans were a well-kept secret. Even the strike force, many of whom spent the night at downtown hotels including the Washington Hilton, did not know their specific assignment until 5 a.m. yesterday.

At 6 a.m., a police press release disclosed the revocation of the Interior Department park permit, although earlier, police had denied that additional forces were being called to duty.

Police massed two deep along Independence Avenue between the Lincoln Memorial and the Tidal Basin shortly before 7 a.m. while many persons at the rock concert were still sleeping.

The police order to clear the camp was first

read from a sound truck at 6:45 a.m. It was repeated several times during the next 4½ hours as the crowd began to disperse.

Shortly before noon, about 750 policemen swept through the campsite and arrested between 50 and 100 persons who refused to leave.

The police sweep through the encampment was delayed for several hours as Insp. T. E. King walked alone through the grounds, talking to protesters and urging them to leave voluntarily rather than face arrest.

When the arrests did come, demonstrators did not resist, and there was virtually no violence.

NUMBERS LISTED FOR INFORMATION

The District of Columbia, Alexandria and Fairfax County have announced that special telephone numbers will be available today and Tuesday for motorists to call about traffic conditions caused by antiwar demonstrators in their jurisdiction: The numbers are:

D.C.: 629-3871.

Alexandria: 750-6311.

Fairfax County: 591-3333.

Arlington County police urged motorists and others to listen to radio reports rather than call police for conditions. No special numbers have been set up in Montgomery and Prince Georges counties.

But the government action was denounced by protest leader Rennie Davis, who told a press conference:

"The U.S. government insists on martial law in Saigon and virtual martial law in Washington, D.C. . . . Nixon has decided to suspend the Constitution," he said.

But Sen. ———, another opponent of the war, said it could be "counterproductive" if demonstrators were successful in interrupting the government.

George Wiley, executive director of the National Welfare Rights Organization, also at the press conference with Davis, protested the cancellation of an afternoon soul rally, scheduled for the Monument grounds.

"The city is virtually under a state of martial law," he said.

After sweeping through the campsite once but permitting newsmen and medical personnel to remain, police regrouped at the south end and swept again, ordering all newsmen and medics out.

Small knots of demonstrators, meanwhile, headed into the area generally between the White House and Georgetown University, in the vicinity of Pennsylvania Avenue.

At one point a section of 17th Street NW near Constitution Avenue was blocked off as a contingent from women's liberation, joined by a number of male bystanders, held a march.

A few arrests were made after paint was tossed at nearby buildings.

Forty-two Quakers were arrested in Lafayette Park, where they walked after a Sunday afternoon meeting and formed a circle and clasped hands. Motorcycle police had been keeping the park clear, allowing people to walk through but not to gather there.

In other parks around the city, Sunday strollers as well as demonstrators were met by police. Dupont Circle was sealed off soon after police moved on West Potomac Park and Montrose Park in Georgetown soon after that.

In closing the parks, police spokesmen cited a broadly worded regulation authorizing police lines barring the public "when (police) consider it necessary for the protection of persons or property."

Throughout most of the afternoon and early evening, however, those who remained in town met in state and regional groups to discuss tactics for the rush-hour disruptions this morning.

Mayday organizers reportedly scaled down the number of target intersections from 22 to 12 or 13.

In addition to the 3,000 protesters who gathered at Georgetown University, a "couple of hundred" were made welcome at the American University Student Association and about 300 remained on the campus of George Washington University, according to spokesmen for those institutions. The spokesmen said the situation was quiet at both campuses.

(NOTE.—Contributing to this story were Washington Post Staff Writers Donald E. Graham, Eugene Meyer, E. J. Bachinski, Jean R. Halley, Martin Weil, William N. Curry, John Hanrahan, William L. Claiborne, Sanford J. Ungar and Michael Hodge.)

SEEKS REASONABLE COMPENSATION FOR ALASKA'S MEDICAL AIDES

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, many citizens in Alaska depend solely on the U.S. Public Health Service program for all their medical needs. Without doubt, these services provide the most beneficial health program in Alaska today. However, because of the ever increasing demands made on these dedicated medical aides and the increasing number of cases they are called upon to handle, the present program does not adequately compensate those who work so diligently and unselfishly.

The dedicated men and women who staff the Public Health Service hospitals are well-trained and deeply concerned individuals who share the common goal of providing good health care for all Alaskans.

Presently, the salaries of these medical aides does not take into consideration the continuously increasing workload nor the increased skills and time needed to perform their jobs properly. If we hope to continue to attract these dedicated people, the U.S. Public Health Service will have to provide a more reasonable and just compensation for each medical aide.

The Alaska State Legislature is also concerned with this matter and has passed a joint resolution to that effect and I submit it for inclusion into the RECORD.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 40—RELATING TO VILLAGE MEDICAL AIDE SERVICES

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the United States Public Health Service program which provides for the services of medical aides in many remote areas of Alaska has proven to be one of the most beneficial programs concerning the health and general well-being of many Alaskans; and

Whereas the duties placed upon these medical aides has steadily increased, along with the necessity that the aides possess more skills and devote more and more time to their duties; and

Whereas the existing salaries of the medical aides do not take into consideration the continuously increasing workload nor the increased skills and time needed to perform their jobs properly; be it

Resolved by the Alaska State Legislature, in the light of Alaska's high cost of living, that the United States Public Health Service

is respectfully requested to provide reasonable compensation for each medical aide.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Elliott Richardson, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

COURT DIES—AND ADDICTS' HOPES

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the State of New York has begun to choke off funds from vital social service programs throughout the State. Citing severe financial constraints, the Governor and budget cutters in the State Assembly have slashed narcotics treatment budgets far below present levels.

These cuts are not painless. They are not trimming fat from inflated programs. They are gutting successful operations that have offered narcotic addicts a real chance to escape a life of crime and degradation. The following article in the May 1, 1971, issue of the New York Post describes the impact of these budget cuts on addicts and their families seeking treatment. Seventeen of my colleagues have protested these devastating budget reductions in a letter to Governor Rockefeller. I include both the Post article and the text of the letter at this point in my remarks:

COURT DIES—AND ADDICTS' HOPES

(By Marc Kalech)

Nobody wanted Special Term, Part Three of the State Supreme Court, to close down. But when it finally did there were a lot of people who were glad the agony was over.

Justice Edward Dudley adjourned the court, thanked the staff and everyone packed up belongings and slowly filed out of the tiny courtroom, heads bowed, trying to avoid the confused stares of the parents and narcotic addicts waiting in the hallway.

Part Three had just completed an agonizing week of turning away heroin addicts who wanted to enter the state's Narcotic Addiction Control Commission's rehabilitation program.

Part Three had spent the week telling parents who had made the decision to turn in their children to the state for up to three years, that the court could not help them any more.

NCAA told the court last week that it would not accept addicts into its enforced-treatment program for at least two months because of state budget cuts.

Dudley, administrative judge of the State Supreme Court for Manhattan and the Bronx was spending his one week of the year presiding in the basement courtroom of the Edgecombe Rehabilitation Facility at 611 Edgecombe Av. in upper Manhattan. The wood-paneled courtroom is only about 30 feet long and 20 feet wide.

Dudley, at the request of defense lawyers, consented to allow a reporter to observe the last session of the court.

A father sat before the justice and asked the court to issue a warrant for the arrest of his 24-year-old son "before he kills himself."

The man stared at Dudley in confusion as the balding jurist told him that the court was going to dismiss his petition.

The man listened to the decision and then quietly stood, wondering what had happened. He turned to one of the two uniformed guards to ask what he could do next but the guard was calling the next case.

A sobbing mother entered with her young son. The woman told the judge that she had no proof that her son was addicted "but I know he uses drugs. I'm his mother."

She said the boy's friend had threatened her life if she turned her son in. She wanted him examined by a doctor to determine if he was using heroin.

Dudley dismissed the case and told the woman to return in 60 days if she still thought her son was using drugs.

"Should I come back after I've been killed," she screamed.

A mother and father accompanied their 16-year-old daughter before the court.

The girl had already been examined by a NACC doctor and was found to be addicted. The parents expected the girl to be committed but the doctor could not be reached to testify at the girl's trial.

Since the date of the trial could not be advanced, Dudley announced that the case had to be dismissed.

"Do what?" the startled mother shouted. "Please, I want this child put away. She has taken all her sister's things. I have to have this child out of the house."

The judge said, "There is no more money and this facility is closing down. I'm sending her home."

The little girl looked helpless. As she left the court she looked up at her parents. Her father said: "I don't care what the Goddamn judge or anyone says, she's not coming home with me."

A self-petitioner stood before the court. He wanted to be taken off the streets. Dudley explained the budget cuts to the boy. He said the court could not hear his case now but he could repetition when the court reopened.

ASKED TO HOLD OUT

"You've come here yourself. That's good. I hope you can hold out another two months," the judge said.

A mother had brought her son in for a medical exam. The boy entered wearing the baggy denims and torn sneakers that were issued to him after his exam.

The doctor said that the boy was addicted. The boy did not want to accept the finding and requested a trial. The doctor could not be reached to testify and the case was dismissed.

The boy explained that if he entered the program he would be released in a few months. "If I go out on the streets in a couple of months I'm going to go back on heroin," he said.

"I need a long period of time to get myself together. I've never been locked up before and I don't like it so I'm going to get myself together."

In all, the justice heard 34 cases before the morning was through. He dismissed 27 petitions and certified seven addicts to NACC programs.

Most addicts that were certified had come to court before the budget cuts were announced and had been in custody since.

As the morning drew on, Dudley grew more testy and his frustration became more apparent and spread to the rest of the staff.

"I think this one of the most frustrating things we have ever engaged in in this court," he said during a break.

"Because of the shortsightedness of our political figures, we're not only not able to continue at present levels, we're not able to continue at any level."

Dudley thought that the NACC program was "no panacea, no magic cure" but that it had "given some people hope . . ."

The justice stopped for a moment. Maybe he was thinking of the mother whose son had not been accepted. "He's going to kill himself," she said.

APRIL 29, 1971.

HON. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of the State of New York,
The Executive Chamber,
The Capitol,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER: We were shocked and dismayed by the recent announcement of substantial cutbacks in funding for the State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission. At a time when heroin addiction is destroying our youth in ever-increasing numbers, turning our streets into jungles, terrorizing our population, killing three New Yorkers every day, we must vastly enlarge, not slash, the size of our treatment facilities.

We understand the pressures for fiscal restraint on the state and national level. But reductions in addiction treatment programs are false savings. The cost to society of addiction-related crimes is bound to be far greater than the cost of programs which seek to rehabilitate addicts and thereby reduce such crimes.

The budget cuts will prevent the Narcotics Commission centers from accepting new addicts for treatment for the next 60 days, which will require them to turn away about 1300 drug abusers. Judges will not be able to commit convicted offenders to treatment programs, and no addicts will be able to come off the street and seek treatment voluntarily. Current waiting lists for treatment programs will grow intolerably large. Addicts will either be put into prisons which are actually schools for crime, or kept on the streets where they will continue to threaten the quality of life for 8 million New Yorkers.

At a time when our narcotics treatment programs are reaching only a measly 10% of New York's addicts, it is inconceivable to us that you could even consider reducing an already inadequate treatment and rehabilitation program. Such actions condemn New York to more years of crime and fear while we pretend to be curing a cancer with band-aids. We urge you to rescind these cuts in the budget of an agency that is crucial to the war on crime and drug addiction.

Sincerely,

Bella S. Abzug, Joseph P. Addabbo, Herman Badillo, Jonathan B. Bingham, Frank J. Brasco, Hugh L. Carey, Shirley Chisholm, John G. Dow, Seymour Halpern, Edward I. Koch, John M. Murphy, Otis G. Pike, Bertram L. Podell, Charles B. Rangel, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, James H. Scheuer, and Lester L. Wolff.

We cannot escape the problems of drug addiction. Drug abuse of all kinds is escalating among the young and those who see less and less hope for satisfying lives. Cutting treatment programs will only increase the rate at which the problems outstrip our ability to cope with them.

**ALLEGANY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AIDS IN RECYCLING GLASS**

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the students at Allegany Community College are active in many community activities—the latest is the recycling of glass in an effort to help improve the environment. The students, led by George J. Krein and Roger L. Creswell, organized collection points throughout Allegany County,

helped segregate the glass by color, and joined in the Glass Caravan to Baltimore.

It is this type of student activity that indicates broad student interest in many phases of American life. I would like to commend the students at Allegany Community College for their participation in the Glass Caravan on April 17. The students are also investigating the possibility of procuring a glass recycling center to be located in Allegany County.

The Glass Caravan was organized by the Middle-Atlantic Region of the Student Council on Pollution and the Environment—SCOPE—to demonstrate the necessity for more recycling of glass. The Maryland Glass Corp. in Baltimore is the recycling center at the present time and was the terminus of the Caravan. The Maryland Soft Drink Association also sponsored the Caravan.

The flyer put out by the Allegany Community College students states:

This effort is based upon the belief that public action and demonstrated concern can bring about lasting and meaningful change for the benefit of society.

This is a very positive approach to the problems of the 20th century—an approach which I encourage and applaud.

**RADICAL "COMMON CAUSE" IS
BEING EXPOSED**

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Jefferson City, Mo., Post-Tribune titled "Radical 'Common Cause' Is Being Exposed." The conclusion of this comment is that Common Cause "despite its nonpartisan claim, is nothing more than a new highly partisan group which supports Americans for Democratic Action policies.

The text of the editorial follows:

RADICAL "COMMON CAUSE" IS BEING EXPOSED

Slowly but surely "Common Cause" is being exposed for what it is—a highly partisan new radical organization on the national scene. It is nothing more than a second Americans for Democratic Action, which most Democrats denounce.

Thank to the Republican National Committee, more is coming to light about "Common Cause," which has been as busy as the proverbial bee on the Washington scene and in metropolitan areas.

The other day the GOP undercut "Common Cause's" claim to political non-partisanship. It also labels the organization's chairman, John Gardner, as a "purveyor of the radical Democratic line. . . ." Gardner is supposed to be a nominal Republican. If so, he's one wearing sheep's clothing.

The GOP newsletter also notes that Jack Conway, "Common Cause" president, is a Democrat and a cofounder of the radical Business Executives for Peace. In fact, "Common Cause's" executive committee and policy council are dominated by Democrats.

The late Cardinal Cushing of Boston once said that if something acts and talks like a duck it is a duck. In the same light, "Common Cause," despite its non-partisan claim, is nothing more than a new radical wing of the Democratic Party.

**CRIME INSURANCE FOR SMALL
BUSINESS BLOCKED**

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when small business continues to be in desperate need of crime insurance, it is with regret that I read in Thursday's, April 29, Washington Post of the successful efforts by affected insurance companies to block immediate crime insurance coverage for District of Columbia small businessmen. It appears that the insurance industry is aggressively taking steps to prevent the implementation of an order by District insurance superintendent, Edward P. Lombard, that the companies make available crime insurance coverage before a Federal subsidy program goes into effect on August 1.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most vital subject, I place the article by Maurine Beasley and Eugene L. Meyer entitled "Quick D.C. Crime Insurance Blocked," in the RECORD:

QUICK D.C. CRIME INSURANCE BLOCKED

(By Maurine Beasley and Eugene L. Meyer)

The D.C. Court of Appeals responding to an emergency request from affected insurance companies, yesterday blocked efforts to provide Washington's small businessmen with crime insurance immediately.

The court granted a stay, pending a full hearing, from an April 15 order by District insurance superintendent Edward P. Lombard that the companies make available such coverage before a federal subsidy program goes into effect Aug. 1.

The effect of the court action, Lombard said yesterday, is "that an effort to have a nonsubsidized program has been delayed to the point where it will be very close to the federal program if it finally goes into effect" at all.

Lombard said the court ordered hearing will be "around June," but Mayor Walter E. Washington said the District would press for an earlier date.

Lombard said he felt the court decided "that the principle of subsidy is of paramount importance." For himself, he added, "It would appear the need for subsidy is rather clear and there will be no relief for the public without subsidy."

It was a clean-cut victory for the insurance companies, which had opposed the mayor's view that crime insurance could be required without a subsidy. The mayor first proposed that the government-backed pool, known as the D.C. Insurance Placement Facility, write crime insurance in 1968, but insurance companies blocked it in the courts.

Lombard issued the April 15 order after opposing it privately.

Last September, the same court that acted yesterday ruled that crime coverage could be included in the pool program, which has been limited to damage from fire, vandalism and malicious mischief.

Crime insurance covers losses from thefts and burglaries, apart from those incurred during civil disorders.

Insurance companies here, between the mayor's decision to go ahead and Lombard's April 15 order sought a 44.8 percent increase in crime insurance rates, claiming large losses without the subsidy. Lombard ordered the raise rescinded.

WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS CALLED
UNDERMINING OF INTENT OF
CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am highly disturbed over recent reports that the Nixon administration is impounding urgently needed funds which have been appropriated for the current fiscal year by the U.S. Congress. Historically, Congress has been charged with the responsibility of authorizing and appropriating funds, and the executive branch has been charged with the responsibility of administering the programs which Congress has funded.

However, we are now faced with the situation in which the executive branch is refusing to spend funds which have been explicitly earmarked by Congress for a particular purpose. This is a blatant undermining of the intent of Congress and an erosion of congressional power by the executive branch. It raises questions which go directly to the heart of the longstanding separation of powers doctrine. This practice not only violates the principle of separation of powers, but violates, as well, Mr. Nixon's own avowed understanding of the process of American government. Mr. Nixon himself has written:

The principles underlying the government of the United States are decentralization of power, separation of power and maintaining a balance between freedom and order. Above all else, the framers of the Constitution were fearful of the concentration of power in either individuals or government. The genius of their solution in this respect is that they were able to maintain a very definite but delicate balance between the federal government and state government, on the one hand, and between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the federal government on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, in withholding the funds which Congress has duly appropriated, Mr. Nixon not only violates an historic and longstanding legal principle of American government, but he once again demonstrates that he is either incapable or unwilling to reconcile his actions, or as in this case, his inaction, with his rhetoric.

And once again, the victims of this latest presidential fiasco are the people. Recent information indicates that Mr. Nixon has withheld \$191 million which Congress has appropriated for Appalachian regional development, \$757 million in basic farm programs, and more than \$600 million in aid to the cities. The frozen aid to the cities is particularly distressing at a time when our cities are literally crying out for lack of funds. I find it unbelievable that a President of the United States can, on the one hand, withhold \$200 million for urban renewal and \$200 million in water and sewer facility grants and on the other hand, send a message to Congress which refers to a "sorely inadequate supply of housing and community facilities, vast wastelands of vacant and decaying buildings, acre upon acre of valuable urban renewal land ly-

ing empty and fallow, and an estimated 24 million Americans still living in sub-standard housing."

The message further said:

Many of our central cities—once symbols of vitality and opportunity—have now become places of disillusion and decay. As many suburban neighborhoods have grown older, they, too, have begun to deteriorate and to take on the problems of the central cities. Even some of the newest suburban "subdivisions," planned and developed in a shortsighted, haphazard manner, are not prepared to provide essential public services to their growing populations. They are already on their way to becoming the slums of tomorrow.

Yet, these are the very words which appear in President Nixon's message to Congress on March 5 of this year.

The case against Mr. Nixon's refusal to release these funds is a strong one. The Speaker of the House of Representatives has declared that—

In determining how much he will spend on any given program, the President is in effect legislating and administering simultaneously.

Yet the Constitution provides that Congress shall legislate and the executive branch shall administer.

In determining which appropriated funds shall be spent and which shall be withheld, the President, in effect, is deciding which laws shall be executed and to what extent they shall be enforced. The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, one of the most respected constitutional authorities in the country, has stated unequivocally that the President "has no authority under the Constitution to decide which laws will be executed or to what extent they will be enforced."

Referring to the practice of impounding funds, this chairman, the senior Senator from North Carolina, continues:

Yet by using the impounding technique, the President is able to do just that. He is able to effect policy by determining which of the laws passed by Congress he will enforce, and to what extent.

Perhaps even more significant is that by impounding funds that have been appropriated, the President is actually practicing a line or item veto. And there is no provision in the Constitution empowering the President to act in this manner. It is well established that the Constitution empowers the President to veto a bill completely or accept it in its entirety. It is certainly well established that the Constitution does not empower a President to accept only part of a bill and reject a part. Yet this is precisely what the President is doing when he spends some of the funds which Congress has appropriated, and impounds other funds.

And what is the Nixon administration's answer to these charges? The administration cannot cite one iota of constitutional evidence for this practice. The only argument which I have heard on behalf of the administration is the one put forth by Caspar Weinberger, the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. His weak argument is merely that someone has done something similar to this before. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's main argument in defense of its clearly

illegal practice is, basically, that two wrongs make a right.

I, for one, do not think the American people are going to accept this argument. I certainly do not accept it, and I join many of my colleagues in demanding that President Nixon uphold his oath of office and carry out his constitutional obligation to give the American people the money and the programs which their elected Representatives have approved.

INSIDE THE PRISONS OF HANOI

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, those who seek favor with the Communists will do well to think on an article by Louis R. Stockstill in the Reader's Digest for April. It is entitled, "Inside the Prisons of Hanoi":

INSIDE THE PRISONS OF HANOI

(By Louis R. Stockstill)

(NOTE.—The following report on the shocking conditions within the prisoner-of-war camps of North Vietnam, and on the threat these conditions pose to the survival of hundreds of U.S. citizens, has been drawn from lengthy interviews with some of the men who have been released, and from informed sources in Washington, Saigon and Paris.)

The truck lurches forward with thrashing gears. On the rough truck bed, an American lies on his back, blindfolded, hands and feet bound. He is jolted by each bump, jarred by thrusts of pain. Hearing clattering street noises and strident automobile horns, he knows they have entered Hanoi. Soon he will be prodded to his feet and led into one of North Vietnam's dread prisoner-of-war camps.

For almost two months, since his capture, the American has been herded from village to village. He is rarely fed. His captors doubletime him, on foot, moving steadily northward. In each village, they tether or cage him like an animal so that villagers can file past to strike him or urinate on his body. He is constantly hungry; his weight drops steadily, and nausea and fever plague him.

Eventually, his captors transfer him to a small hut with 12 bamboo cages, force him onto his stomach, thrust his feet into wooden stocks and tie his arms behind his back with wet rope. For 29 days they keep him in this position, freeing him only long enough to gobble a daily bowl of rice and to relieve himself. His face is obscured by a scraggly beard, his eyes burn from sunken sockets. Then he is told that he is to be moved to Hanoi.

Now, three days later, a truck deposits him at the looming triangular mass of the "Hanoi Hilton," an old French penitentiary covering approximately a city block and surrounded by glass-studded concrete walls. Within, two separate sections are reserved exclusively for U.S. prisoners-of-war. As in other POW camps in North Vietnam, its tiny cells are cement-walled and heavily barred; bunks are either cement slabs or rough boards stretched across sawhorses. The only other furnishing is a toilet bucket. Terrazzo-like floors slope away from a central corridor toward open drains where rats enter and leave. Doors are thick teak, with peepholes.

¹ There are two other prisons within the city, one called the "Zoo," the other the "Country Club." If there are others—and there probably are—the U.S. government, to safeguard security, cannot talk about them.

NIGHT WATCH

The misery and demoralization that American POWs experience in this subhuman environment can best be understood by looking at a typical prison day. Above the prisoner's hard, narrow bunk, with its paper-thin straw mat, a bare light bulb burns day and night. On the bunk he tosses and frets, searching vainly for a comfortable position for his calloused hips and thighs, relief for his pain-ridden body. He sleeps little, thinking daylight will never come, that the hated light bulb will never fade. There is no clock; the hours drag on.

Now it is winter, bringing the cold he detests and fears most. He has wadded a mosquito net around his frigid feet, wrapped one of his two flimsy blankets around the net, and covered his legs and torso as best he can with the other. He still wears his coarse pajama-like shirt and trousers. But the cold penetrates everything, numbing and taunting him. His empty stomach rumbles, and now he is shaking convulsively, uncontrollably.

He will have to get up. He swings his stiffened legs to the floor, stands with great effort, slaps at his skinny legs, wasted backside and bony chest. The flesh feels dead. Sometimes he hears the muffled movements of another prisoner also fighting the cold. In a nearby cell a man cries out, "Oh, God. Oh, God!" He repeats the words to himself, only vaguely aware that the cry has nudged him into prayer.

How many hundreds of nights like this has he endured? He can no longer remember.

GONGS AND JUDAS HOLES

Finally daylight comes, and he watches the gray light filter slowly through the exposed portion of the small window far up the wall of his cell. He waits. He listens. He has learned to segment the days into sounds. The first one, at 5:30 a.m., is the harsh, reverberating jangle of the "gong," a metal ring periodically assaulted by a metal rod. It echoes and reechoes. And as it fades, he strains to hear the bolt being withdrawn on a distant door. He knows the guard is starting along the cells, slapping open the "Judas Hole" in each door to make certain the man inside is on his feet. Stiffly, the prisoner rises and begins to fold his "bedding." The sounds of the opening and closing of the peepholes come steadily closer until the guard peers into his own cell and passes on.

A loudspeaker over the door squawks to life. The voice of Hanoi Hannah enters his cell, seeking to "re-educate" him about the war. She tells him that the United States is suffering disastrous defeat, and that the American people couldn't care less. She frequently quotes American critics of the war. Her flow of bad "news" is salted with reports on riots and racial problems in the States. The half-hour monologue drones on like a funeral dirge. Then the loudspeaker dies. But he knows Hannah will be back in the evening with more cheerless news. She visits him twice a day, every day.

Now he hears the guard taking one of the men outside to empty his toilet bucket; the man is then returned and locked back up. He listens to a repetition of the same sounds, slowly passing from cell to cell. Soon, he too is taken out to the cesspool and then brought back to await the next event. If it is a wash-day, he will be allowed to wash. For him, this is the week's highlight. But he must await his turn. Precautions are always taken to prevent him from seeing or talking with other prisoners.

He is taken into one of several cubicles, each with a small tub of icy water. The guard locks the door. In the five minutes allotted him, he quickly strips, braces himself and begins sloshing the freezing water onto his body. If there is soap, he lathers and scrubs his skin. But, he must rinse thoroughly, for he knows that any trace of the abrasive, lye-

like soap will produce a painful rash. He dresses rapidly and rinses his other suit of "pajamas." The guard returns and marches him back to his cell, allowing him to hang his laundry alongside the dripping clothing of other prisoners.

It is almost noon, time to be fed. He never thinks of the bread and watery soup as food. But he relishes the thought of having something—anything—in his stomach.

As the food is dispensed, each cell door is unlocked and locked in the familiar pattern. When the guard opens the door, the prisoner reaches down for the bowl and bread placed on the threshold. Anything he is given is placed on the floor so that he must always bend down in front of his captor. In appearance, if not in spirit, he must always display humility. (He wryly remembers the staggering blow from the rifle butt when he once, "disrespectfully," crossed his legs in the presence of an interrogating officer.) As he rises with the food, he must come to attention. And so he stands as the guard shuts the door.

Then he eats, forcing himself to chew the bread with great care, watchful for the small stones sometimes embedded in the dough. He has disciplined himself to eat every crumb, every drop. With the last of the bread, he mops the bowl.

He waits again. Soon another "gong" sounds, instructing him to lie down. The room is still cold, but his shrunken stomach is temporarily pacified. Now, more often than not, he is finally able to doze. But the fitful sleep ends abruptly, torn apart by another gong. It is two o'clock. For the next seven hours he can only pace or sit. He is not permitted to lie on his bunk again until 9 p.m. Periodically, unexpectedly, a guard slams open the Judas Hole to check.

Body and Soul. As the prisoner paces, he gropes for something to occupy his thoughts. He has recited the names of the states forward and backward, the names of all the U.S. Presidents he can remember. He has built boats and houses in his mind, gone on imaginary walking tours, retraced most of the memorable events of his life, the plots of books and movies. But the monotony of these efforts has made it increasingly difficult to concentrate. His thoughts skitter away to questions he would prefer to avoid, to a maze of anxieties.

He thinks about the war. Can Hanoi Hannah be right? Has America given in to defeatist views? If so, what will happen to him? He worries about his health. He is half-starved, ridden with tiny things that crawl in his stomach. He has grown steadily weaker.

The question he dreads most, and that now recurs with frightening frequency, is: *Can I last?* And what about my family? Will my wife wait forever? Is she well? Will the children remember me? How do they manage without a father? Sadness overwhelms him.

Occasionally he gets a letter, but this is a recent development. And the six-line note that is permitted can never answer the hundreds of questions that roam his mind. Still, other prisoners have received nothing, so he must be considered fortunate.

At 4:30 he is fed the same food he received earlier, the same that he will also get twice tomorrow, and the next day and the next. There is no meat, nothing green, nothing sweet—always the same tasteless soup and bread. After this second feeding, he will wait 18 hours to be fed again.

It is dark now, and at 8:30 Hanoi Hannah is back. She stays until 9, and as the loudspeaker clicks off, the last "gong" rings out. He must crawl back onto his bunk to face the cold, and his lonely thoughts, until morning. He pleads with his body and soul for strength to survive yet another night under the light bulb.

SHATTERED ROLES

How long this man and his fellow captives can last is anyone's guess. But their lives are more gravely threatened with each passing day. Some of the POWs have already died.² Others face almost certain death unless their treatment is drastically improved. One careful study of available information, compiled by Lt. Col. Joseph R. Cataldo, a doctor with the Green Berets, indicates that the POWs not only are severely malnourished, but that 80 percent have skin diseases, at least half suffer from intestinal worms, a quarter may have active tuberculosis, and many are afflicted with serious vitamin deficiencies, mental disorientation and muscular wastage.

Hanoi also has weakened men by systematic torture. Prisoners have been denied food or water for long periods, suspended from ceilings by their arms, burned with cigarettes, clubbed with rifle butts and physically beaten. In numerous cases, their captors have refused them adequate medical care, and have neglected to attend to major injuries.

Small wonder, then, that North Vietnam forbids inspection of the camps by the International Red Cross—in direct violation of the Geneva Conventions. Instead, "showcase" prisoners are paraded in propaganda films. When anti-war groups or friendly foreign journalists are selected to talk with or film small groups of prisoners, only the healthiest men, barbered and freshly clothed, are trotted into public view to parrot carefully rehearsed information. What the public never sees are the hidden cells, the men on crutches, those who can walk only with the aid of another prisoner, those with deformities, the badly emaciated, the sick in bed.

The Geneva Conventions require repatriation of the sick and wounded, as well as the release or transfer to a neutral nation of men whose long confinement jeopardizes their health. Yet Hanoi, which is a signatory to the Conventions, has ignored these rules as they apply to the 781 captured and missing in North Vietnam. And the enemy has made no effort to persuade the Vietcong and communist forces in South Vietnam and Laos even to identify the almost 800 other Americans captured or missing in these areas.

For the prisoners, meanwhile, years pile on lonely years. The first men captured are nearing their seventh year in captivity. More than 300 others soon face their fourth, fifth and sixth anniversaries in enemy hands.

Unless help is forthcoming, these men will continue to rot and die.

Here at home, private citizens and concerned organizations are reacting with growing impatience to North Vietnam's inhumane treatment of our prisoners. Public denunciations, mounting press attention, resolutions in the U.S. Congress and the United Nations, letter-writing campaigns and many similar efforts are beginning to have an effect. These are evidence that Hanoi is smarting under the attack.

In the past year North Vietnam's leaders have tried to muffle criticism by easing a few of the harsh restrictions imposed on the prisoners. Hanoi has, for example, permitted an increase in mail between some of the men and their families, authorized more packages for the captives, boosted the weight-limitation on Christmas parcels and permitted families to mail previously forbidden items such as small games, medicines and vitamins.

²North Vietnam has told U.S. anti-war groups and Senators that 23 prisoners have died. But the lists cannot be regarded as completely accurate: all of the deaths were reported long after they supposedly occurred, and after a number of the men had been held captive up to five years.

But conditions are still deplorable. You can show your concern over Hanoi's treatment of our prisoners-of-war by signing the statement below (adding a personal message if you wish) and sending it at once to: "Help Our POWs," American Red Cross, P.O. Box 1600, Washington, D.C. 20013. The Red Cross will tabulate the responses and see that your message gets to the government of North Vietnam. Millions of protests from indignant Americans cannot fail to have impact, even in Hanoi. Don't wait. Sign and mail your letter right now, then call a friend and ask him or her to do the same. The one hope these prisoners have is that their fellow Americans will not forget them.

WE WANT PROOF, NOT PROPAGANDA

President TON DUC THANG,
Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, c/o
American Red Cross, "Help Our POWs,"
Box 1600, Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: You have claimed repeatedly that American citizens held in your "detention camps" are being treated humanely. But you offer no proof of this. Except under the most restricted circumstances, you will not even allow foreign observers to enter these camps.

Proof of your sincerity would be the immediate repatriation of all sick and wounded captives and the release (or transfer to some neutral nation) of all prisoners whose health has been jeopardized by long confinement. By doing so, you could perhaps end some of the uncertainty and dismay your policies have created throughout the community of nations. I join with millions the world over in urging you to take these steps.

PIPELINE REPORTS SUPPRESSED

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious ecological questions confronting our Nation today is the decision to build or not to build the trans-Alaskan pipeline.

For many years this country has experienced industrial growth and technological advancement, never considering the possible environmental consequences. The effect is easily seen in traffic congestion and air pollution in our major cities.

Today, many of us are asking the environmental questions, not for the purpose of stopping progress, but in the hope that we might fully understand the ecological consequences of our decision before an irreparable mistake is made.

The decision to build the trans-Alaskan pipeline is one such case. One of my distinguished colleagues, Representative LES ASPIN, Wisconsin, has written an article in National Parks and Conservation magazine regarding the risks that construction of the pipeline would pose to the Alaskan environment and to the Alaskan Natives. I include his article in the RECORD for your consideration:

PIPELINE REPORTS SUPPRESSED

(By Representative LES ASPIN)

The Federal Government so far has failed to confront and resolve the ecological and human consequences of the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline. One especially disturbing aspect of this failure are the recent attempts to suppress two vitally important documents that were critical both of the pipeline itself

and of the Interior Department's draft of its environmental impact statement.

The first document, a 38-page report authored by Harold Jorgenson (then of the Bureau of Land Management), details many of the omissions and unfounded assumptions in the impact statement. Mr. Jorgenson concludes that the impact statement's summary "seems too much to assume that 'what's good for the oil industry is good for the country.'"

Although dated January 8, 1971, the Jorgenson Report still was not public at the time of the Interior Department's pipeline hearings in Washington on February 16th. Not until I placed a copy of the report in both the pipeline hearings record and the *Congressional Record* did the Department agree to make the Jorgenson Report available to the public.

The second critical document that was kept away from the public's reach was a 21-page report on the impact statement written by the Alaskan office of the Army Corps of Engineers. This report is both revealing in what it says about the pipe and surprising. It is surprising because the Corps frequently has been criticized for failing adequately to consider the ecological consequences of many of their own projects. But in this report the Alaskan Corps office demonstrates a real concern for the environment. Its report asserts that the conclusions of the impact statement "appear to be unsupported opinions which, in fact, in many instances they indeed are."

The Corps of Engineers' report criticizes the Interior Department impact statement for:

Failing to "fully comply with the letter and spirit of the Environmental Policy Act," which requires a full report of the expected ecological consequences arising from a proposed project.

Assuming without sufficient data that immediate development of the Alaskan oil deposits is necessary for national security.

Agreeing to stipulations that "are too general to support the positive assurances given throughout the report that adverse ecological changes and pollution potential will be eliminated or minimized by these stipulations."

Unfortunately, though dated February 5, 1971, the existence of the Corps' report was not publicly known during the pipeline hearings held in Washington and Alaska. In fact, it was still bottled up in the Pentagon on March 5 when I released the report to the press and subsequently placed it in the *Congressional Record*.

What are the implications of these attempts to keep the two reports quiet? The first and most disturbing implication is that these are attempts to undermine and violate the clear intent of the Environmental Policy Act of 1970. The intent of that Act was to require a thorough and objective study of the likely ecological consequences of a proposed project before that project could be approved. The purposeful thwarting of the act, if allowed to continue, bodes ill for the integrity and efficacy of future environmental impact statements.

A series of inescapable implications of the attempts to keep these reports secret is that the impact statement is inadequate; that the two dissenting reports effectively hit upon many of its shortcomings; and that many of the top officials involved with the pipeline proposal know, in light of such criticism, that the impact statement will be hard to defend. Secretary Morton's encouraging statements (see page 40), made a couple of days after the Washington pipeline hearings, represented the first public glimmer of recognition on the part of Interior that all is not well with the pipeline.

After scores of witnesses have testified against the pipeline in both Alaska and Washington, after the two dissenting reports

have come to light, after new statements on the pipeline have been made by Secretary Morton, and in the light of the intense public attention that is now focused on the pipeline issue, Interior's draft impact statement is not very persuasive. Briefly and selectively, I would like to touch upon a few of the more salient questions that the draft impact statement fails most clearly to answer adequately. These areas relate to what should have been the impact statement's overriding concerns: the risks that construction of the pipeline would pose to the Alaskan environment and to the Alaskan natives depending on that environment.

If approved, the Alaskan pipeline would be the largest ever constructed in the United States. Each day, it would carry millions of gallons of oil across 780 miles of the most rugged, pristine terrain in the country. Climatic conditions in Alaska are the most severe in the United States. No one can predict accurately the consequences of this vast and unprecedented project or assure that it can be safely built and operated. Many of the technical problems of building a huge pipeline through the frozen Arctic environment have not yet been solved. In fact, the week before the Washington pipeline hearings, Alyeska Pipeline Co. (the subsidiary of seven oil companies that was formed to build the pipeline) stated that the pipeline has not yet been designed, and that it will be designed "as we go along" (Journal of Commerce, February 5). It is difficult, indeed, to see how the Interior Department could discharge its primary obligation to the public and, at the same time, approve this pipeline sight unseen.

The risk of pipeline fracture resulting from an earthquake was inadequately considered and grossly understated by the impact statement. As the statement points out, "the southern two-thirds of the proposed pipeline route is subject to the occurrence of large earthquakes, magnitude 7 or greater." In fact, the segment of the pipeline route from Valdez (the southernmost point) to Willow Lake is subject to earthquakes of up to 8.5 magnitude, and from Paxon to Donnelly Dome up to 8.0 magnitude. (By way of comparison, the earthquake that had such tragic consequences in Los Angeles in February had a magnitude of 6.5.) In the 70-year period between 1899 and 1969, there were 23 earthquakes with Richter magnitudes greater than 6 within 62 miles of one or more of the proposed pumping stations.

The previous Secretary of the Interior, Walter Hickel, admitted to the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee that "we cannot provide assurance that large earthquakes will not rupture the pipeline." He went on to state that the effects of such a break would be minimized by installing a series of cutoff valves. The draft impact statement concedes that "there is a probability that some oil spills will occur even under the most stringent enforcement." Dames and Moore, Alyeska's seismic consultants, have stated: "We believe the most effective provision for protection against the adverse effects of fault displacement earthquakes would be appropriate spacing of shut-off valves"—thereby tacitly admitting that the pipeline cannot be guaranteed against fracture, and that the most that can be done is to attempt to cut down on the amount of oil that will be spilled.

Alyeska's present plans call for automatic shutoff valves at approximately 60-mile intervals. This may sound like a reasonable solution to the problem, until one realizes that 1 mile of the pipeline will contain 500,000 gallons of oil! This is almost twice as much oil as was released during the Santa Barbara oil blowout in 1969. The prospect we appear to be facing, therefore, is that up to 100 times as much oil as was spilled at Santa Barbara could be loosed over the Arctic landscape. But the impact statement barely

glances over the almost certain eventuality of a spill and the potentially disastrous effects a large spill could have on both the environment and the way of life of the native Alaskans.

This leads up to another major defect of the impact statement, its almost total failure to consider the impact of the pipeline on the people who live on or near the pipeline route, most of whom make their living from the land. An oil spillage would be a tragedy for the entire nation. But it would be more than this for the native Alaskans who live in the path of the pipeline. Their already tenuous existence depends entirely on maintaining the delicate balance of their ecosystem.

Alaskan Indians and Eskimos have for thousands of years lived and hunted on the land and fished on the waters to be traversed by the pipeline. Recent archaeological surveys have uncovered prehistoric hunting and fishing campsites (up to 13,000 years old) on the path that the pipeline is to take. Many of the present-day inhabitants depend on the land in a way that has changed little for centuries. Hunting and fishing are not sports for them, but essential means of survival in a harsh environment.

For example, the 150-odd Indian inhabitants of the native Village of Allakaket, which is about 50 miles from the pipeline route, harvested the following items in 1967: 230 caribou, 48 moose, 12 black and brown bear, 110 beaver, 100 muskrat, 10 red fox, 15 lynx, 15 porcupine, 10 land otter, 30 martin, 20 mink, 10 weasel, 5 wolf, 30 rabbit, 12,000 salmon, 7,800 whitefish, 1,000 grayling, 100 charpike, 200 grouse, ptarmigan, and spruce hen, 1,000 duck, 10 geese, and 550 pounds of wild berries. This harvest was valued at approximately \$97,000. As these figures show, fish represent a particularly important item. It has been estimated that the native Alaskans who live along the Yukon River catch about 450,000 fish a year for sustenance.

It is thus very easy to imagine the impact an oil spill would have on these people. But it is unnecessary to rely on imagination. The following statements, all by officials of the Interior Department and the Alaska State Department of Fish and Game, make plain what will happen in the event of a pipeline break:

"There is no place on the pipeline site where an important watershed would not be threatened by a major spill. A spill along the small tributary of Koyukuk could infect the entire Yukon River drainage. Some areas, such as tributaries to the Minto Flats, are particularly sensitive, and a spill there would threaten one of Alaska's most productive waterfowl breeding habitats."

"A major resource disaster could result from a major pipeline break in these particular areas of the Yukon River and its tributaries."

"With miles between shutoff valves, any rupture would be catastrophic, no matter where it occurred."

"A pipeline break at the wrong place at the wrong time could be devastating to a broad spectrum of the life of a significant area, affecting native food supplies."

"Pipeline breaks or leaks could cause pollution of lands and waters that would be indescribable."

"Public concern for the aquatic resources in the Tanana and Yukon drainages is high. A major [pipeline] break could pollute the water in almost all of Central Alaska and the estuaries."

"Oil leaks occurring in the drainage of the Sagavanirktok, Koyukuk, Tanana and, Copper Rivers and Minto Flats pose serious threats to important waterfowl habitat."

Yet, none of these statements were included in the impact statement! The people who live along the pipeline route, and depend on the land for their very livelihood, face the prospect of a catastrophic disruption

of their way of life. The impact statement made no reference to this fact whatever. Nor did the Interior Department include in its proposed stipulations governing the project any protection against catastrophe for the natives. Incredibly, flying in the face of the statements of some of the Department's own officials, the draft impact statement concluded that "the proposed pipeline system would not result in any significant adverse environmental effects that can be related to present or future cultural features of most Alaskans." The assumption that the mere stating of such an unsupported conclusion can erase the evidence of hard facts is little short of remarkable.

Not only did the impact statement underestimate the potential effect the pipeline could have on the natives' way of life, but it failed to provide for adequate compensation to the natives for any economic loss that they incur as a result of the pipeline. One of the draft stipulations provides for the indemnification of the U.S. government for the costs of cleaning up an oil spill. But the actual inhabitants—whose very way of life could be destroyed by an oil spill—are not even protected for economic loss they suffer as the result of a spill, let alone the greater loss due to destruction of their way of life. Moreover, the draft stipulation on native training and employment by Alyeska is extremely vague and requires Alyeska to reach agreement only with the Interior Department, not with those natives in whose homelands the pipeline will travel. In short, the impact statement blithely assumes that neither the construction of the pipeline nor any possible oil spill poses a significant threat to the natives.

Some of the other basic questions which the impact statement failed to answer include the following:

Are there alternate pipeline routes, such as a Canadian route, which would be safer than the Prudhoe Bay-Valdez route?

Will that part of the pipeline that is underground eventually break due to the melting of the permafrost by the oil's 160° F-heat?

How will the aboveground portion of the pipeline affect migratory patterns of the caribou and other Alaskan species?

Are there alternate methods of transporting the oil that involve less risk to the environment than a pipeline, wherever routed?

I believe the trans-Alaska pipeline issue will receive a growing amount of public attention over the next several months. The final decision, unless Congress intervenes, will be made by the Interior Department. That decision could take as long as two years, according to Secretary Morton. The longer the better, I think, for we have not yet had either the time or the resources to begin effectively to refute one of the impact statement's most basic unsupported assumptions—that the immediate construction of the pipeline is essential to national security.

There is growing evidence that many of the "facts" on which the national security argument is based are either distorted or simply incorrect. It appears that the estimate of lower-48 oil reserves is understated, while the estimate of future domestic demand for oil is overstated. The possibility of the development and use of other sources of fuel (such as coal or electricity) was not even considered in determining long-range demands for oil. The necessity of the oil import quota system to the maintenance of national security was left unchallenged. The vulnerability of a 780-mile pipeline to sabotage went unmentioned. The net balance-of-payments benefits from producing North Slope oil instead of importing oil were grossly exaggerated.

So far, the draft impact statement has been released and two pipeline hearings have been held by Interior. Out of this has emerged a growing awareness that the impact statement failed to consider many basic

ecological problems associated with the proposed pipeline. The one thing that can be predicted with some assurance, however, is that in the coming months there will be new questions and new data on the pipeline (especially, I think, on the national security issue). The eventual outcome is unsure. But a report such as the Interior Department's draft impact statement leaves room for a great many questions.

RECOGNITION AND HONOR IN HIS TIME

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the article "A Medal for Mr. Truman" by Paul Harvey which I read in the Savannah, Ga., Evening Press, has expressed extremely well an attitude and ideas which I feel all of my colleagues should note.

I personally remember with warmth and pride the outstanding qualities of leadership demonstrated by a most engaging, earnest, and dedicated President—the Honorable Harry S. Truman. Some of my own recollections of this fine man go back to 1962 when he so graciously accepted my invitation to speak to the Hibernian Society on St. Patrick's Day down in Savannah. I shall never forget his asking me to come visit with him to discuss that invitation at the Mayflower Hotel. Not only I, but all of Savannah, Chatham County, and the entire State of Georgia were delighted, proud, and gratified by his presence during this annual festive occasion. My personal association with President Truman also included a tour through the Truman Library which he personally conducted and these things will always stand out as some of the greatest experiences of my life.

Because of our appreciation for his services, and because we should take time to commend and honor a man for the efforts he put forth in our lifetime, I bring this provocative article to your attention with the hope and belief we should all support such a bill:

A MEDAL FOR MR. TRUMAN

(By Paul Harvey)

CHICAGO.—There is a bill on the Hill proposing a medal for Mr. Harry S. Truman. May I second the motion.

History judges most presidents after they're gone; judges them by the long-range results—the long-range effects—of their decisions.

The one most agonizing decision of the Truman Administration already has been evaluated.

Truman had been President less than three months when he learned that Americans had unharnessed the atom and suddenly in his hands was a secret weapon 2,000 times more lethal than any weapon theretofore.

With this weapon of decision in his folded fist, on July 2, 1945, he demanded that Japan surrender.

On July 29 the Japanese cabinet met, but chose to ignore the surrender ultimatum.

President Truman, as commander in chief, left with an unprecedented decision, did not procrastinate.

Aware of the terrible toll in American lives resulting from our tedious amphibious inva-

sions of South Pacific Islands—knowing that there were years of bloody surf between us and the ultimate invasion of Japan—on Aug. 6, he lowered the boom on the enemy.

In one blow, four square miles of Hiroshima, Japan, were destroyed; 135,000 Japanese were killed or injured.

But when it was either them or us, Truman chose to kill them.

In subsequent years, President Truman was more damned than praised for that decision.

Monday-morning quarter-backs called it unnecessary, diplomats called it cruel, scientists said they were "ashamed" of their science. The President was labeled a "sadist," a "barbarian," a "monster."

And for two decades thereafter, American leaders, self-conscious, feral, fought pulled punch wars with out-dated weapons.

And on the alter of their timidity, in an unending forced march, American sons were sacrificed.

Perhaps it serves no purpose to draw parallels between the costs of "enforcing peace" the Truman way and this other way:

But no man can be insensitive to the cruel indictment which Truman suffered for doing what he believed best:

And though historians can already see the humaneness of the swift-knockout strategy, officially nobody has told him so.

While in the White House, Truman frequently presented the Congressional Medal of Honor with the words "I'd rather have this medal than be President."

He repeated that statement so many times it must have reflected a very agonizing personal question, until then unanswered.

While he lives, would it not be most appropriate for our former Commander in Chief to receive our nation's highest military decoration?

And let the inscription read that when the chips were down—and it was either them or us—he was on our side.

TAYLOR J. SWAN

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, a career spanning three decades will come to a close May 1 as Greyhound driver Taylor J. Swan retires.

Swan drove an estimated 1½ million accident-free miles during his years with Greyhound.

The veteran driver joined the transportation company in 1942. Prior to coming to Greyhound, Swan was a licensed steam engineer.

Throughout his many years on the road, Swan has viewed the changes occurring in the transportation industry. He said:

Things have improved so much. Buses, terminals, service, and more—I could almost write a book on this.

A native of Roseville, Ill., Swan is a member of Amalgamated Transit Union, Holmesburg Fish and Game Protective Association, and the Cleveland, Tenn., Church of God. In past years, the Greyhound driver was a pistol and big-bore rifle enthusiast—entering various competitions.

What advice does Swan have for young people just entering the transportation industry? He said:

Always wear a smile. Try to make each day's work as safe and smooth as you can.

Swan will leave the driving to someone else as he plans to travel quite a bit. Other retirement plans include moving to Augusta, Ga., later this month.

Presently, Swan and his wife reside at 4615 Pennypack Street, Philadelphia, Pa. They have two children.

CONGRESSMAN CABELL DISCUSSES DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ITS HISTORY AND ITS GOVERNMENT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, twice each month the Texas Breakfast Club meets in the Rayburn Building. The meetings are always well attended, mostly by Texans who work in Washington, and their guests. The present chairman of the group is the Honorable Luther Holcomb, vice chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Recently the club was privileged to hear a very interesting talk by our colleague, EARL CABELL. He discussed the District of Columbia, its past and present. Because many interesting aspects of this subject were developed, a copy of the speech follows:

Speaking before Texans in Washington is always difficult, especially in choosing the subject matter. We are such an active and diverse group with interests ranging in length and breadth of this great city. It is trying, indeed, to find a topic which is common enough to be of interest to all, yet distant enough to be informative.

But a common point does exist and it is surprisingly obvious. For, in addition to being Texans, we all live or work in this our nation's capital, Washington, D.C. And although we still call Texas home, we should be interested in what happens in and around this city as much for the effect it has on our personal lives as its effect on Texas as a whole.

As a member of the House District Committee, I feel qualified to spend a few minutes with you this morning to give you a little background on Washington.

There has been a lot of controversy on how Washington is run. The legal basis for the District is found in the main body of the Constitution itself, which provides that Congress has the power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases over a District which shall be the Seat of the Government of the United States. The framers of the Constitution realized that it was necessary that some location be provided for the national government which could be controlled only by that government. Some consideration was given to putting the Capital City within the boundaries of a state or within the limits of an existing city, but the disadvantages of these proposals became quickly evident.

During one of the early periods of the country, the Continental Congress was surrounded in Philadelphia by a mob. When pleas from the Congress for the Mayor of the city and the Governor of the state were ignored, the Members had to slip out and go over to New Jersey to meet and transact the public business.

Thus, the problem was solved by providing for the establishment of a government at a location in the unsettled wilderness between Maryland and Virginia which would be under the control of the Federal government.

The first government of the city of Washington was established in 1802 and consisted of a Mayor appointed by the President and a city council elected by the people. Beginning in 1820, the people were permitted to elect the Mayor. This form of government was continued until 1871.

In 1871, by an Act of Congress, a Territorial government was formed. This government was so corrupt and irresponsible that the District went bankrupt in 1874. The Federal Government was then forced by circumstances and demands of national interest to pry off the bankrupt bonds and exercise the full "exclusive legislation in all cases" in the District of Columbia. During all these years, no one has ever successfully challenged this power of Congress.

From 1878-1967 the District operated under the commissioner form of government.

In 1967 the three-man board was abolished by Congress and in its place was created a single commissioner, an assistant to the commissioner, and a nine-member Council. All of these persons are appointed by the President.

The District has dual status as a municipal corporation and as a branch of the Federal Government. While the District has a municipal form of government, Congress has treated it, in some respects, as a branch of the United States Government in budgetary and accounting legislation, and as a state in highway legislation.

All legislation affecting Washington must be passed by Congress. Four committees are concerned with and responsible for this legislation. They are the House and Senate District of Columbia Committees and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees whose subcommittees on the District of Columbia have jurisdiction over all expenditures of the District.

In 1924 Congress began making lump sum authorizations to the District. This annual authorization has increased from \$23 million in 1957 to \$126 million in 1970. Only once since 1954 has Congress appropriated the entire amount.

Beginning in 1958, Congress granted the District loan authority to borrow money. The 1958 loan ceiling was \$75 million. By fiscal 1970 the ceiling had risen to \$392 million.

In 1970 the borrowing authority was raised to a 9% ceiling for 1971 and 1972 which is expected to yield an estimated \$610 million for the General Fund, \$72 million for the Sanitary Sewer Fund, \$110 million for the Highway Fund, and \$57 million for the Water Fund.

The District ranks at or near the top in general expenditures when compared with sixteen cities in the U.S. of comparable size.

- No. 1. General city expenses.
- No. 1. Per capita expenditures for police protection.
- No. 1. Expenditures for Public Health and Hospitals.
- No. 2. Operating expenses per pupil in education.
- No. 4. In Public Welfare.
- No. 4. Expenses in fire protection.

From 1965-1970 the spending budget increased more than 100% from \$397 million to \$806.4 million. The 1971 payment authorization of \$126 million represents 28.7% of the General Fund Revenues. This can be compared to the 1956 figures in which the payment authorization was \$20 million and only 18% of the General Fund.

During the present Congress, in addition to the ever-present revenue and new loan proposals, there will be many others brought forth that will affect the city.

You can see that the District of Columbia benefits in many ways by having the Federal Government located here.

The Federal Government supplies massive monetary support. The Federal Government employs over 200,000 District residents. The mean average household income in the Dis-

trict is over \$10,500. I cannot believe that credence can be given to the charge that the Congress has been penurious with the District.

THE LONGEST SOFTBALL GAME

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that a new world record—for the longest softball game ever—has just been set by some 200 of my constituents in Neptune City.

In a feat of prodigious endurance never before equalled in the history of mankind, two fluctuating but dedicated teams battled through 821 innings over 128½ hours from early Monday, April 12 to the evening of Saturday, April 17. Fire company floodlights and automobile headlights provided night-time illumination as players of all ages and both sexes took turns in the lineup. The final score, which was in doubt right up until the last out, was the Reds 900 runs on 1,260 hits, and the Blacks 894 runs on 1,238 hits.

Borough Patrolman John Rowland, who supervised the proceedings, was quoted in the Asbury Park Press of April 18, as saying:

As near as we can tell, the old record for a marathon softball game was 110 hours. We called the Associated Press and Guinness's World Book of Records, and they said they had nothing listed. But we heard someone played 110 hours up in North Jersey.

Mr. Rowland plans to submit full particulars on the game—including press clippings and scorebooks—to Guinness, in hopes it will be recognized officially as the record.

The marathon was conceived by Ken Martin, a Neptune City High senior, who also did most of the organizing. The official scorer—who got 15 hours of sleep all week—was 19-year-old Al Hartmann.

Mr. Speaker, a newspaper article describing the game follows:

[From the Asbury Park Evening Press, Apr. 18, 1971]

THERE'S JOY IN NEPTUNE CITY OVER LONG-PLAYING RECORD

NEPTUNE CITY.—The longest softball game in the history of the borough—and maybe of the world—finally ended last night.

After 128½ hours and 820½ innings of nonstop action, a hardy band of ballplayers called it quits at 6:32 p.m., leaving dusty Memorial Field deserted for the first time since early Monday morning.

The Reds won the game, edging the Blacks by the narrow margin of 900 to 894, but that really didn't mean very much. What mattered most to the youngsters who took part in the game—more than 200 in all—was that they had set a new world record for endurance on the field of softball combat.

At least they think they did. "As near as we can tell, the old record for a marathon softball game was 110 hours," says John Rowland, a borough patrolman, director of the Neptune City Organized Sports Committee, and supervisor of the game.

"We called the Associated Press and Guinness' World Book of Records, and they said they had nothing listed. But we heard someone played 110 hours up in North Jersey."

Mr. Rowland plans to submit full particulars on the game—including press clippings and scorebooks—to Guinness, in hopes it will be recognized officially as a record.

The idea for the marathon originated with Ken Martin, 50 Evergreen Ave., a 17-year-old senior at Neptune High School, who acted as coordinator.

"We'd been playing a lot of softball the last few weeks," he recalls, "and I remembered a marathon game that was started here about four years ago. It was Easter vacation and we knew we weren't going to be doing anything special, so I suggested trying again."

"It really got to be a serious thing after it got going."

It got so serious for young Martin that he wound up in bed with a chill and a 102 degree temperature after three days and nights of almost continual play. He recovered enough to return for the final few innings yesterday, but he plans to get plenty of rest again today.

Another young man who definitely won't be playing ball today is Al Hartman, 19, of 115½ Hawthorne Ave., the game's chief scorekeeper. He got just 15 hours sleep all week.

"I played the first day, then kept books the rest of the time," young Hartman relates. "Somebody had to do it, and I was one of the few who knew how."

By yesterday afternoon his eyes had grown red and his voice raspy—from "screaming and no sleep"—but he stayed at his post sprawled out on a chaise longue, for the most part) right to the end.

He took a few days off from his job at the Brisbane Child Treatment Center, Wall Township, where he is a supervisor of children, to be on hand for the game.

Players were shuffled in and out of the teams' lineups as needed—and as available. Several times there were barely enough to keep things going—18. At other times the field, behind the Veterans of Foreign Wars building on Sylvania avenue, was crowded with spectators—many of them potential substitutes.

By week's end many had played on both teams—and at practically all nine positions.

The players ranged from peanut-sized 7-year-olds to men well into middle age—and even included a fair share of girls.

Joseph Meyers, 44, of Lawrence Drive, who lives near the field, played more than four hours yesterday.

"I saw them playing every day," he explained, "and I figured I'd give someone a chance to rest."

Community involvement extended far beyond the immediate neighborhood. Fire companies here and in Avon set up floodlights at night to permit the game to continue. Several merchants donated refreshments for the players, and one service station contributed gasoline for use in cars that were helping to light the field.

And one woman, who asked to be anonymous, donated \$50, which was used to buy hot dogs and hamburgers.

Linda Chapman, 16, of 131 Hillside Ave., and Cathy Collier, 17, of 78 Avondale Ave., volunteered to provide hot drinks, and helped the well-chilled players survive some difficult nights. Two tents were set up alongside the field, and players took turns sleeping there at night.

The best thing about the game, from Patrolman Rowland's standpoint, was that it gave the kids something to do.

"We haven't had any problems with juveniles all week," he said. "It's been fantastic, and usually, on a vacation like this, there's quite a bit of mischief—especially when they get that first whiff of spring."

The youngsters already are making plans for another marathon game in the summer. And they're girding for the inevitable challenge to their record.

"I'm sure someone else will try to beat us," Patrolman Rowland remarks. "But we'll be

right back and set another new record if we have to."

The game was finally halted to give the participants a day of rest today. School reopens tomorrow.

PATRIOTS' MARCH FOR VICTORY WILL CLIMAX VICTORY WEEK

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 weeks, our Nation's Capital has been plagued with hordes of anti-Americans demanding our surrender in Vietnam. Their banner has been the Vietcong flag; their sign, the clenched fist; and their slogan, "Out now."

This week is being observed by many patriots as Victory Week. It will be marked with peaceful visits to universities, Government offices, and embassies as well as with prayer services. The culmination will be a Patriots' March on May 8 to end the war by victory.

In contrast to the mislabeled "anti-war" demonstrators, the observers of Victory Week have Old Glory as their banner; the Holy Bible and the cross as their signs; and as their slogan, "For God and Country."

The observance of Victory Week is a sign of hope, a desire for permanent peace, and a reminder of our birthright to perpetuate our individual liberties under God.

I insert a schedule of events for Victory Week and a newsclipping from the Christian Beacon at this point in the RECORD:

VICTORY: MAY 3 TO 8, MONDAY THROUGH SATURDAY

Tuesday afternoon, May 4: Washington Marathon, Radio Station WFAX.

Tuesday, May 4: University Day. Visit to Universities in area by teams.

Wednesday, May 5: Embassy Day. Visits to: the following embassies: Taiwan, Korea (South), Viet Nam (South), Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand.

Thursday, May 6: Justice Day. Visit to: J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Communications Commission, and Pentagon. 8:00 p. m. Memorial Service. Park across from Washington Cathedral.

Friday, May 7: 8:00 p.m. Prayer meeting on Capitol Steps, East Side.

Saturday, May 8: 11 a.m. Assemble for Patriots' March for Victory.

THE CHALLENGE IS IN WASHINGTON

To All Readers of the Christian Beacon: In every section of the United States there are those who faithfully read this paper, rejoice in the stand which it takes, and desire to help the cause which it represents. Seldom have we ever come to our readers with the appeal which we are now making. Never in the history of our ministry have we reached such a strategic moment when issues are so focused and drawn that we can actually see that we are in a position to really count and do some good for righteousness' sake.

We will always call the April 24 march of the so-called peace groups the "hippie surrender march." Ninety percent were hippies. They called for "Out now," which is surrender. But they did have the largest gathering in Washington so far as marches are concerned up to this present point. I was

there. We passed through their ranks, talked to many of them, gathered up their literature, and heard their foul and abusive language.

The whole thing was dope-oriented, sex-oriented, anti-U.S.A. The Viet Cong flag led the procession. Chants for Ho Chi Minh were loud and pronounced. It was the nearest thing to a Communist demonstration in the United States that you could possibly have. The Paris Peace Conference leaders had put their blessing upon it. Hanoi had spoken in favor of it. The United States is asked to surrender now and leave Southeast Asia to the Communists whatever they may desire to do with it.

The most favorable kind of press publicity was given. Senator Fulbright arranged his hearings before his committee on how to end the war so that the leader of the U. S. Vietnam Veterans Against the War could have the finest platform possible for television and national coverage. He got it.

On Monday, April 26, part of the coalition of the groups that are continuing with their May Day demonstration (May Day will be the Communist day throughout the world) went over to the Secretary of Defense's home and put a Viet Cong flag on the lattice of his front porch and then reenacted some of their mischief on his lawn. The disgrace which all of this represented to the nation seems to have brought little reaction. Saturday night after their march they burned the benches and all the wood that they could get their hands on in the Sylvan Park, just at the foot of the Washington Monument. The press did not report this. They will be leaving the city on May 5, and in the providence of God our March for Victory comes in.

We have arranged some preliminary exercises for persons in the area. Friday evening, May 7, there will be a prayer meeting on the Capitol steps, and then Saturday, May 8, the March for Victory will take place. We have accepted the challenge laid down by these pro-Hanoi leaders in the United States.

God in His providence arranged that we should come after them, for our date was selected before theirs, and God in His providence has given us a clear indication now as to what we shall have to meet and do. Washington needs a bath. Pollution needs to be removed. There needs to be some kind of a cleansing from all that has been heard in her parks and beloved Capital.

The march of the hippies brought immediate reaction from the whole Communist world in the Far East. A story from Peiping by Mark Gayn, Chicago Daily News, Foreign Service, reads: "The banquet, a glittering affair, was given by Sihanouk to mark the first anniversary of what is known here as the 'Indochina summit,' a two-day meeting somewhere in south China of representatives of the Communist or allied regimes of North and South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

"Spokesmen of each, as well as of China and North Korea, delivered speeches in which they spoke of the defeats being suffered by U.S. forces, of the rising antiwar sentiment in the United States, and of the coming victory."

Here we have the three matters—U.S. defeats, anti-war sentiment, the coming victory. Our enemies, the enemies of all we love and hold dear, have possession of the word victory, and this big affair in Washington has given them greater encouragement and courage. This is disastrous.

Another story from Peiping by the same service, "G.I.'s Lured to Desert to Viet Cong," says: "The Viet Cong Monday offered special protection and unstated rewards to U.S. antiwar servicemen in Vietnam who cross over its lines out of sympathy for the Communist cause.

"The offer was a new attempt to stir rebellion among U.S. forces. It was contained in an order of the day issued to all 'South Vietnam's People's Liberation Armed Forces,' and was distributed here [Paris] by the Viet Cong delegation to the Paris peace talks. . . .

"The appeal was timed to coincide with anti-war demonstrations in the United States

which the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong delegations here have been using increasingly as a propaganda weapon at conference sessions."

Our March for Victory comes at this strategic moment. The press thus far has virtually blotted it out. Instead of reporting with all the expansive news that they have been carrying from Washington that another march is scheduled for the victory forces, as would be the normal thing to do, all of this has been cut out. We are back where we were before April 4, when the press did nothing for us until just two or three days before our March when the White House said the March had been cancelled. But a hundred thousand of our people came.

Our whole March is distinctive. We have been able to bring representatives of every segment of our national life. The whole family comes for freedom. The hippie surrender march represented the masses of these young people who have been misled and deceived in our high schools and colleges.

This then is the basis for my appeal to you and to all who may read this *Christian Beacon*.

First, we must outdo the hippies. If we can bring more people into the city for the May 8 March than they had for theirs it will shake the capitals of the world, and the Communists will say, "Well, there is more life and strength than we ever dreamed."

Never have we been in a position where our presence in Washington could mean so much as this will mean to the cause of freedom. God has arranged this for us in His providence. If we should fall far short, there will be tremendous rejoicing in the Communist world and our March will be used to further harangue the country against victory. There is nothing left for us to do but to look to God in prayer and rally our people to come to our nation's capital with our flags, our banners, our Bibles, our hymns of thanksgiving and praise. "Onward, Christian Soldiers!"

Is it not magnificent that God's providence has let us know what we have to meet and what the enemy is saying and doing, and we know now that if we can all be there—and I mean all of us, every member of the family—that we can produce more than they produced and do it in an orderly and honorable manner for the glory of our God. Who would have thought that in the providence of God He would give such an opportunity to those of us who read the *Christian Beacon* and want to be a part of the struggle to help save our country's freedom.

This is the last appeal we will be able to make as this *Christian Beacon* goes out across the country. Recently in Southern Michigan we had one of the most thrilling rallies that I have been in. The people are stirred; some were in tears. There is a sense of terror gripping many people. Two men told me that for the last March they did not decide until 7:30 that Friday evening to come, after they heard some abusive reports on the radio.

There will be plenty of parking space in Washington. We need only to fill up our cars, five and six, or to get the buses that are still available.

Washington is the place where we all should come. We should lay aside every other consideration and unite now in giving a united witness to the whole world that America has been a land in which we have rejoiced in God's faithfulness, for "In God We Trust." It is on our every coin. It is this faith that leads me now to appeal to you at whatever the cost to be in Washington, and if you are unable to be there, then you must help finance someone else's trip, and especially among the young people.

At the Michigan rally a chorus from the Grace Bible Church Christian School sang. It was thrilling. They were attractive. The audience raised nearly \$4,000 for the expense of the Washington March; \$600 of it was

raised first to pay the cost of a bus to take these young people to Washington. What a glorious spirit it was. That is the spirit that I trust will grip you as you reach this point in this appeal and that you will turn in prayer and sacrifice and be in Washington, D.C. with us on May 8.

Never has a moment of this nature come to us. We are in a place now to speak, really to speak, throughout the whole world. Please do not fail the cause. Join us all in Washington, May 8. "To God be the glory. Great things He has done." "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

Indeed it is a privilege to be in this position as those who believe that God is able to deliver and that He will deliver those who look to Him and who will stand and not compromise. Let us make it indeed the greatest gathering we have ever seen in our nation's capital, and may it truly be a march to victory.

The only way to deal with the Communists' world-wide onslaught is to stop it and have victory over it. This is our duty in the charge which we have from our Saviour to occupy—yes, to occupy until He comes.

I will look forward to seeing you readers of the *Christian Beacon*, hundreds of you, yes, may I say thousands of you, in Washington, D.C. May 8.

Yours in Christ,

CARL MCINTIRE.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF GEN.
WILLIAM J. SUTTON

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to observe the significant and valuable contributions of Maj. Gen. William J. Sutton to the defense programs of America over a period of many years. In particular, he has rendered outstanding service for a stronger reserve program in the U.S. Army. He is now retiring and his wise and helpful guidance will be greatly missed.

I note that the Senior Reserve Commanders Association has adopted a resolution commemorating his services, and I am pleased, indeed, to submit this resolution for inclusion in the RECORD. This resolution attests to the fact that those who know Bill Sutton best know him as a great soldier, a loyal citizen, and a wonderful friend.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF SENIOR RESERVE
COMMANDERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas, Major General William J. Sutton was appointed in 1963 to the position of Chief Army Reserve on the staff of Department of the Army, and

Whereas, under the provision of PL 90-168 he was reappointed to the same position in 1968 as its first statutory appointee, and

Whereas, General Sutton has brought dignity, prestige, and integrity to the office of Chief Army Reserve, and

Whereas, General Sutton has displayed the courage and determination to withstand forceful opponents of the U.S. Army Reserve Program thereby insuring the continuation of the Program as a viable part of this country's defense, and

Whereas, General Sutton has given unselfishly of his strength, knowledge, and wisdom to the Senior Reserve Commanders Association and has been faithful and dedicated to the cause of National Defense, and

Whereas, General Sutton will enter retirement on 31 May 1971 from the U.S. Army

having served his country as a true patriot for over 44 years, and

Now therefore be it resolved, the Senior U.S. Army Reserve Commanders hereby recognize and commend the outstanding contribution of MG William J. Sutton on the occasion of his retirement.

SCHOOLCHILDREN STILL GO HUNGRY AT LUNCHTIME

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, although our Nation is approaching a trillion dollar GNP, many of our school age children still go hungry at lunchtime. The need to support and augment the 1972 budget for child nutrition programs is imperative, if we are to keep our youngsters healthy.

It is disgraceful for a nation like ours, the most advanced and technologically capable nation in the world, to allow its children to eat improperly balanced meals or no meals at all while in school. We must insure that all our children have a decent lunch. I ask my colleagues to read the remarks of Thomas P. O'Hearn before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF MR. THOMAS P. O'HEARN, CHAIRMAN, LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I am Thomas P. O'Hearn, Director of Food Services for the schools in the Archdiocese of Boston. I also serve as the Legislative Chairman for the American School Food Service Association. This Association includes more than 50,000 members who are concerned with the administration and operation of food service and nutrition education programs for children. These 50,000 members are public service employees and include state level administrators and technicians in the field of nutrition, local and supervisory personnel, food service program managers, and the personnel who prepare and serve the food to children.

On behalf of the Association, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to testify before this Committee on the 1972 budget for Child Nutrition Programs. We are very mindful and very appreciative of your support and interest in the expansion and strengthening of these programs to improve the nutrition of our Nation's children. We are particularly grateful for the prompt action of this Committee last fall to provide substantial increases in funds to assist in expanding the lunch programs to additional needy children.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be brief, covering only a few major points of particular interest to my Association. These points of view on the 1972 budget proposals are all consistent with the Association's goal of promoting good nutrition for all the Nation's children through the federal-state food service program for children.

We are, of course, most concerned that the budget envisions no expansion whatsoever in cash appropriations to finance the cost of free and reduced priced lunches for needy children and no increase in funds for the general support of the program so that all children may take part.

First, on funds for free and reduced price lunches—the proposed budget amount of \$356.4 million for this purpose is based on reaching 6.6 million needy children daily

at a cost of 30 cents from federal funds. This amount is clearly inadequate by reason of several factors: (1) USDA regulations permit a much higher payment than 30 cents from federal funds on such lunches (as much as 48 cents) and many schools are receiving such amounts. (2) Reports from states and local school districts made to the Department of Agriculture indicate that the original estimate of 6.6 million children is more than one million children short of the actual need. (3) USDA official figures show that 6.7 million needy children received lunches in February. (4) The number of children qualifying for free and reduced price lunches has increased over the past several months due to increased unemployment in many parts of the country.

Our own estimate is that the target figure of need should be 8 million needy children rather than the USDA figure of 6.6 million.

We are most mindful that recent legislation in P.L. 91-248 makes it mandatory that all children from families with income below the poverty level must be provided free or reduced priced lunches. In the event that adequate funds do not become available to meet this legislative requirement, local school officials will have no choice but to discontinue their lunch programs.

On the second point, with regard to general support for Child Nutrition Programs, we have an equally deep concern. Again, the Administration's budget proposes a stand pat, no increase program for 1972. This position is directly counter to the mandate given by Congress to the states in P.L. 91-248 to extend the National School Lunch Program to all schools not already under the program. This position, also, takes no account of the fact that increases in minimum wages and in the cost of goods and services generally have to be reflected in the cost of producing and serving lunches to children. In the absence of increased federal support, this only means that children must pay a higher price for their lunches and that less children will take part in the program.

Frankly, we feel that we are losing ground toward reaching our goal of trying to provide nutritionally balanced lunches for all children in school. It is true that, in the past two years alone, we have been able to increase the number of needy children receiving lunches by 3.2 million. We are very proud of that record, and we shall improve on it. However, participation by children who pay for their lunches has actually declined. In the same period of time, total program participation has increased by only 2.5 million.

In other words we have lost over 700,000 paying customers. We are losing these paying customers because lunch prices have inflated to the point that children from families just above the poverty level, who are not eligible for free or reduced price lunches, have been forced out of the program. We are seriously concerned that this trend may continue, and we feel that it will continue unless additional federal funds are made available for general support of lunches for all children. In just the past five years, the cost of producing type "A" lunches increased by 25%, from about 48 to 60 cents. During the same period, the federal contribution per lunch has remained static at about 5 to 6 cents and is projected in next years budget at 5 cents.

We therefore, have two recommendations:

1. The appropriations to finance the lunches for needy children must be adequate to meet fully the legislative requirement in P.L. 91-248 that all such children be provided with a free or reduced price lunch.

2. The federal contribution per lunch from section 4 funds should be increased to at least 10 cents to partially offset the heavy increases in labor and food costs that schools have experienced in the past few years and which cannot be without price increases to children.

... We note that the proposed budget lists an increase of \$134 million for 1972 in the value of food commodities to be distributed to Child Nutrition Programs. The total amount for 1972 (\$302 million) would be far in excess of food donations for any previous year. While such a volume of food donations would be very welcome, we feel it necessary to raise a question as to whether or not school officials can safely plan, in light of past experience, their food service programs on the basis that full budgeted amounts will actually be available in the kinds of foods that schools can effectively use.

... The Administration's budget again proposes the elimination of funds for the Special Milk Program. We are not in favor of this action for several reasons:

1. There are still several million children attending schools without lunch programs. A large proportion of these schools serve children from low-income families. The least we can do for these children until an adequate food service program is established is to be able to continue to provide milk either free or at a token price of a few pennies to promote an adequate level of milk consumption.

2. The program makes available a valuable nutritional supplement to children at recess periods or when they first arrive at school in the morning. In many cases, also, children are receiving milk free under the program.

3. Because of the nature of the budgetary process, the decision of whether the milk program will continue is not likely to be known until some time next fall. In the meantime, schools operating in the summer, as well as child care institutions and summer camps, will have to gamble on whether or not they will receive their normal payment to assist in financing the cost of milk service. In short, we believe the timing of the proposed action is inequitable.

All in all, the Association's position is that the milk program should be continued at the current level until such time as nearly all schools and institutions presently participating should be given official notice of at least six months prior to the ending of this program.

... Mr. Chairman, I have one final comment, we are seriously concerned over the very minor amount proposed in the budget for nutrition education, training, and surveys. These funds are being made available under a new provision contained in P.L. 91-248. For the first time, there is authority to make a beginning on eliminating perhaps the most important cause of malnutrition and poor diets... here I refer to the general ignorance that exists in all segments of the population with respect to the principles of good nutrition.

Specifically, the budget figure of \$750,000 for 1972 is much too small to make any realistic beginning on these specific objectives. We therefore respectively recommend that the amount be doubled to \$1.5 million so that all states will have sufficient funds to employ a minimum staff for the purpose of developing and initiating programs of nutritional training and education for workers, cooperators and participants in Child Nutrition Programs as provided for in P.L. 91-248.

Again, let me express my personal thanks and the gratitude of our Association for the opportunity to testify before this Committee.

THE UNITY OF FREE NATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, since this administration came to power em-

phasis has been placed on the necessity of unity among the free nations of Southeast Asia in their fight against aggression. Stress has been placed on the impossibility of the United States acting as a "world policeman" and that military preparedness plus the unity of free nations through regional alliances is the key to the preservation of freedom. Any progress made to date in the implementation of this strategy might well have been cancelled by our unfortunate change of policy toward Red China.

The May 8, 1971, issue of Human Events, the highly observant newsweekly on current events here in Washington, raised this all-important theme. How are our friends in Southeast Asia reacting to our new China policy? What effect upon the unity of free nations in this area will the new China posture cause? These are, of course, questions that apologists for Red China ignore in their preoccupation to gain worldwide respectability and recognition for this bandit regime.

Following is the May 8 article, "Nixon's Peking Diplomacy Imperils Southeast Asia," from Human Events which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

NIXON'S PEKING DIPLOMACY IMPERILS
SOUTHEAST ASIA

We do not claim to know precisely what the Administration is up to in the current courting of Red China, but whatever the reason, it is beginning to look as if the game is not going to be worth the candle.

Perhaps, as the insiders will tell you, we are engaged in a devious plot to drive a wedge between Moscow and Peking. That, of course, is the probable explanation for what's happening, but such intrigue will hardly be time well spent if we also succeed in driving a wedge between ourselves and our Asian allies. And it is this latter possibility that appears far more likely—and ominous—at the moment.

Keeping our alliance together in Southeast Asia has to be considered far more important than initiating some desperate Machiavellian maneuver—with no assurance whatever of success—that may encourage the two Communist superpowers to leap at one another's throat.

The Sino-Soviet quarrel, we might also note, blossomed rather fully without any concerted outside interference on our part. Indeed, the argument could be made that the friction between Moscow and Peking has

lessened as we have warmed up relations with Mainland China. Franz Michael of the Sino-Soviet Institute, in fact, has documented the gradual easing of tensions between the two Red powers during the Nixon Administration.

The spirit of détente between America and Peking, however, has clearly caused a deep uneasiness among some of our Asian friends. At the 16th annual ministerial conference of the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization in London last week, the six foreign ministers attending issued a communiqué that was striking for its omission: There was no mention in the 10-page document of Peking or the recent overtures made by the Red Chinese government.

"The omission," reported the New York Times, reflected a skepticism shared by several of the Asian members of the alliance about the true motives behind the Chinese gestures toward improved relations with the United States."

This skepticism was voiced by Lt. Gen. Jesus M. Vargas of the Philippines, secretary-general of the organization, who said that it was still too early to tell whether Mao's China had eliminated her "well-known sinister ways" in dealing with Southwest Asia. "We are still waiting for some concrete indication of change."

Australian minister Leslie Bury also sounded a note of apprehension. "To those of us who are more nearly China's neighbors," he said solemnly, "there is as yet little to inspire confidence that Peking has in fact abandoned those policies which have prevented her from being regarded as a responsible member of the family of nations."

Even more disturbing has been the almost frantic reaction in Thailand. In the wake of our diplomatic overtures to Peking, Thailand, itself, is now rushing to develop contacts with both Red China and North Viet Nam. Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman suggested that his country is moving toward a rapprochement because it no longer trusts the United States to come to its defense. The Nationalist Chinese, of course, are also alarmed at our diplomatic games.

Not only do they fear we may let Red China into the United Nations, but they are now wondering what we plan to do with their future. Incredible as it may seem, the State Department last week even questioned the "legal status" of Taiwan, suggesting that the island might be part of Red China after all.

Especially in view of the wary reaction among our anti-Communist allies, we can see no legitimate reason for recognizing Peking or allowing her into the United Nations.

Despite all the lavish hospitality bestowed on our table tennis team, Red China has by no means reformed. She is still an out-

law in the family of nations. She was a clear aggressor during the Korean War and she is still calling for South Korea's violent overthrow. She wrested territory away from India and she flattened Tibet. Tenzing Gyatso, the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet, wrote only two months ago from India that the Chinese "have launched a veritable reign of terror" in his country.

Mao and Chou have stirred up revolutionary activity in Africa, Asia and Latin America. They are not only a major supplier of North Viet Nam, but they are conducting insurgency schools for revolutionaries from many Southeast Asian countries, including Malaysia, Burma and Thailand. Just last month, in fact, Radio Peking called upon "the Thai peasants to actively participate in the armed struggle under the leadership of the Communist party of Thailand. . . ."

Yet the Red Chinese are also actively trying to stir up revolution in this country. FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover wrote in 1970: "During the past year . . . we have experienced a definite increase in our Chinese investigations due to the stepped-up intelligence activities on the part of the Communist Chinese aimed at procuring highly technical data, both overtly and covertly, and the efforts of Chinese Communists to introduce deep-cover intelligence agents into this country."

Mao has lent his support to the Black Panther party and other revolutionary groups, including Progressive Labor. For Red China harbored Robert Williams, an American now back into his country, who urged U.S. Negroes to rise up and revolt.

Walter Judd, chairman of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Red China to the United Nations, cannot understand this great drive to recognize Red China. While there is great pressure to "trade" with Peking, says Judd, her greatest exports are "communism" and "heroin." Great Britain, he points out, recognized Mao's mainland in January 1950 in order to reap supposed trade benefits. "What has she gotten in return? Imprisonments, beatings, storming of British Embassies and people and no increase in trade.

"De Gaulle showed his defiance of us by recognizing Red China. And it was the Chinese Communists who organized the great [Paris] riots in the spring of '68, a major factor in overthrowing de Gaulle. Israel made overtures way back 20 years ago toward Red China. And it was the Communists from China who organized and trained the Palestinian guerrillas which almost blew up into an all-out war against Israel last fall.

"I would think people would see what's happened when folks have followed these policies of softness toward communism and be wary."

SENATE—Wednesday, May 5, 1971

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

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

Our God, our help in ages past, our strength in every age, enlighten our minds by Thy spirit that we may serve Thee aright this day.

Be in our home to make them sanctuaries of love, and havens of peace. Be with those who have no home that they may find the home of their soul in Thee.

Be in our schools to make them academies of democracy and arenas where fullness of life and understanding take place.

Be in our executive and legislative

chambers that all who work therein may serve with noble purpose.

Be in our churches that they may mediate Thy grace to all men.

Draw together youth and age in firm alliance that the authentic revolution of free men under God may be brought to rightful consummation and that all unholy revolutions may dissolve in emptiness and futility.

In the name of the Great Galilean, Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its