

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.J. Res. 615. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. KOCH):

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution relative to asset depreciation range; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H. Res. 425. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Res. 426. Resolution to equalize retirement age as provided for in the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Act of 1937; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. HORTON):

H. Res. 427. Resolution providing for two additional student congressional interns for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Delegate from the District of Co-

lumbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McCOLLISTER, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROY, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. THONE, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H. Res. 428. Resolution providing for two additional student congressional interns for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Delegate from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 429. Resolution authorizing the payment of additional amount out of the House contingent fund to defray expenses of the House restaurant and the cafeteria and other food service facilities of the House for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

162. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to installing radar for meteorological signals in San Juan, which

was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8135. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Meandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 8136. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alfeo Grasso and their three children, Roberto, Rosario, and Rita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8137. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Taormina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 8138. A bill for the relief of Marie Denis Champana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 8139. A bill for the relief of Baldomera Conde Trelease; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 430. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 1959) entitled "A bill for the relief of American Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Company" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE RIGHT TO PUBLIC COMPASSION

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was privileged to address the legislative conference of the Communications Workers of America on April 21.

Recently, I have been speaking out on what I call "The New Bill of Rights for America." One of these new guarantees is the "Right to Public Compassion." Every American has the right to be secure in the knowledge that his health, material, and spiritual well-being, his old-age and loneliness are the concern of the American people.

Understanding the nature of poverty and the problems of the poor is a most important step in rallying Americans behind expressions of this national compassion.

Mr. President, in order that I might share my thinking on poverty, its nature, and possible cures, I ask unanimous consent that the release and the text of my remarks be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

THE RIGHT TO PUBLIC COMPASSION

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

I have been talking to various groups throughout the country about what I call "A New Bill of Rights for America." These new rights are what you might call an updating of those first ten amendments that

declare Americans shall be truly free men and women. We have come a long way towards making those ideals a reality. A majority of Americans do have and exercise their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Most Americans do participate fully in the mainstream of our national life. But poor Americans, all 24 million of them, they are Americans in name only, do not. So today I would like to discuss with you what I call the "Right to Public Compassion."

"Compassion" is an interesting word. It means to "suffer with." I emphasize the "With." It means that this right is a two-way street. The poor have a right—a right to know that this magnificently affluent, powerful and ingenious nation also has a heart—not a bleeding heart—but a heart. More fortunate Americans also have a right to feel for our brother citizen—the right to expect the Government we elect and support find the means to alleviate and then eradicate poverty. Poverty, of the kind too many Americans suffer, is a national disgrace and we all have the right to call for its disappearance from the land.

We all know what poverty is—in the abstract. We have seen the pictures that accompany various charitable appeals—a little child with a grossly swollen stomach—a large family posing in front of their shack in Appalachia—a black infant whose feet have been gnawed on by a rat.

We think we know what poverty is but these 24 million Americans experience poverty on an entirely different level of reality. They live poverty—they sleep poverty—and frequently all they have to eat is poverty.

Affluent Americans feel that certain material and social things go with their life style—a decent home, an automobile, color television, vacations, maybe a power boat.

Well, the poor of America also find that certain things go with their life style. They are always hungry. They are sick far more often than you and I because of their poor diet and because in their weakened condition they are far easier prey to disease. They

wear clothes until they literally fall off their backs. They sleep 3 and 4 to a bed. They are, particularly in inner cities, subject to criminal attacks, robberies, and violent death. They are often illiterate or, if educated, suffer from some degree of cultural retardation.

The Citizen's Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition estimates that 10 million Americans are "Slowly starving."

Many of these are children. Surveys have shown that a series of psychologically and physically crippling diseases and deficiencies, resulting from childhood malnutrition, effectively lock many poor children into a lifetime of poverty. Chronic fatigue, listlessness and exhaustion often accompany the diseases. These children are being raised to remain dull, listless and poor.

The 1968 report of the Office of Economic Opportunity states that the poor suffer four times more heart disease—6 times more nervous disorder and retardation—10 times more eye trouble than the affluent.

The extremes of heat and cold, overcrowding, ancient plumbing and outdoor privies are all too real to the millions of American poor. Millions are packed into inner city tenements which have inadequate heating and plumbing. In rural areas, individual shacks or groups of shanties are the dwelling for farm workers and migrant laborers. These houses, often crumbling and rotting, seldom have running water or indoor plumbing. These conditions are ready breeding places for diseases you and I never encounter in our lifetime.

The sense of hopelessness that poor Americans feel in bearing the burden I just described is bad enough.

But what is really ironic is that the poor must largely abandon their culture to make it in our affluent society.

Affluent society looms before them as an almost insurmountable conglomeration of strange customs: seemingly illogical requirements, rules and regulations; and, in some cases, cruel hypocrisy and condescension.

To the poor, affluent society is a world of

endless printed forms, big words, ambiguous phrases, listed requirements, and big blank spaces where they must sign their names, in ignorance of what they are signing. It is into this world that the poor have to venture if they are to receive the education, the employment, and the Federal, state and local aid that they are told will help raise them above the poverty level.

The principal cause of poverty is that the individual is either unemployed or underemployed. Fifty-five per cent of all poor families in 1969 were poor despite the fact that the head of the family did work during all or part of the year. In another 30 per cent of poor families, the head of the family was unable to work because of illness or disability or because it was necessary to stay home to care for the family.

But whether poverty is caused by unemployment, underemployment, disability, age, or inability of the head of the house to leave the family for work, the results are the same: low income, hunger, disease, poor housing and personal discouragement.

This condition contributes to an environment where another generation of poverty-trained children are raised. This is the poverty cycle we talk about so much and find so difficult to break.

The Office of Economic Opportunity reported that between 1959 and 1966, 6,200,000 rural poor moved to urban areas, taking with them whatever skills they possess. They left behind them the older and less educated. Local rural governments cannot provide the education, employment and other means to break out of the poverty cycle.

One-half of the nation's poor live in metropolitan areas. Thirteen per cent of the population of central cities are considered to be poor.

It is in the ghettos and slums of our urban areas where the seamless web of poverty is drawn most tightly: poor education, limited employment skills and work habits, unemployment, dependency, decrepit housing, broken families, hunger, overcrowding, crime and narcotics. All combine to make escape from the poverty cycle difficult if not impossible—without our help.

These explosive ingredients combine to make the American urban slum the most ominous and dangerous pocket of poverty in the Nation. We have all seen what happened in Detroit, Washington, Watts, Newark and New York.

Many cities are nearly bankrupt. New York State and City are planning massive layoffs of municipal and state employees. The influx of low-income families into the central city has created a heavy demand for welfare and other costly public services. But this demand for increased services is not matched with the tax base to support them. The well-off have moved to the suburbs and industry no longer locates plants in the inner cities. In fact, there is a rush of corporate headquarters from New York City. Not only are the jobs no longer in the inner city, but even the taxes from industrial headquarters are leaving.

This is why the struggle for civil rights in America is in the inner city.

These walled fortresses of poverty—these ghettos of the poor are where we must meet the challenge of the '70's. This is where the testing of America's new Bill of Rights is taking place.

We have developed a broad offensive to combat poverty. The poor are not a homogeneous group. Their needs differ from city to city and from urban to rural area. This broad approach is reflected in passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, establishment of new programs such as community action, neighborhood legal services, Headstart, and VISTA.

But much more needs to be done to finish the job.

The two-pronged general attack should expand opportunities and incentives for everyone to earn a living, and establish an ef-

fective income maintenance program for all who are in need.

The job program should provide effective training and educational plans, combined with job placement. We must strengthen our public employment program to provide as many jobs as are feasible in health, transportation, sanitation and other basic public services. There are thousands and thousands of these jobs unfilled right now and all of us are suffering because of it.

Work related to Social Security programs should be strengthened to keep the retired, the dependents of deceased workers, the disabled and the unemployed from poverty.

Old-age, survivors and disability benefits should be increased with particular emphasis on the minimum benefit. Benefits under unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation need to be increased, and coverage needs to be broadened, so that all workers under age 65 who are injured or unemployed will receive adequate payments.

The welfare reform plan now going through the Congress is a beginning. It provides a guaranteed annual income of \$2400 for a family of 4; food stamps would be phased out in favor of cash payments; minimum payments for individuals would scale up to \$150 and a couple would receive \$200 by 1974; the working poor would be covered and their total income could reach \$4,320 before the \$720 work supplement would be erased by actual work income; day-care centers would be provided for children of those working; and up to 200,000 public service jobs would be created. This program would save the states and localities approximately \$2.2 billion. Eventually, all welfare must be federalized.

We must not indulge in fantasies that poverty will go away as soon as we can put all those on welfare to work. This just isn't going to happen. We will continue to have expensive bills to pay. But this country is rich enough to take care of its own. We have the resources and ingenuity to make this system work—make it grant basic decency to the recipient of welfare and peace of mind to the taxpayer, through simplicity, equity, adequacy and dignity.

Poverty in a time of affluence is a national disgrace—it weakens and divides our Nation. You people are in communication—the whole world knows what is going on in every city and rural area of America.

Can we talk about the basic and inalienable rights guaranteed to every American while 24 million of us are excluded from that right we have discussed today—the "Right to Public Compassion?"

Let the groups of Americans on both ends of this "Compassion" assert their rights.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S REMARKS AT THE LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, QUALITY MOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today declared that the poor of America "have a Right to Public Compassion—the right to have their society be responsive in helping them lead lives of dignity and economic self-sufficiency."

Speaking to the Annual Legislative Conference of the Communications Workers of America, the Senator stated, "A majority of Americans do have and exercise their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Most Americans do participate fully in the mainstream of our national life.

"But poor Americans, all 24 million of them, do not. They are Americans in name only. Poverty, of the kind too many Americans suffer, is a national disgrace and we all have the right to call for its disappearance from the land.

"We all know what poverty is—in the abstract. We have seen the pictures that accompany various charitable appeals—a little child with a grossly swollen stomach—a large family posing in front of their shack

in Appalachia—an infant whose feet have been gnawed by a rat.

"These 24 million Americans experience poverty on an entirely different level of reality. They live poverty—they sleep poverty—and frequently all they have to eat is their poverty."

"The Citizen's Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition estimates that ten million Americans are 'slowly starving.' Many of them are children. These children are being raised to remain dull, listless and poor.

"The poor suffer four times more heart disease—six times more nervous disorders and retardation—ten times more eye trouble than the affluent.

"The principal cause of poverty is that the individual is either unemployed or underemployed. Fifty-five per cent of all poor families in 1969 were poor despite the fact that the head of the family did work during all or part of the year.

"In another 30 per cent of poor families, the head of the family was unable to work because of illness or disability or because it was necessary to stay home to care for the family.

"We have developed a broad offensive to combat poverty. This approach is reflected in passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, establishment of new programs such as Community Action, neighborhood legal services, Headstart, food stamps, and Vista.

"But much more needs to be done to finish the job. The two-pronged general attack should both expand opportunities and incentives for everyone to earn a living, and establish an effective income maintenance program for all who are in genuine need.

"The job program should provide effective training and educational plans, combined with job placement. We must strengthen our public service employment to provide as many jobs as feasible in health services, transportation, sanitation and other basic public services.

"Work-related social security programs should be strengthened to keep the retired, the dependents of deceased workers, the disabled and the unemployed from poverty.

"Old-age, survivors and disability benefits should be increased with particular emphasis on the minimum benefit. Benefits under unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation need to be increased, and coverage needs to be broadened. Also the minimum wage must be increased to \$2.00 per hour.

"The welfare-reform plan now going through Congress is a beginning. This plan would save the states and localities approximately \$2.2 billion. Eventually, all welfare must be federalized.

"Poverty in a time of affluence is a national disgrace. It weakens and divides our nation. Can we talk about the basic and inalienable rights guaranteed to every American while 24 million of us are excluded from that right we have discussed today—the 'Right to Public Compassion.'"

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for consideration by all the House Members the following request on behalf of the National Association of Women Lawyers. The statement was delivered to me in a letter form from the past president of the above mentioned organization, Marguerite Rawalt. The National Association of Women Lawyers advocate House Joint Resolution 208—

the equal rights amendment—particularly as it applies to involuntary service in the armed services.

The item follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

The awesome responsibility for national security is vested in the Congress under Article I, Sec. 8 of the Constitution, empowering Congress to raise armies, maintain a Navy, make rules for land and naval forces, and provide for Militia in the service of the United States. Pursuant thereto, Congress enacted the Military Service Act of 1967 (50 U.S. Code App. Secs. 450 et seq) imposing the duty on "every male citizen" age 18½ to 26 to register and be liable for military training and service.

Congress possesses unchallenged power to draft any citizen, male or female, black or white, rich or poor, under the Constitution as it stands today. It has chosen to impose the draft only upon "male citizens." It has built into the statute, which has been implemented by Presidential regulations, a series of classifications fixing priorities of call-up for duty, plus a series of exemptions and deferments.

Under the Military Selective Service Act, the President of the United States has approved regulations for "deferment from training or service of any category of students" and it is the "sense of Congress that the President provide for annual deferment" of those in optometry, pre-medical, preveterinary, pre-dental training. The Vice President, state governors, judges and other public officials are exempt.

Persons employed in industry, agriculture, or actively in graduate study, research, medical, dental, etc., found necessary to maintenance of national health, safety, or national interest are classified in deferred categories. Full-time high school students, conscientious objectors, those employed by the United States or a State in health, safety activities, or by non-profit organizations doing prescribed work are given deferred classification. A registrant with child or children, or because of extreme hardship to dependents, is classified as III-A, and dependent is defined as wife, divorced wife, parent, grandparent, brother, sister, a physically handicapped, and legitimate or illegitimate children. A registrant will be placed in delayed Class III "on grounds of fatherhood" if he continues to maintain a bona fide family relationship in the home with his child or children.

Given the Equal Rights Amendment a woman, wife or mother, with child or children, or on a showing of extreme hardship to dependents such as parent, grandparent, brother or sister, would be placed in Class III-A, just as the male registrant. Classification in delayed Class III would apply on the grounds of "motherhood" as now on grounds of "fatherhood." Female students and females employed in the excepted categories would be given delayed classifications. In sum, single females within the limited ages, not entitled to student deferments, not married, not supporting dependents, not employed in preferred occupations, not conscientious objectors, not students, etc., would be left subject to the draft on the same basis as young men.

Similarly, women in the military would receive the same benefits and veteran's preferences, employment education skills learned in the service. Granted that excusing women from the draft has been founded upon the most commendable motives of our members of Congress, this should not be a vehicle to continue to withhold equality of legal rights and citizenship recognition to the women of the country. Young women of draft age, themselves, reject this action, as testimony before your Subcommittee in April 1971, and testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1970, will show. For example, the Resolution of the Intercollegiate

Association of Women Students, in convention March 17-21, 1971 reads:

"The major issue concerning the Equal Rights Amendment is the question of women's involvement with the draft; therefore Resolved that given whatever selective service prevails, IAWS supports the involvement of women equally with men in the responsibilities, requirements, and rights inherent in that system; and continues to advocate a more equitable selective service system."

In U.S. v St. Clair (DC N.Y. 1968) 291 F Supp 122, James St. Clair resisted the draft, refused to register, and contended invidious discrimination based upon his sex in violation of the Fifth Amendment. The Court ruled that courts may not review Congress' determination as to how its power under Article I, Sec. 8, Cl. 12, 13 shall be exercised; that "Congress made a legislative judgment that men should be subject to involuntary induction but women not . . . women may constitutionally be afforded special recognition (Cf. Gruenwald v Gardner, the social security case particularly since women are not excluded from service). (Cf. Hoyt v Florida, jury service, with White v Crook ruling against exclusion of women from juries.) "The distinction is not arbitrary, capricious," said the court. Here, again, appears the old court shibboleth that "sex is a valid classification" which the Amendment is needed to destroy. This case has been cited as authority in the later decision raising the same issue. U.S. v Cook (W.D. Pa., 1968) 311 F. Supp 618.

Aside from the court "hands-off" attitude, discretion still rests with the Congress to make involuntary service applicable to both sexes; to exempt, or to defer, as they now do, all persons (male or female) upon hardship grounds to dependents, upon "fatherhood" (motherhood) responsibilities. All citizens are equally involved and liable for the survival of the nation.

There should be no thought of amending the Equal Rights Amendment to exclude women from the service. Congress should not abandon its grave responsibility for our national security by deliberately placing a constitutional straightjacket upon its powers to draft one half the population. Today's warfare is not confined to battlefields and is no respecter of sex.

It is sincerely urged that you, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, cast your vote and lend your support to equality of rights regardless of sex within the Constitution and without exception and without qualification.

Very sincerely,
 MARGUERITE RAWALT,
 Past President, National Association of Women Lawyers; General Counsel, Women United.

THE PRESS

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to a recent editorial in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times discussing Vice President AGNEW's criticism of radio, television, and newspapers.

The editorial makes two points of considerable interest:

Instead of resenting criticism, newspapers and broadcasters should be listening with interest.

And—

The danger to freedom of the press is not from outside criticism. Freedom of the press becomes a license only if publishers and broadcasters so insulate themselves from their readers and listeners that they can no longer distinguish between the right to make a profit and the right and duty to inform the public.

The full text of the editorial follows:

THE PRESS

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew's consistent, often virulent, criticism of radio, television and newspapers had created a mixture of anguish and self-defensiveness. Many members of these professions profess to believe that Agnew is actually trying to destroy freedom of the press.

It should be conceded in the beginning that the Agnew attacks have been generally popular with the people. Readers, with or without rational reasons, resent monopoly self-righteousness. Listeners are offended by the oracular manner in which television and radio personalities dispose of the great and not so great questions of the day.

As far as the public is concerned it is useless to try to argue about the special problems of time and space which confront newspapers and broadcasters. The process of selection of the events believed most newsworthy quite often invites charges of distortion.

What is most surprising among newsmen and broadcasters, though, is the impression they give that their medium is somehow sacred and therefore immune from criticism under the Constitution. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Because of the tremendous costs of plant, equipment and general operations the trend in recent decades among newspapers has been toward monopoly. The single ownership of morning and afternoon newspapers in metropolitan areas is no longer an exception. The trend toward monopoly is not so evident in television and radio, even though limitations on channels and frequencies do reduce competition.

Instead of resenting criticism, newspapers and broadcasters should be listening with interest. Much of the criticism may be ill-informed, mean and petty. But some of it may be well justified.

The danger to freedom of the press is not from outside criticism. Freedom of the press becomes a license only if publishers and broadcasters so insulate themselves from their readers and listeners that they can no longer distinguish between the right to make a profit and the right and duty to inform the public. No profession, in fact, should be as willing to listen as it is to write and speak.

NEW ADR REGULATIONS NEEDED

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, our economic indicators are climbing. A great deal of credit is due to the administration for its careful and persistent moves against inflation. We want to avoid gimmicks—the "backing and forth" we went through with the investment credit certainly had its effect on our economy's instability. Let us take a sound approach. Let us give business more leeway to decide how and when to write off the cost of their capital investments. It is important for us to focus attention on the need for approval of the proposed eas-

ing of depreciation rules, and I am glad to join with many of my colleagues urging that the "asset depreciation range" proposal be so approved.

The Treasury proposals would allow business an "asset depreciation range" under which they could take depreciation deductions up to 20 percent shorter or 20 percent longer than specified in the IRS standard guidelines.

These changes are needed to encourage investment and meet the growing challenges from foreign competition. The outcome of this issue may determine whether our country will have meaningful depreciation reform and move to a realistic cost-recovery system for years to come. Our alternative is to stay bogged down for the indefinite future in the present archaic system.

At this point, I would like to insert the highly pertinent editorial from this past Monday's Wall Street Journal.

CONFIDENCE AND TAXES

As President Nixon was saying the other day, businessmen need to be confident of the long-term future if the economy is to resume vigorous expansion. It would help, too, if businessmen could be a little more confident of the short-term political outlook.

Speaking at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting, Treasury Secretary John Connally noted that there has been speculation about a revival of the 7% investment tax credit. The credit, initiated in 1962 allegedly as a permanent part of the tax structure, provides an allowance to encourage companies to invest in new plants and equipment.

The credit, of course, proved to be hardly permanent. First it was suspended and then restored and finally it was repealed in 1969. Businessmen who laid long-term investment plans on the basis of a permanent credit got a surprise.

In light of the record it's worth wondering just how much stimulation would stem from revival of the credit now; at least some businessmen would want to examine the gift horse's molars. Still, Mr. Connally is probably right to worry that a number of firms may be holding back on investment in anticipation of the event.

Because of this worry the Treasury Secretary has obtained assurances from Congressional leaders that any credit revival would be retroactive, at least to April 1. In other words if a businessman is waiting for the credit he should go ahead and spend—he should, that is, if he believes that political promises always will be kept.

Mr. Connally stresses that the administration has no current plans to ask renewal of the credit, and those are plans it should stick to. A realistic easing of depreciation rules, of the sort that the administration has already proposed, is a far better approach.

In these high-tax days a company must be able to compute with a certain amount of confidence its standing with the Internal Revenue Service, not only for now but for future years. That sort of confidence is not instilled by on-again off-again gimmicks such as the investment tax credit.

Other major industrial nations have more generous writeoff allowances. This, in itself, without even taking into account all the other factors, puts U.S. business at a competitive disadvantage. Until the time our Nation can close the gap between capital recovery systems, there will be little chance for increasing exports and reducing imports. The asset depreciation range is a necessary step if we are ever going to compete with other countries.

During the past decade, we have gone from being exporters of textile machin-

ery, for example, to being importers. We are sensitive to these facts of life in my Third District of Tennessee. In exporting textile machinery and raw materials, we are exporting jobs. These are just a part of the statistics which document the alarming drop in the American balance of trade in recent years as well.

The Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund recently warned that it would be desirable for countries with a weak payments position who want to lift their economies from a recession to put more emphasis on fiscal rather than monetary stimulation. Singling out this Nation, Mr. Schweitzer noted that:

The importance of restoring cost and price stability can hardly be exaggerated; at stake are the checking of the inflationary trend on a worldwide basis, the long-run stability and efficiency of the U.S. economy, the much-needed strengthening of the U.S. balance of payments, and the sound functioning of the international monetary system.

The changes proposed by the Treasury will help bring the American business taxation structure into line with that of our industrial competitors and thereby help improve the balance of trade.

These changes are neither a windfall for business nor an infringement on congressional tax-levying authority. The asset depreciation range will spur productivity growth through modernization of machinery and equipment. It will help halt the recent retrogression in the modernization of machinery and equipment. Further, the proposed ADR will stimulate a higher rate of capital formation, partially compensate for effects of inflation, improve investment opportunities for small and medium business, and help meet the costs of environmental restoration. The proposed ADR, en toto, could provide the economy with a lift which can help 1971 to be a year of stable economic growth.

A BILL FOR A NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, because of my increasing awareness of how vast the bureaucracy of the U.S. Government has become, today I am introducing a bill for a national health plan that I believe will not only provide better care for our citizens, but would divest the Government of much of the power it has accumulated in this area.

The mood of the country and the Congress is such that some form of national health insurance will be enacted into law. In the face of this, my position is that of trying to involve the private sector of the economy as much as possible, and trying to prevent the formation of one more huge Federal bureaucracy.

My bill would establish a standard of health care for all our citizens that is far superior to that which exists today. Basic needs would be provided for, and

by raising the general quality and quantity of care, costs are expected to decrease in the long run. Every person who establishes eligibility would receive a health protection certificate which he can redeem with any qualified carrier to insure himself and members of his household against accident and illness.

The legislation outlines the minimum benefits every company must provide in order to participate. When an eligible citizen requires medical attention, he notifies the provider of this care as to the name of his company, and the carrier pays the bill. Obviously, competition between companies should stimulate them to seek out the most efficient and competent methods of serving their certificate holders.

At the present time, we are spending close to 21 billion annually on health care in the public sector of the economy. I estimate that, if passed, my bill would only add an extra \$4 billion to this. The cost would be covered by a 5 percent surtax on personal income, and since my program would replace medicaid and medicare, and would eliminate the need for health coverage outside it, the actual cost for most of our citizens would be less than it is today.

I call on my fellow Members of the House to give special attention to this legislation, and I hope that all of you can give it your unqualified support.

STUDENT ALIENATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the good fortune to read the commencement address to the Harvard Law School on June of 1969 of Meldon E. Levine.

I was stirred by Mr. Levine's address and I found his comments and observations so timely today—almost 2 years later—that I have chosen to include it in the RECORD.

I commend this statement to my colleagues and I hope they see the same wisdom and understanding in it I found:

ENGLISH DISQUISITION: A CONFLICT OF CONSCIENCE: OUR PRACTICE OF YOUR PRINCIPLES

(By Meldon E. Levine)

"The streets of our country are in turmoil. The universities are filled with students rebelling and rioting. Communists are seeking to destroy our country. Russia is threatening us with her might. And the republic is in danger. Yes, danger from within and without. We need law and order! . . . without law and order our nation cannot survive. . . ."

These words were spoken in 1932 by Adolf Hitler. A campaign speech made in Hamburg. Vide *Saturday Review*, Vol. LII, No. 20, May 17, 1969, p. 10, 12.

We have heard almost every one of those assertions used this year in this country as justification for repressing student protests. Instead of adjudicating the legitimate causes of the dissatisfaction, our political and social leaders have searched for explanations which they deny either the validity or the pervasiveness of the dissent.

Our society cannot afford to deny this conflict any longer. You cannot, parents and friends, expect it to go away by suppressing

it. For it is a conflict inherent in our consciences—one which exists because you have taught us what America should stand for.

What is this protest all about?

It is not a protest to subvert institutions or an attempt to challenge values which have been affirmed for centuries. We are not—as we have been accused—conspiring to destroy America. We are attempting to do precisely the reverse: we are affirming the values which you have instilled in us and which you have taught us to respect.

You have told us repeatedly that trust and courage were standards to emulate. You have convinced us that equality and justice were inviolable concepts. You have taught us that authority should be guided by reason and tempered by fairness. And we have taken you seriously.

We have accepted your principles—and have found this task to be less than easy. Almost every one of us receiving a degree today has faced the inflexibility and insensitivity of our system.

To those who would argue that the system has been responsive, there is a one-word answer: Vietnam. It is not a weakness but a strength of American education that enables us to understand the absurdity of the premises which control our policy in Vietnam and which threaten to embroil us elsewhere. We have tried every possible peaceful means to change our disastrous course. We have signed petitions. We have written to our Congressmen. We have had teach-ins. We have marched. We have reasoned with anyone who would listen. And, in 1968, after years of peaceful protest and after the American people had spoken in primary after primary in favor of a change, we were not even given a choice on Vietnam. We have grown weary of being promised a dialogue. What we urgently need is a meaningful response.

Our experience with Vietnam reflects the type of frustration we face every time we press for change. We are told to follow "the system." But when I look at that "system," I see rules—but not understanding. I see standards—but not compassion.

And although our complaints are more with society than with the University, the University itself is not an illogical target. Some students believe it contributes to oppressive social policies and most of us feel that it has become, in an unresponsive system, the only means whereby we can focus attention on the most serious injustices which continue to infect our nation.

And the University too has tenaciously resisted change. Six years ago, I was elected president of the student body at Berkeley. I ran on a moderate platform—one calling for educational reform, increased University involvement in the community, and student participation in academic decision-making.

Since that time, I have received degrees at Berkeley, at Princeton, and, today, at Harvard. And I have heard my fellow students, here and elsewhere, raise the same issues—time and again. And time and again, I have witnessed the University's response: A committee will be formed, and the issues will be discussed.

Year after year, the result is the same. And eventually the tactic of setting up committees is discredited. They come to be seen as a device to buy time rather than to make changes; and opportunity to stall until another class of undergraduates leaves the school, removing that particular thorn from the University's side as they go.

Thus, the University and the society respond the same way to our appeals for change: A direct confrontation of ideas is refused and the issues raised are avoided. But explaining the issues away won't make them go away. And the frustration which comes both from the issues themselves and from the continual denial of their existence touches all segments of the campus.

If anyone still doubts the depth of the conviction, I ask him to witness the intensity

with which it is felt. I ask him to review the efforts of my classmates. These efforts were pursued not as a sacrifice, though sacrifices were made; not as a risk, though risks were involved; not to gain praise, though praise they deserve, but because this was necessary to achieve the ideals which you have held forth for us. They chose to work with poor people in Appalachia and with black people in Mississippi and in urban ghettos. They persevered in calling attention to the injustices in Vietnam, despite accusations of disloyalty to their country. And when the price was raised to include physical danger, they exhibited courage and did not waver—in Chicago, in Berkeley, and in Cambridge.

Now, for attempting to achieve the values which you have taught us to cherish, your response has been astounding. It has escalated from the presence of police on the campuses to their use of clubs and of gas. Last month at Berkeley, the state ordered a helicopter to gas the campus from the sky and ordered the police to shoot protesters from the street. Whether the victims had themselves engaged in violence seems to have made little difference.

When this type of violent repression replaces the search for reasonable alternatives, Americans are allowing their most fundamental ideals to be compromised.

What do you think that response does to students?

It drives the wedge even deeper. It creates solidarity among a previously divided group, committing the uncommitted and radicalizing the moderates.

I have asked many of my classmates what they wanted me to say today. "Talk with them about hypocrisy," most of them said. "Tell them they have broken the best heads in the country, embittered the most creative minds, and turned off their most talented scholars. Tell them they have destroyed our confidence and lost our respect. Tell them that, as they use the phrase, 'law and order' is merely a substitute for reason and an alternative to justice."

Continuing to explain the conflict away will only serve to heighten the frustration. It can no longer be denied. Once you recognize that it pervades the campuses—that it affects more than a discontented few—how will you respond?

So far, we have been unable to understand your response. You have given us our visions and then asked us to curb them. You have offered us dreams and then urged us to abandon them. You have made us idealists and then told us to go slowly.

We have been asking for no more than what you have taught us is right. We can't understand why you have been so offended. But as the repression continues, as the pressure increases, as the stakes become higher and the risks greater, we can do nothing but resist more strongly and refuse more adamantly. For it would be unthinkable to abandon principle because we were threatened or to compromise ideals because we were repressed.

We are asking that you allow us to realize the very values which you have held forth. And we think you should be with us in our quest.

CALLEY VERDICT MORALLY AND LEGALLY JUSTIFIED

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the polls indicate that a large majority of the American people feel Lt. William Calley

should not have been convicted. There has even been a song glorifying him which, I understand, has sold more than a million copies.

No politician likes to place himself in opposition to such a tide of popular opinion. But I must say that in this case the facts clearly indicate that those who support Calley are dead wrong.

Calley slaughtered unarmed and unresisting prisoners. This is the long and the short of it. It is murder; there is no other way to look at it. The fact that the prisoners were old men, women, and babies makes the crime more hideous, but it would be murder even if they had been elite troops.

The popular sympathy which has developed for him seems to be largely based on misinformation. One of the most prominent misconceptions is stated in two lines from the popular song to which I previously referred:

"We returned their rifle fire with everything we had,
And when the smoke had cleared a hundred souls lay dead."

There was no rifle fire, and there was no smoke. Calley met no resistance at all, and he saw exactly what he was shooting at.

As one who has worked very hard at attempting to secure the release of our prisoners of war from Indochina, I am most apprehensive about the consequences of overturning Calley's sentence. If we say, in effect, that it was all right for Calley to line up 102 prisoners and shoot them, we will be saying it will be all right if the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong line up 102 American prisoners and shoot them. To put it very mildly, I am aware of nothing in the actions of Lieutenant Calley that indicates he is worth 102 American POW's.

I feel that Lieutenant Calley is, in a sense, being used as a scapegoat. His superiors certainly carry a full share of responsibility for this tragedy, and rank should not serve as a refuge from justice. But whether Captain Medina or General Koster or General Westmoreland or President Johnson or you or I are guilty does not affect or mitigate the fact that Lieutenant Calley committed murder and ordered others to commit murder.

Calley was found guilty by six decorated combat officers, five of whom had served more time in Vietnam than he had. One juror said afterward:

I wanted to believe it didn't happen . . . that it was just a hoax, by any stretch of the imagination, that it didn't happen.

Another told how he spent hours trying to find some possible basis for acquitting Calley. But in the end not one of them could find a basis for acquittal, and neither can I.

It cannot be said that Lieutenant Calley acted in the heat of battle, or that he was in a kill-or-be-killed situation, or that he acted to protect his troops. There was no battle and there was no threat from which he or his troops needed to be protected. During the entire day the platoon was never fired upon, nor did it encounter a single mine or booby trap.

It is said in Calley's defense that Vietnamese women and children throw grenades, plant booby traps, and so forth.

I cannot see how this is relevant, even if we set aside the fact that some of the children Calley's platoon killed were not old enough to walk, much less throw grenades. The fact is that these people were unarmed and unresisting prisoners. Under these conditions they were entitled to the protection of the Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War even if they had been regular combat troops.

Article 13 of the Convention says:

Prisoners of war must at all times be humanely treated. Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner of war in its custody is prohibited, and will be regarded as a serious breach of the present Convention.

We spend a lot of time criticizing the other side for its failure to live up to the Geneva Convention; if Calley is freed, we had better pray they do not do unto us as we will have done unto them.

There is the argument that Calley was "just following orders." Blind, robot-like obedience to orders has never been the American way, and it must never become so. We Americans pride ourselves on our individualism, but with individual rights there must go individual responsibility. As Maj. Walter Kinard, one of the jurors, said after the trial:

There are some things that a man of common understanding and common sense would know are wrong.

A number of the men in Calley's platoon flatly refused to shoot the prisoners. But Calley went ahead and shot, and ordered others to shoot. It seems to me that therein lies the difference between an honorable American soldier and a criminal.

I have heard it said that Lieutenant Calley was "just doing what he was trained to do." There is no question that our training programs have been deficient in their consideration of the people we are supposed to be saving. But the training is not bad enough to justify Mylai. As former Marine Lt. Barry Kowalski wrote in a recent letter to the Washington Post:

During my tour in Vietnam no man in my command found it necessary or proper to throw a pre-school toddler into a ditch and shoot him to death. No Marine in the 3rd Battalion, 3rd Marines, ever watched a terrified child attempt to cover the wounded body of his baby brother, then unemotionally kill both of them. Yes, we like Calley, were trained to kill. We did kill. But . . . we, like Calley were never trained to kill babies. And we didn't kill babies. There is no excuse, moral or legal, for the crimes of which a jury of his military peers found him guilty.

There is the question of the effect of the trial on military morale and military recruitment. I must emphatically reject the assertion that any combat serviceman can now expect to find himself on trial if he obeys orders and protects his own life. If a man is planning to do what Lieutenant Calley did, then he can properly expect a court-martial. Frankly, I feel it would be best for all concerned if such individuals did not seek military service.

But for men who have the elementary decency to tell right from wrong, the attractiveness of a military career has been strengthened. The entire command structure is now bending over backwards

to prevent any future Mylais. More importantly, every serviceman now knows that, should he receive a clearly illegal and immoral order, he can refuse it without incurring any penalty. The man with the strength and integrity to do this is the kind of man we want and need to have in uniform. Just imagine the effect if the opposite decision had been reached: Suppose the Army had acquitted Calley and convicted those who refused to shoot. Imagine the kind of man this would have attracted into the service.

In summary, I regard the Calley verdict as legally and morally imperative in its own right. Moreover, I believe it is a first step toward demonstrating to our young people and to the world that the U.S. Army practices what it preaches. I regard it as the necessary first step toward reestablishing the American military in the honorable place it occupied in our national life before it was degraded by our disastrous involvement in Southeast Asia.

HAWAII CONSIDERS PACIFIC COMMUNITY CONFERENCE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD a letter and speech I recently received from Mr. George S. Kanahale, administrator for the Hawaiian International Services Agency. Mr. Kanahale very ably and quite accurately puts forth the reasons for encouraging the growth of the concept of a Pacific community, and the need for the United States to develop a coherent policy in that part of the world.

I have held similar views for a number of years and am very pleased to have officials in the State of Hawaii making positive contributions to the discussion. It is very appropriate that interest in the Pacific community be expressed from the State that serves as this Nation's most prominent extension in the basin.

I recommend Mr. Kanahale's remarks to my colleagues:

HAWAII INTERNATIONAL SERVICES AGENCY,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 12, 1971.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HANNA: Thank you for your letter of April 6 and the enclosures regarding the Pacific Community. Please find enclosed a copy of a recent article I wrote entitled, "The U.S. Needs a Pacific Policy." As you can see, it argues that the Pacific Community is a viable concept upon which a new American Pacific policy can be formulated. I would appreciate any comments you may have on the arguments contained in the article.

We are also moving ahead on our plans to hold an international conference late this year to examine the feasibility of a Pacific Community. As a first step, we will be looking mainly at the types and levels of organized international cooperation now existing in the Pacific region. We feel this is a practical and realistic first step.

Since the State of Hawaii appears to be in the vanguard in advancing the idea of a Pacific Community, we would very much want to maintain contact with you because you remain one of the very few voices in

Congress calling attention to the Pacific Community.

Best regards,
Sincerely,

GEORGE S. KANAHELE.

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS A PACIFIC POLICY (Remarks by George S. Kanahale)

For a long time the dynamics of world development favored the Atlantic and it was easy to argue that an Atlantic axis was as natural and necessary for the United States as the Panama Canal. This is no longer the case, however, as there has been a definite shift toward the Pacific, an event which was predicted more than a century ago by Secretary of Interior Seward when he said: "The Pacific Ocean and its shores and islands would become the chief theater of events in the world." Unfortunately, it is a prediction which too few Americans understand.

Accordingly, it does not require much insight to state that the future of the United States will in large measure be determined by peoples and events in the Pacific. But, by the same token, so will the future of the Pacific be largely determined by what the United States does or does not do. In either case, one thing is sure: the U.S. needs a Pacific policy.

That need, of course, stems from our involvement in the Pacific, a fact which few Americans would quibble about, but which many would probably prefer to go away. The extent of our involvement can be at once appreciated by checking off an almost endless list of problems we face in the region: the challenge of Soviet naval power, the political tinderbox in Micronesia, the bitter trade battle with Japan, Red China, the fish-boat skirmishes with Ecuador, the Indo-China War (the "Vietnam" War has really been a misnomer), ad infinitum.

To state the obvious, at no other time in our history has America been so deeply committed and so inextricably bound to developments in the Pacific. And the prognosis is for even greater U.S. involvement.

We need to recognize that our involvement in the Pacific is neither an accident nor a matter of recent history that began with Pearl Harbor. Ever since Lewis and Clark opened the first trails to the West, the United States has moved inexorably westward—and not just to the suburbs of Los Angeles. It is no fluke that it was an American Commodore who ended the isolation of Japan, or that American traders, followed by American marines, insisted on keeping the doors of China open, or that America's major colonial adventures took place in the Pacific. World War II, our occupation of Japan, our espousal of the Chiang Kai Shek regime, the Korean conflict, and finally the tragedy in Indo-China—all testify to what one astute Asian observer described as "the existence of irresistible pressures towards a Pacific destiny."

While this may seem like revisionist history to Euro-centric Americans, our 19th century vision of "Manifest Destiny" turned our eyes to the West, not to the East. The cry was: "Go West, young man. Go West."

There is nothing mysterious about this attraction to the Pacific—after all, America is bordered by two oceans. It is the Pacific that has increasingly offered the greatest prospects for shaping the course of world history. The Pacific Ocean is a common boundary to six continents and more than 25 countries with over half the world's population. Around it are gathered all the superpowers, actual and potential: the Soviet Union, U.S., and Japan and Red China who are well on the way to becoming superpowers. It is the largest world market and economically one of the fastest growing regions in the world.

The Pacific is also where the issue of world peace may be decided. When Prime Minister Sato visited Washington two years ago he said, "Today, as we look to the future of the

Pacific, we recognize that whether peace survives in the last third of the century will depend more on what happens in the Pacific than in any other area of the world."

It is for these reasons the United States is involved in the Pacific—and why we are a Pacific power.

A year before his election as president, Richard Nixon declared: "The United States is a Pacific power. Europe has been withdrawing the remnants of empire, but the United States, with its coast reaching in an arc from Mexico to the Bering Strait, is one anchor of a vast Pacific community." Later in 1969 at his Guam press conference and again in his February, 1971 report to Congress on "U.S. Foreign Policy For The 1970's" the President reiterated the fact that the United States is a Pacific power.

Yet, the astounding thing is that we are a Pacific power without a Pacific policy. That is, this nation has no clear guidelines by which it can determine the best course of action regarding Pacific-wide problems. This does not necessarily mean that Washington acts or reacts willynilly when a matter of Pacific-wide importance arises, although it is reasonable to believe that in the absence of any definite policy the odds are good that it might.

To be sure, the United States is not wholly without guidelines, but they represent at best a patchwork of policy considerations rather than a coherent, systematic formulation of policy. What the former amounts to is the so-called Nixon Doctrine which, according to its author, presents an entirely "new philosophy" of U.S. foreign policy. While many will argue its basic premise that the U.S. must maintain "a role in the world rather than a withdrawal from the world," the thought is by no means new. If it provides little that is new, neither does it offer much that is clear and straightforward.

Although first proclaimed in the Pacific, the Nixon Doctrine is not so much a Pacific but an Asian policy. Its intended message has been to reassure the leaders of Asia that while the U.S. will not opt out of its existing commitments, henceforth Asian problems will require Asian initiatives and Asian solutions. But where and how does one draw the line? To many, Washington's reluctance to answer that question will leave the U.S. "straddling some undefined middle ground between total isolation and instant intervention." Which leaves us somewhere but nowhere.

Many Asian leaders, like many thoughtful Americans, are troubled about the meaning of the Nixon Doctrine. Recently President Marcos of the Philippines reportedly said, "I get all these calls from leaders all over Asia. They ask me: 'You're much closer to the Americans. Do you know what they're intending to do?'" What is meant by the Nixon Doctrine? As one student of U.S. foreign affairs put it, the Nixon Doctrine is like the Bible: it can mean all things to all people at all times.

But one thing it does mean—we still do not have a clear policy for the Pacific. There is an absurd contradiction in all this. On the one hand, we are still groping for what we claim we have, an Asian policy, yet we disavow any claims to being an Asian power. On the other hand, we flatly declare ourselves to be a Pacific power, but have no definite policy to show for it.

It is not a matter of put up or shut up, for we do not have the luxury of that choice. Like it or not, the United States is and will continue to play the role of a Pacific leader for the foreseeable future. Leadership is best exercised, however, when purposes and guidelines are clearly understood or else the consequences can be disastrous for both friends and foes alike.

There is a viable concept upon which a new American Pacific policy can be formed. It is an idea which Nixon himself explored in 1967, but which, strangely enough, he has not mentioned much, if at all, since his elec-

tion: the building of a Pacific community. He stated then: "Without turning our backs on Europe, we have now to reach out westward to the East and to fashion the sinews of a Pacific community. Both our interests and our ideals propel us westward across the Pacific not as conquerors but as partners, linked by the sea not only with those oriental nations on Asia's Pacific littoral but at the same time with occidental Australia and New Zealand, and with the island nations between. . . . This has to be a Community in the fullest sense: a community of purpose, of understanding and of mutual assistance." Although Nixon has chosen not to address himself to this concept, he must certainly grant that the need for such a community is no less greater today than it was four years ago.

But if Washington has remained silent, Tokyo has not. Japanese leaders, including Prime Minister Sato, have made it plain that Japan aspires to build, *along with the United States*, a "New Pacific Age," where "a new order will be created" in the Pacific. Although to some it may be a painful reminder of imperial Japan's dream of "the Asian Co-prosperity Sphere," it underscores the determination of the Japanese to forge ahead in making the "Asian-Pacific Zone" its major arena of action.

Whatever Washington or Tokyo may say, the emergence of a Pacific community is becoming more and more a reality. It is reflected in the growing interdependence of Pacific countries brought about by their increasing economic, technological, scientific, educational and cultural ties. It is also evidenced in the resultant growth of large numbers of regional, i.e., trans-Pacific as well as sub-regional cooperative organizations in almost every conceivable field. In effect, Pacific nations and peoples are being gradually linked together by an intricate network of interrelated and interlocking organizations and groupings.

This sense of community which has been fostered by mutual cooperation particularly in the areas of trade and investment, received important recognition by Asia's most authoritative economic journal, *The Far Eastern Economic Review*. In a recent issue, it editorialized, "Over the last year or so, East Asia has been increasingly developing a Pacific Basin consciousness—looking towards the west coast of the American continent, towards Japan and Australasia and regarding itself as part of a developing market region circling the Pacific Ocean."

The building of a Pacific community can and should be the basis for a new American Pacific policy. It would provide a much more positive framework, as opposed to the military and security considerations of the Cold War, upon which US policy could be reconstructed. It would serve as an effective counterbalance to the Atlantic Community and thereby restore some equilibrium to the nation's international posture. And above all, it would serve as a dynamic new symbol of peaceful progress and cooperation throughout Asia and the Pacific.

LAW DAY U.S.A.

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the traditional annual observance of Law Day U.S.A., and this year's theme, Channel Change Through Law and Reason.

As American citizens, we are basically a great people and a great Nation.

We are citizens of the greatest democracy the world has ever known. As

American citizens, we have no higher civic duty or moral and ethical obligation than support of the law of the land. There must be respect for the law because it is the law. There is at the present time in this country an ever accelerating disrespect for the rule of law. The doctrine of civil disobedience and the disturbances that follow will engender every expanding disillusionment with the movement that prompts this action.

I am convinced that those in positions of intellectual and moral trust who advocate public disobedience of the law must assume responsibility for those who act upon their advice. The motives of many of these well-meaning individuals are above reproach. Invariably, they reject violence as a method to achieve goals. Unfortunately, they do not see, or are unable to see, the connection between the doctrine of civil disobedience that they preach and the explosions of violence that have followed.

However, when individuals begin to decide what laws they will obey or disobey, the fabric of society begins to disintegrate. Nobody wins—everybody loses.

Americans must begin to temper their actions with reason. While the process of the law may sometimes appear to be slow and frustrating in reaching justice, we must always bear in mind that it is the only responsible way we have of attaining justice. Through law and reason, the many urban social and civil problems are being overcome.

The trouble concerning the present generation of urban Americans is constant fear of unprovoked physical harm. Fortunately, we have a legal process of government and it is the continued implementation of this democratic process that will bring just order to our land.

We all know and recognize the problems of criminal activism that urban America faces every day. Americans are entitled to enjoy the serenity that comes from peaceful cities; they are entitled to know that their families are safe from wanton criminal attack and they certainly are entitled to know that the law is strong enough to protect them.

The laws of this land have been responsible for bringing America to its present heights and we as lawmakers are constantly searching for methods by which we can improve the judicial system.

As we observe this day in honor of "Channel Change Through Law and Reason," we must remember that we have much to do in maintaining it if we are to effectively serve the people who turn to us for help.

It is our responsibility to bring about any necessary change through the due process of legislation. Reason must rule the changing passions of all concerned Americans.

America's historic past has provided us with a solid basis of law for our modern mode of life—it has provided us with the flexibility to engage in a responsible program of justice and equality for our citizens. The American people today can look forward to a brighter future because they realize the American process of law is constantly working for them.

Today there are many serious problems confronting the inner moral strength of this country. Civil disobe-

dience is more widespread than ever before, and in some cases, the security of this country is being threatened.

However, we can be certain that the principles of the American judicial system as established by our predecessors and maintained by us will enable us to forge the proper path for the country to follow.

CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD INVOLVES ITSELF IN COMMUNITY PROJECT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, for almost 3 years there has been a concerted effort in the California National Guard to continue and expand community relations projects. The community and youth oriented programs participated in by the National Guard are commendable and deserve recognition. The California National Guard has rooted itself into the community and made it a special point to participate in viable community activities.

A brief recapitulation of activities participated in by the National Guard is in order. The guard has contributed its services to countless festivities from assisting the ecology center in Sacramento by gathering used containers to be recycled, to delivering used clothing to the Hopi Indian Reservations.

Although the first priority of the National Guard is, and probably will remain, the development of combat readiness and of the military skills which lead to this readiness—productive domestic action programs are encouraged. Department of Defense Directive 5030.37 urged units and individual members of the Guard and Reserve to participate voluntarily in domestic action efforts. This directive provides guidelines and establishes policy for participation in and support of the DOD Domestic Action program. The objectives of this program is to utilize the resources of the Defense Department in cooperation with other organizations, to overcome our serious domestic problems.

In California, numerous guardsmen have enthusiastically and voluntarily engaged themselves to the task of promoting community relations. By providing color guard for parades and ceremonies, and participating at concert performances at local community affairs the guardsmen are able to utilize skill gleaned from their military training in civic orientated functions.

Last summer the Guard provided transportation for a special group of Chicago girls to and from a campsite. The affair was sponsored by the Camp Fire Girls, and it was the first camp-out that these girls had ever attended.

The National Guard, also, participated in the President's Youth Opportunity program on a nondrill, voluntary basis. Many States have initiated innovative youth programs which have been used as models throughout the Nation.

Quite frequently, however, individual

efforts are the catalyst that formulate new projects. Lt. Patrick B. McGreevy devised a plan that would involve the companies' medical doctors, dentists, and trained medical technicians in providing physicals, and medical counseling in the Hunter's Point District of San Francisco. Although the plan was never carried through Lieutenant McGreevy aided directly in establishing a committee to direct a summer day camp program to be financed and executed by the National Guard and local community groups.

Mr. Speaker, the National Guard has been contributing significantly to community related projects; however, I am certain that the usefulness of the above mentioned programs can be further advanced. Defense Department policy could be oriented toward a pattern that would provide more training in implementing community welfare programs. More Pentagon initiated encouragement could be provided at the policymaking level and a more strengthened unity could be developed by implementing projects that alleviate some of the fundamental problems of people that reside in communities such as Hunter's Point, in San Francisco, or Watts in Los Angeles.

FROM ESTES PARK TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MALL: "RAGE OF LOVE"

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mary McGrory, columnist for the Washington Star, provided readers with an interesting viewpoint recently.

The thesis of her column was that the same general theme of philosophy characterized the carefully arranged White House Conference of Youth held recently in Estes Park, Colo., and the protesting veterans of Vietnam in Washington.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Sunday Star, May 2, 1971]

ESTES PARK TO MALL: 'RAGE OF LOVE'

(By Mary McGrory)

From the Mall and from the mountains, from the uninvited and the invited, the message was the same.

Delegates to the White House Conference on Youth—"the most representative body of American youth ever assembled"—were meeting as pampered guests of the government in Estes Park, Colo., the same week that a thousand veterans were camping out under the inhospitable trees of the Mall.

Estes Park proclaimed in the preamble to its report to the President that it spoke "out of the rage of love for the unimplemented principles we here assert." The veterans didn't put it quite that way, but the Mall was in the grip of a "rage of love" such as the Capital has seldom seen before.

A year ago, the morning after Cambodia, President Nixon made an invidious comparison between the campus "bums" demonstrating against the war and the brave young Americans who were fighting it. Now that the soldiers are home the comparison won't hold any more—at least from the evidence of the thousand on the Mall. Youth in the barracks and on campus and in the

factories is bound together by ties the Nixon administration cannot put asunder.

In fact, it would have been easy to mistake the unwelcome warriors on the grass for a cross-section of the President's guests in the snow. The hair was as long, the spirit as mocking. The difference between the campers and the conferees was that the campers' sketchy uniforms were G.I. issue, while the conferees had acquired theirs from Army surplus.

"We are motivated not by hatred," said Estes Park, "but by disappointment over and love for the unfulfilled potential of this nation." They demanded an end to the war by the end of the year.

It was verbalized more starkly and urgently on the Mall: "Bring our brothers home now."

It was the oddest veterans' convention ever seen. The brothers enjoyed their reunion, but it was redemption they were seeking. They were haunted by what they had done and seen in Vietnam. They did not take the line of Lt. Calley, the most famous veteran of this war and the object of White House solicitude, that it was "no big deal" to kill civilians.

They sought to purge themselves in a shattering final ritual in which they threw back their decorations, discharge papers and draft cards over a force on Capitol Hill.

"God knows how many I killed," cried an overwrought young airman after he had hurled his medals at the statue of John Marshall.

These veterans were not like other veterans. At their homecoming they had been greeted as killers by their peer group, they had been greeted like stepchildren by the government. But they were too intent on their mission to be embittered.

For them to be alive and together seemed to be enough. On the hard ground of the Mall they had discovered purpose, pride and an odd measure of peace.

"My paranoia's gone," exulted a shaggy ex-sallor. "It's the first time I've felt together since I got out."

"There are absolutely no bad vibes here," said a 19-year-old retired Marine lance corporal.

"The unity is a sub-line factor here," said a bushy-haired ex-Green Beret. "Its because of the experiences we shared that nobody else can believe."

Their efforts to share their guilt and their nightmares with Congress met with indifferent success. One group stormed into Rep. Bella Abzug's office and demanded to be sworn in so they could testify to atrocities. They were furious when denied.

The impact of their succinct and picturesque campaign on the peace movement, Congress and foreign policy is being hotly argued and busily discredited by more conventional veterans' groups. But their message was surely more important than their effect.

They were reassuring a shaken country in the most vivid way that they were not brutalized by Vietnam. They came to Washington demanding love and forgiveness. They are done with death, violence and vindictiveness. Out of the cauldron of a hated war they have emerged as caring human beings, moved by the plight of suffering mankind.

Flag-wavers on Capitol Hill were jolted by their pleas for amnesty for their contemporaries who had fled the war that had wasted their young lives and bodies.

Beside their vision of charity, the White House spectre of "a nightmare of recriminations" attending an early peace fade into pettiness. If the veterans can forgive and forget, who would dare not to?

A red-headed, barefoot lad wearing a mailman's jacket and a combat infantry badge on his blue jeans, stood shivering in the doorway of the USO on the final night and pleaded with a passing journalist: "Tell them we care about our brothers. Tell them we love them and we want them home."

CRASH FUNDING WON'T DO IT

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the April 1971 issue of Parks and Recreation magazine, there appeared an excellent article written by Clarence M. Pendleton, Jr. "Penny" Pendleton, long considered one of the leading experts in the field of recreation, is presently the director of urban affairs of the National Recreation and Parks Association.

I wholeheartedly support Mr. Pendleton's basic thesis that the Federal Government's crisis-oriented approach toward the funding of our Nation's recreation programs is totally inadequate. This is especially true of those programs which have been geared to meet the recreation needs of our cities.

I am sure that my colleagues will find this article most informative.

CRASH FUNDING WON'T DO IT

(By Clarence M. Pendleton, Jr.)

They were troubled—the 84 park and recreation administrators who came to Washington last February for NRPA's summit meeting. All were distressed about federal funding for recreation programs. From every part of the country the message was the same—they liked what Uncle Sam was doing, but not the way he was doing it.

Hoping to alert President Nixon to their concerns, the delegates drew up and approved a set of recommendations which were then delivered to the President for his consideration. These recommendations, as adopted, were printed in the March issue of *Parks & Recreation*; but the problems and concerns which led to their adoption have not been fully examined. What are the issues which brought these men and women to Washington? What is the story behind NRPA's emergency meeting on funding?

PROGRAM FUNDING IS CRISIS-ORIENTED

For several years, local park and recreation administrators have noted with growing concern that the federal government has continued to maintain its crisis-oriented approach toward program funding for recreation and parks. Such an approach has limited program funding to a brief two-month summer period and to urban centers. The rest of the year and the rest of the country have been consistently neglected.

Crisis funding was born when the specter of burning cities loomed large over the country. A panicky government went into action. In an effort to extinguish smoldering discontents which might erupt into violence, the federal pump was primed, and over the past five years, it has poured out approximately \$175,000,000 which was supposed to meet recreation and park program needs of disadvantaged youth. Government planners assumed that this city-dwelling age group (as opposed to the entire population) must be kept busy during the potentially explosive summer months. Then, when the weather cooled, it was assumed that the need for activity and the problems which spawned this need would subside.

Such thinking was fallacious. Every independent evaluation of this federal effort has come to the same conclusions: short-term summer programs will not prevent riots; year-round, twelve-month planning is essential to provide relevant, effective programming; any other type of programming is inefficient, ineffective, and wasteful. Part of the problem with this crash approach lies in the fact that many local park and recreation departments are bypassed when it comes

to planning and operating programs. Program guidelines are established at the federal level, requiring that local administration be handled by a youth coordinator. Unfortunately, many of them are not recreation professionals and are somewhat unfamiliar with local program capabilities and priorities. The results have been fragmentation and duplication of effort, inefficient and wasteful use of appropriations. In many instances, the federal program guidelines have competed against rather than complemented local park and recreation programs.

Administrators of these local programs accept much of the criticism leveled at their departments concerning relevancy, disrespect for life styles, etc. They note, however, that response requires financing and as long as funds go to other agencies—who have not been measurably more successful than the park and recreation departments—there cannot be that response. Local administrators are anxious to be responsive to the needs of concerned citizens or organizations within their jurisdictions and to cooperate in efforts to make their services more effective and relevant, but when funds must be spread around so everyone can "do his own thing" and support is not forthcoming, problems are bound to develop.

Now, when many cities are facing financial crises and recreation departments are candidates for budget cuts, it is more important than ever that all funds available for recreation purposes be used to the best advantage. It borders on the tragic, therefore, that the federal government continues to spend funds in a manner which will not deliver the most effective recreation program for the disadvantaged. This is why NRPA feels it is important to share with you what it considers to be the issue around public programming for the disadvantaged and which led to the emergency funding meeting and the subsequent adoption of the recommendations which were forwarded to the President.

THE ISSUE

The federal government has invested a considerable amount of time and money to improve the quality of human services available to the nation's urban residents. In this effort, specific attention has been placed on providing funds for the "expansion of recreation programs" and "recreation-oriented" job opportunities for disadvantaged youth during the two-month summer period. Any or all of the following reasons could be responsible for this recreation emphasis: (1) the assumption that recreation services could be delivered at the local level without unduly disturbing existing federal fiscal and political structures; (2) the broad base of palatability for recreation services among the disadvantaged residents of urban communities; and (3) the facts documented in the Kerner Commission Report that identified inadequate recreation services to the disadvantaged as one of the primary causes of civil disorders.

The continued federal awareness and use of park and recreation services to meet human service needs is evidenced by the substantial allocation of approximately 175 million federal dollars over the last five years to a total of 100 of the nation's most populous cities.

The scope and complexity of the federal efforts become even more obvious on examination of the number of federal agencies and programs that have been involved up to this point:

FEDERAL AGENCIES

1. Department of Housing and Urban Development—Model Cities and Community Resources program.

2. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—NCAA Summer Sports Program in cooperation with the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

3. Department of Transportation—Funds for local trips.

4. Department of Interior—Recreation Support Program.

5. Department of Labor—Manpower Development Training Act, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and New Career Enrollees.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

1. Office of Economic Opportunity—Community Action Programs in recreation and cultural activities.

2. President's Council on Youth Opportunity—Local/federal coordination efforts

3. President's Council on Physical Fitness—Operation Champ, NCAA Summer Sports Program in cooperation with Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Providing funds for the expansion of recreation programs operated by "local public or nonprofit agencies" results from a kind of federal interagency cooperation. Each year federal agency representatives conduct a series of meetings to decide how many dollars each can contribute to sponsor and control the local expansion efforts. When the funding level has been established and approved, guidelines for their use are hastily developed without input from park and recreation professionals.

Local public park and recreation agencies shared the Federal government's concern for expanding recreation and park programs and employment opportunities for disadvantaged youth. Successful methods were developed to attract resource contributions from local public and private agencies, i.e., public and private social service organizations, civic and business agencies, to supplement their own resources in order to provide the needed services.

Assumptions were made by local park and recreation departments that since they were the legally enacted authority responsible for developing and controlling recreation resources, they could match their resources with those of the federal government and implement a meaningful program for the urban disadvantaged. However, federal guidelines called for an administrative process in direct competition with the local park and recreation department. Needless to say, federal and local officials with commonality of purpose exhibited a conflict in process.

In spite of all the investment of both federal and local time and resources, experience over the past five years reveals:

A fragmentation and dilution of park and recreation services within urban communities.

Maldistribution and use of park and recreation manpower resources.

Inadequate and inappropriate development of park and recreation areas and facilities.

The creation of critical voids in the plans that many cities had on the drawing boards.

A continued demand by the urban disadvantaged for an increased park and recreation service by the local agencies.

It is obvious that the federal government retains unto itself the privilege of determining the direction and emphasis it wishes to maintain in providing support for park and recreation programs. However, it is equally obvious that local park and recreation administrators should have somewhat the same prerogative.

MUTUAL PROGRAM CONCERNS

The 1971 summer is fast approaching and there is no indication of a change in the existing federal process. The National Recreation and Park Association believes that the local park and recreation departments have no less professional responsibility than any other public service agency to develop and implement programs that meet the needs of their citizens. Therefore, NRPA convened a meeting of park and recreation administrators from the country's most populous cities. Mutual concerns about public park and recreation programs with priority attention being focused on the effects of the federal funding process as well as the development of

strategies for responding to anticipated federal funding guidelines and processes for the 1971 summer were discussed at the meeting.

The major points of concern were:

1. Effectiveness in the execution of federal park and recreation programs, be they hardware or software, depends crucially on understanding that local park and recreation departments have the competence and ability to plan, implement, and coordinate programs and services.

2. The federal allocation of resources, ideas, and leadership is indispensable. However, it is only a contributory range of offerings. At the local park and recreation department the federal resources should be accepted, applied, and matched with other resource contributions and turned into products.

3. At the local park and recreation department projects should be planned, goals and priorities established, applications originated, resources mobilized, and, finally programs administered in a coordinated system.

4. Federal programs that work well do so because local park and recreation planning and coordination have worked well—and federal guidelines have been established that have encouraged and permitted them to work. No amount of intergovernmental sponsorship and operation of programs will substitute for what must be done at the local level.

5. The federal government must reconcile its competing strategies and settle upon a unified approach that will perfect the local park and recreation planning process, establish it, and develop the machinery and the funding to support and sustain it.

NATIONAL RAISIN WEEK

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the 62d annual National Raisin Week, set for May 3-9, 1971, the Nation's oldest food festival calls attention to one of California's most vital industries.

The quarter-billion dollar raisin industry, which effectively utilizes the modern tools of sales promotion and advertising, supply management, and bargaining, had its roots in antiquity. Raisins were grown by the Egyptians and Persians in 2000 B.C. and the Bible mentions that an Israelite brought cheese and raisins to pay his taxes to King David. In Rome during the time of Nero, the wealthy always had raisins on the menu of their feasts.

Raisins were once an expensive food, and only the wealthy ate them. Today everyone can enjoy raisins for eating out of hand, and in puddings, cakes, cookies, bread, and a multitude of other delicious food forms.

Today the California raisin industry's vineyards produce some 250,000 tons of raisins each year for processing and marketing throughout the world.

I would like to commend the California Raisin Advisory Board, as the industry's research, promotion, and advertising arm, for the highly effective job it has done in promoting sales of raisins in the United States and overseas in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service.

Despite increasing competition from foreign competitors and other products,

the California raisin industry has become the largest in the world.

Special commendation should go also to the Federal Raisin Advisory Board and the Federal Raisin Administrative Committee for their effective efforts under Federal marketing orders which have had great success in bringing about the orderly marketing of raisins and which have also been effective in development of export markets.

I would also like to commend the Raisin Bargaining Association for its work in improving grower returns for their crops. In less than 5 years, the association has brought the raisin growers together in a concerted effort which has given them a strong voice in determining the reward for their labors.

The raisin industry, for its effective efforts in producing, processing, and marketing its crop, one-half of the world's raisin supply, well deserves special recognition during National Raisin Week—May 3-9.

VISTA MERGER

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my dissatisfaction with President Nixon's plan to merge VISTA with other volunteer service organizations into one huge action corps. I feel that in the long run this proposal, if carried through, will have a devastating effect on the original goals of an organization dedicated to alleviating the problems of the poor.

After hearing the views of many VISTA volunteers from different parts of the country, I think that the effects of the proposed merger should be critically scrutinized. Will the consolidation of numerous service organizations into a large bureaucracy better facilitate the needs of the poor? Or is it more correct to say, in the words of Eric G. Airries, a VISTA volunteer from Madison, Wis., that:

Mr. Nixon's objectives are to provide an experience for a nebulous middle-class young where they will be the individuals to benefit rather than the poor.

Mr. Speaker, the National VISTA Alliance, which represents over 1,800 VISTA volunteers working in 49 States, is very much opposed to the proposed merger. I would urge you to consider very carefully the following statement received by me from Lynn Taron, a dedicated young VISTA volunteer from Oklahoma City. The situation that she describes is not unique to Oklahoma, but a strong indication of what could happen all across the country.

This explains partially what the merger will mean to VISTA, and more tragically, what effect it will have on the poor. I encourage all my colleagues to oppose this merger.

Miss Taron's letter follows:

The proposed Nixon merger will include VISTA, Peace Corp, Teacher Corp, ACE and SCORE. Vista will be merged with these

programs into the super "ACTION" agency. VISTA will not merge with the Community Action Program (C.A.P.). C.A.P. is only the sponsor of VISTA projects and is itself related directly to OEO. What will occur if the merger is accepted is that C.A.P. will have almost total control of the VISTA project it sponsors. We will lose any autonomy we have and be transformed into C.A.P. employees subject to their rules and regulations. My own C.A.P. has already begun along these lines informing community people and agency people that the VISTAs are C.A.P. employees. If this lie persists I will not be able to show my face in many areas of my community because C.A.P. is not well liked where I work. All I have done or will be able to do will be negated.

The takeover by the sponsor is already in motion. I learned at the statewide conference this past week that the sponsor of a VISTA project will have to assume the responsibility of paying approximately 50% of the VISTA coordinator's salary as of the beginning of fiscal year 1972. The sponsor will also have to assume approximately 50% or more of the transportation costs of volunteers in the field if the volunteer is to be effective. The Federal government will only furnish \$30 per month per volunteer on an urban project and \$50 per month per volunteer on a rural project on the basis of an average 12.5 volunteers per project. This money will be given to the sponsor in a block to ration as is necessary. The sponsor will have to provide the cars, rental fees, mileage and possibly insurance. If the sponsor is not able to provide matching funds to the federal monies the volunteers will be left with little or no transportation facilities. It is absurd to think that \$30 per month per volunteer will provide adequate transportation for the 17 volunteers on my project considering car rental fees from GSA is approximately \$40 per month per car, not including mileage.

What this means is that VISTA projects will be closed because the sponsor can not afford to pay the costs of transportation, coordinator's salary and office support facilities. This new policy will make it impossible for "grass roots" agencies and community groups to sponsor VISTA projects. C.A.P. with all its monies will have definite problems in attempting to find the additional matching funds they must to support a VISTA project. If the funding can not be found there will be no VISTA in that area. It is a direct attempt to reduce the number of VISTA projects. Those that do survive will be placed under the thumb of their sponsor with the threat of termination if VISTA's don't do as they're told. These "grass roots" anti-poverty organizations that need the services of VISTA most will have nothing because they can't afford a project. This is just another step to help the poor stay poor. My own project with its \$2.5 million budget may be unable to assume the financial responsibility to support our project.

Concerning the merger I can only emphasize my opposition. It will be more costly and less efficient. A centralization into one agency of volunteers that has no functional similarities will sacrifice the needs of individual programs in an attempt to meet only the most common needs of the component programs. The emphasis of the new agency will ignore the poor as they will have little input into the ACTION agency programs. How could they have input into a super agency with such diverse programs as Peace Corp and Teacher Corp? How can the Peace Corp relate to the needs of the poor in Oklahoma City? It can't! And it's absurd to think that it can. In a recent interview with Peace Corp director Blatchford in the Washington Post he stated he knew little of VISTA, it's operation, philosophy and field operation. This is just dandy since he'll be the one named to head ACTION. Once again the poor will get skewed. VISTA should remain in the same agency as other anti-poverty geared

to the home front of the War on Poverty for maximum effectiveness.

The new ACTION agency will predefine the areas volunteers will work in, eliminating the self-determination of the community in utilizing volunteer's talents as they choose. The emphasis of the new agency will be entirely on service projects turning VISTA into a bandaid. Community organization to help the poor help themselves is on its way out. The new agency will exclude community VISTA volunteers in its recruitment of 'skilled' volunteers. This is against the present VISTA ideology of helping the poor to help themselves. It was that indigenous community people could join VISTA and help the people in their own areas directly with the resources of VISTA. The new change toward specialization will exclude the indigenous person because he is not 'qualified' while in reality he is the most qualified of all.

According to the President, the main purpose of the new agency will be to promote voluntarism among Americans. I and my fellow volunteers see voluntarism as a means to an end . . . in terms of VISTA the elimination of poverty. Voluntarism, per se, should not be cited as the goal of any agency.

It is insane to think that one agency, one director complete with assistants could deal effectively with the diverse programs of the programs the merger will include. Lack of expertise will reduce the effectiveness of all the programs. Once again the poor are left with nothing. The plan will damage the component parts by artificially separating them from the offices and departments from which they could receive maximum benefits from information, planning and guidance. If my own project survives at all and the merger is approved, we will be entrapped with the policies and guidelines of a 'super' agency that attempts to treat all poor people the world over without being able to really help anyone. The original catalytic, self-help philosophy of VISTA will drown in a sea of 'super' red tape and conflicting approaches to poverty. In short VISTA will be dead and along with it the hopes of the poor.

FAIR CREDIT REPORTING MEASURE IS CAUSING DIFFICULTIES WITH FHA AND VA MORTGAGE APPLICATIONS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to the attention of the House an example of how not to legislate.

Last year, the Congress attached to the Foreign Bank Account bill a title VI that contained the language of the Consumer Credit Reporting Act passed by the Senate. The House's only consideration of this far-reaching title was when it was brought before it as part of the conference report.

As a result of this, we are now in the middle of a bureaucratic morass which is already having a severe and negative impact upon, of all things, mortgage financing.

Title VI went into effect a week ago Monday. It went into effect although the impact of many of its sections were unclear and as yet have not been fully dealt with by procedural guidelines.

The specific problem in regard to mortgages stems from the possibility

that banks may come under title VI when they routinely pass along credit information they have received from a reporting agency to the FHA and VA for insurance guarantee approval. No one is sure whether they do come under the act or not. However, until many banks find out, they have stopped processing VA and FHA mortgage applications. This situation promises to become increasingly serious unless some action is taken immediately.

It apparently was not the intent of the drafters of title VI that banks be included under these circumstances, but the language is imprecise and could be interpreted otherwise. The enforcement agencies want to interpret the language so that the banks will not be in jeopardy, but as yet have been unable to come up with adequate guidelines that satisfy all the parties involved.

Many in banking and understandably so, believe the Congress should remedy the circumstances since it was the Congress that created the problem. There is substantial feeling in the enforcement agencies as well as in mortgage lending circles, that an administrative solution will not be enough to sufficiently resolve the problem that has been created.

The result of all this Government thrashing is that thousands of potential homeowners throughout the Nation are finding themselves in limbo. Their applications for mortgage loans have been frozen and will stay in that condition until the mess back here is straightened out.

Now, this is not something that has just developed. For months the banks have been telling the Controller, the Federal Reserve, and the Federal Trade Commission that they need guidance. And for months there has been considerable thrashing but no final solution.

Well, now the title is in effect and the problem has not been resolved. In California, some major banks have frozen all processing of VA and FHA mortgage applications. In the case of the Bank of America alone, this means more than 2,000 FHA applications a month are going into limbo.

This state of affairs is unacceptable. It is essential that the agencies responsible come to an agreement immediately and publish the necessary guidelines.

I also intend to place this problem before the Congress—the institution that caused it in the first place. Hopefully, we will be able to offer a legislative remedy.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental

genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

DISORDERS IN WASHINGTON POINT OUT NEED FOR DISTRICT TO REMAIN UNDER EXCLUSIVE U.S. JURISDICTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, the entire Nation has smarted with indignation in observing the wild disorders in our Capital City, requiring not only the use of local police, but also the U.S. Army, U.S. Marine Corps and the District of Columbia National Guard as backups for the Metropolitan Police in preventing a shutdown of normal activities of Government.

Despite the dedicated and untiring efforts of police, some Government buildings have been closed, among them the Municipal Center and the Washington Monument. Such disorders are not voluntary nor spontaneous, but the result of precise planning with military-like precision and detail. With some exceptions, the published plan as reported in underground papers has been followed.

The scenes of confrontation and tension, as well as countermeasures featured by helicopter scouts, is reminiscent of combat operations during World War II. The sound reasoning as to why the Founding Fathers provided for the creation of a Federal District to house the Government of the United States, with exclusive legislative authority over such district vested in the Congress reasserts itself.

There were proven reasons why the founders of our Government provided for such district in the Constitution. Following the Revolutionary War, a mob of soldiers came to Philadelphia and interrupted the Congress then in session there. The Governor of Pennsylvania did not call out the militia to protect the Congress because he feared that they might join the mob. The necessity of a Federal District to have a neutral Federal city under the exclusive control of the Congress was thus effectively demonstrated.

Today, the scenes in Washington emphasize better than anything I could say, the imperative necessity for the Congress to retain its Constitutional powers over the District of Columbia and should end for all time any further consideration of converting this turbulent city into a self-governing State with representatives in the Congress. It is, and must remain, a Federal reservation under the exclusive control of the U.S. Congress.

For the freedom and safety of Congress, it is better that Congress retain the right to self-govern and self-determination than squatters on this Federal reservation.

CAMPAIGN TO DISRUPT GOVERNMENT FAILS: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE COMMENDED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed the onslaught of the radical wing of the antiwar movement in the Capital City, and the massive civil disobedience demonstrated by this group is in sharp contrast to recent peaceful demonstrations for peace in Washington.

There is no place in our form of Government for protests anchored to violence, disruption of Government, and destruction of property, and lawlessness.

Our citizens are repelled by the massive efforts to disrupt traffic and block officials and employees of Government from coming to their offices and places of work, and carrying out their responsibilities.

The right to petition for redress of grievances is basic in our Government and is guaranteed by our Constitution—the right of peaceful petition is assured. However, civil disobedience, violence, and disruption of traffic to stop the Government are condemned.

During this siege on the Congress and the Capital City, I want to commend Police Chief Jerry Wilson and members of the Police Department of Washington and the District of Columbia for their firm and effective handling of this disruptive demonstration. They have been restrained but exercised firmness and promptness.

These law enforcement officers have rendered an outstanding service under trying conditions—and they deserve our commendation and congratulations.

By dispersing the demonstrators at their camping sites, the police disrupted the organization and planning for the campaign of massive civil disobedience, throwing the demonstrators off balance so that their efforts were weakened and lacked cohesion and coordination.

The lawless actions of radical elements of the peace movement have weakened the entire movement with their demonstration of disregard for our Government and our people. Many of their actions have been counterproductive and set the peace movement back, regretfully.

In this connection, I place in the RECORD my recent newsletter on the recent events in Washington.

The newsletter follows:

DEMONSTRATIONS AND PETITIONS FOR PEACE FLOOD WASHINGTON AND THE CONGRESS

(By Joe L. Evins)

With the Spring season has come an unusual number of demonstrations, petitions, and appeals to Congress for peace and the ending of the war in Southeast Asia. The offices of many Members of Congress have been visited by veterans and young people and others urging an end to American involvement in the war in Vietnam.

As the war has continued and escalated at times, many believe there is much broader support for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam this year than ever before. Many Members are suggesting a specific deadline for ending the conflict. While adhering to his plan for gradual withdrawal

and announcing plans for further reductions in American forces in Vietnam, President Nixon in a televised news conference reaffirmed his intention to continue a scheduled plan for withdrawals of American troops as South Vietnamese forces are trained to assume combat responsibilities.

Thousands of veterans of Vietnam from throughout the Nation marched on Washington in a peaceful demonstration to urge an immediate end to the war. Some leaders appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and made an eloquent plea for their position. Thus far the demonstrations have been generally orderly and peaceful—however, a radical group has announced its plans to disrupt government and transportation in Washington during the next few days. Such civil disobedience and lawlessness damage the cause of those who participate in such activities. The President has indicated that those demonstrators who violate the law will be prosecuted.

Other citizens have quietly visited their Congressmen and Senators, stating their case or presenting petitions and urging consideration.

During the week Mr. Clarence Davis, father of Tom Davis, of Livingston, Tennessee—the first American combat soldier to be killed in Vietnam—brought to our office petitions signed by 8,000 citizens of Livingston and Overton County, urging leniency and clemency for Lieutenant William Calley, tried and convicted by Army courtmartial. With Mr. Davis was retired Army Sergeant Ellis Snoddy, a courageous veteran of Vietnam, Korea and World War II, who was severely injured while attempting to save a fellow American soldier from a hand grenade in guerrilla action. The Tennessee Sergeant's view of the Vietnam war was that an honorable conclusion to the war must be reached so that our servicemen who were killed there shall not have died in vain.

The right to petition Congress, the President, and our Government for redress of grievances is a basic guarantee of our Constitution, and American citizens are this Spring availing themselves of this guarantee.

Certainly all of us want the unfortunate conflict in Vietnam ended on honorable terms as soon as possible so that our American servicemen can be returned home to their families and Homeland.

REVENUE SHARING—A VIABLE OPTION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, a fact, according to George Orwell, stands all by itself. If there is one such fact that today towers above all other domestic considerations, it is that practically every major American municipality is teetering on the fine edge of bankruptcy.

I am a city person down to my toenails. America, like it or not, is overwhelmingly an urban entity. Without denigrating in the least the vital role still played by rural America, our cities contain most of our population, and as they fall or survive, so shall the Nation.

That is why I find it so astounding that we calmly observe the ongoing destruction and decay of our urban areas. As more and more people become dependent upon the well-being of our cities, we are allowing them to fall into ever-worsening straits.

My own city of New York presents a

most classic example. What happens there is either also transpiring in most other cities, or will take place eventually. Our tax base erodes as demands for services multiply like results of the mating cycle and reproduction of the fruit fly.

We produce more garbage, yet collection service deteriorates. Why? Not enough money for equipment, salaries, and overtime. Also, there is the disposal problem.

Law enforcement is on the receiving end of stupendous demands. Drug addiction and all other horrors of our modern era blossom like evil flowers in all cities. Yet where are we to find the wherewithal to pay for containment of such an escalating series of problems, much less their solution? Air and water pollution alone are enough to give any mayor in the land an ongoing nightmare.

The same is true of educational demands in our municipalities. As parochial schools continue to find it increasingly difficult to meet financial needs, pupils are being levered into public school systems. Further, there are constantly growing and often legitimate salary requirements of professionals who do actual teaching.

Mass urban transit is perhaps our most pressing problem. Today we cannot move massive numbers of city dwellers across metropolitan areas on a regular schedule with confidence that they will be able to consistently get where they wish to go.

Housing is as great a national scandal as it is an urban disaster. We are not putting up the type or quantity of housing required to cope with demands of shifting urban populations.

For each of these problems and a dozen others there is only one answer. We cannot single out any group, such as city workers, for blame. Mayors, Governors, and city officials are doing their best. The answer is money. Vast sums of capital. Major programs which can only be made to get underway and be completed by massive infusions of money.

Practically every city in America can produce a mayor and Governor who will travel any distance and testify before any committee. They will solemnly and truthfully tell you what we all know already to be truth. Cities and States have no way of raising such new revenues. No way in the world. Not even if their collective or individual lives depended upon it.

From 1946 to 1968, States and localities multiplied their spending six and one-half times. Their debt grew by seven times. Their tax take grew only five and one-half times. One of the major reasons for this is that National Government dominates tax collection through the personal income tax. Thirty-seven States have such income taxes. But Washington receives 90 percent of all such revenue.

Property and sales taxes, traditional main supports of local and State revenue systems, react sluggishly to economic growth. Such taxes are also regressive, falling most heavily on those least able to pay. Moneys now being parceled out to States and cities are tightly controlled by Washington through a series of often confusing programs. We have a massive highway trust fund. Not a cent of it can be diverted to build what we in the majority—in cities—desperately need—mass urban transit systems.

Further, most Federal programs, such as those in welfare, hospital building, library services and water and sewer systems, require matching funds from States and localities. In many cases, such matching funds are impossible to raise. Twenty or ten percent of nothing is still zero.

Revenue sharing, as presented in H.R. 7876, which calls for \$10 billion as opposed to \$5 billion in other measures, promises what New York City must have a better financial share of what she is paying the National Government. This is above and beyond any and all programs run by our Federal Government in which she is participating. Here is the sole opportunity a city such as New York will foreseeably have for more money.

It is a fact that New York State pays more than \$20 billion annually into our Federal Treasury. Yet she receives back only a pittance of this massive contribution.

I believe here is one of the answers to our awesome welfare dilemma. It is obvious that we cannot wipe out our commitment to those who are less fortunate. It would be a criminal act to deprive those people of what they are receiving in the form of welfare payments. But the central problem of enough money still remains. Here is where the revenue-sharing concept enters our picture. With such a supply of new capital, the city of New York would be able to take a fresh grip upon problems confronting her. It is obvious that welfare reform alone will not provide sufficient funds.

Cities cannot tax their residents further. To do so would court massive tax rebellion and massive exodus from cities of what remains of their middle classes. Further, it would do much harm to the average small homeowner, who would have to give up a tiny dwelling he or she had spent a lifetime paying for, but which higher property taxes would make untenable. The States are just as much at the end of their tether.

An argument has been made that it might be unwise to trust localities and States with large quantities of Federal funds. Surely, no situation could be any worse than the one we find ourselves in presently.

The concept is viable. Revenue is there at the Federal level. Programs and solutions to most of our problems are at hand. All we require is a will and an actual setting aside of revenue for cities. The time to act is now. It is a time for decisiveness and commitment. Times have changed greatly from when William Jennings Bryan could say: "Destroy the cities and our farms will still survive."

They won't, anymore, you know. Our society is so complex and dependent upon urban technology that the death of America's urban areas means the end of America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe here we enter the realm of nonpartisanship. A recent Gallup poll showed 71 percent of the people interviewed favored the concept. In such a dilemma as we now find ourselves, a time has come for joining together in order to find our way out of

the morass. We have little time to waste, and all viable opportunities should be considered by the Congress.

REV. GEORGE REGAS' VIEWS ON VIETNAM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the following article was extracted from the Los Angeles Times. I would like to share its contents with my colleagues. The article presents the principal message contained in a recent sermon by the Reverend George Regas, rector, All Saints Episcopal Church, in Pasadena, regarding American military involvement in Indochina.

As a member of Reverend Regas' parish said:

Reverend Regas' sermon is an articulate statement of conscience and particularly relevant at this time as increasing numbers of average Americans are reexamining their own attitudes toward the war.

The article follows:

MR. PRESIDENT, THE JURY IS IN

(The Rev. George F. Regas, rector of Pasadena's All Saints Episcopal Church, recently gave a sermon on Indochina which has stirred controversy in the parish. The vestry of the church—which is the largest Episcopal church in the Western United States with 4,000 baptized members—has commended Mr. Regas "for facing the moral issue . . ." This is a condensed version of the sermon.)

In a nationwide televised press conference March 4, President Nixon addressed himself to the extension of the Indochina war into Laos and Cambodia by South Vietnamese troops and American air power and called on the American people to stand behind him "while the jury is still out." He asked the people "not to harken to the drumbeat of television commentary which takes a pessimistic view of the war."

I respectfully say that the President is wrong. The jury is not still out. They rendered their verdict long ago and a majority of the country is pessimistic and conscience-sick about the Indochina war.

The jury has spoken in almost every corner of the globe and called the Vietnam war a colossal misadventure. Gunnar Myrdal, in his monumental study of Southeast Asia, "Asian Drama," points out that we got into Vietnam originally because we sensed that communism would fill the power vacuum left by French withdrawal, and that we believed we could show the Vietnamese a better way than communism. We claimed to be the defenders of freedom, honoring our commitment to support a free nation against aggression from within and without. That is a generous interpretation of our initial involvement.

But now, as we look at what our presence has in fact accomplished over this last decade, as we consider

The bombed-out and devastated villages,
The millions of refugees (nearly one-third of the population of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia),

The staggering number of civilian casualties,

The use of vicious and indiscriminating antipersonnel weapons,

The devastation of crops and fields,
The political corruption and America's part

in sustaining a regime the people would never support.

The forfeiture of political freedom for dissenting views in South Vietnam, looking at the monstrous results, many of us find it impossible to justify this kind of suffering and destruction in the name of democratic principles. Are the Vietnamese really better off dead than Red? And who made Americans the gods that should decide their fate?

Oh, the physical destruction and suffering of Vietnam! But there is also the death of the spirit and the erosion of conscience in this land of ours. Something has happened to America because of Vietnam, and our basic decency as a people can no longer be taken for granted.

Mr. President, the jury is in. The cost is too great; the suffering among the peoples of three of the poorest nations in the world and the continued loss of American lives can't possibly be justified.

Many experts from every part of the political spectrum admit we should not be in that war. Right, left, centrist; many agree. It isn't a partisan jury, sir.

Yet the war goes on. Death continues to reign and we are given assurance that an expansion of the war is really a deescalation and a way to hasten the withdrawal of our troops. Seeing what we've done to Vietnam looking straight at that ravaged land, we say bombing of Cambodia and Laos is necessary to protect freedom and safeguard Southeast Asia from communism.

The jury is in! We won't listen to the same phony rhetoric America has heard for a decade from its leaders at every stage of this country's long, misguided plunge into the Southeast Asia morass. The contradiction between what is being said and what is being done has reached the point of sustained insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Surely the jury is in! Vietnam is a colossal mistake and a tragic commentary on America's belief in sacredness of every person in the sight of God and his right to self-determination.

Mr. President, if we are silent, it is not because we are waiting for the jury's return. It is only because the scandal of Vietnam no longer scandalizes us. We've heard the body-count so frequently, watched the television's reports of the suffering so long, and allowed the political rhetoric to mesmerize us that now we are numbed, anesthetized and silent.

And what is not a mark of patriotism but of spiritual death—moral decay. How devastatingly cogent are those words of Jesus: "What does it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul?"

I saw a poster recently that seared my conscience:

"Dear Mom and Dad; Your silence is killing me (In Vietnam, at home, on campus.)"

In profound love for my country and with respect for my President—I say we must protest the war!

In the name of all that is holy, all that is honorable, all that is decent, all that is noble, we must say, "Stop the war now!" No longer will we concur with a continuation of such massive violence. We must find ways to speak, for the Christian church could make a stunning contribution to the world if it could say the right words.

Pastor Martin Niemoller's confession carries warning for us all:

"In Germany, the Nazis came for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I was not a Communist. Then they came for the Jews and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics and I was a Protestant so I didn't speak up. Then they came for me . . . By that time there was no one to speak up for anyone."

This parish must speak up and protest

the war—our very soul depends on it. We are not at liberty to stick with safe and manageable subjects while the world convulses with violence and slaughter. And if the unity of this parish depends upon silence in the face of an extension of the war then it is a church whose unity is spurious to begin with. Our oneness lies in a faithful obedience to the Jesus of love and mercy, not in a tacit agreement to keep everyone on board while waiting for a conflict-free consensus before raising our voice.

I ask you now to center your mind and heart on four aspects of my protest:

1—THE WAR HAS RAVAGED VIETNAM MERCILESSLY AND ERODED THE CONSCIENCE OF AMERICA

It isn't necessary to visit Indochina to appreciate the horror of the war. The bare statistics will suffice. The tonnage of bombardment is now approaching three times the total bombs used by the American military in all theaters in World War II.

53,544 American soldiers dead.
120,563 Saigon government soldiers dead.
697,342 N.L.F. and North Vietnamese soldiers dead.

South Vietnamese casualties estimated at over 1 million; North Vietnamese as probably more.

In Cambodia, after only a few months of war, there are an estimated 1 million refugees out of a population of 6 million.

I won't go on into the endless horrors and atrocities caused by both sides. If only each of you would read just one book on the Vietnam war—any book—and realize all of this suffering comes from a war which the majority of Americans feel is a tragic error for our country.

And I grieve for all of us who have been brutalized and numbed by this war. I have found reading the news reports of Lt. Calley's trial for his part in the My Lai massacre a staggering experience.

"I was ordered to go in there and destroy the enemy. That was my job that day . . . I did not sit down and think in terms of men, women and children. They were all classified the same, and that was the classification that we dealt with—just as enemy soldiers.

"I felt then, and I still do, that I acted as I was directed and I carried out the orders.

"Our job was to destroy everyone and everything in the villages . . .

"I never sat down to analyze it; men, women and children. They were the enemy and just people . . ."

I grieve for Lt. Calley because of what this war has done to his humanity. How could he say he never thought about it; just followed orders? I grieve for what war has done to us all. In Calley's painful story, it is war that stands revealed as the true monster. What that war is doing to many William Calleys growing up in America is immeasurable.

In Houston, on Oct. 27, 1967, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker said that ". . . peace demonstrators are a bunch of bums. The U.S. should bomb the ports, dams and population of North Vietnam. That's what airplanes are for. You're not fighting human beings over there—you're fighting two-legged animals. The people are just slaves. That's all war is for is to kill and win, to destroy, to defeat the population of your enemy."

Surely, the words of Jesus shout to America: What does it profit a nation if it gains the whole world for democracy and loses its own soul? God have mercy on us for what the war is doing to the soul of a nation; for in many ways it is inflicting its dehumanizing shrapnel into all of our hearts.

The blind distortion of national priorities have produced deep estrangement and polarization in American society. How can we accept passively a society that now spends nearly 70% of its tax dollars on wars and their aftermath and the preparation for future wars? A committee report to Congress estimated the cost of the Vietnam war, if it ended in 1970, would be \$350 billion. And the

poor, hungry and oppressed around the globe cry out for a chance to live . . .

One should understand why some of our citizens are so morally outraged at such a gross distortion of priorities. The case of the Berrigan brothers is an example. I know both Berrigan brothers personally and yet I am uncertain of their guilt in Hoover's conspiracy charges. We must await the trial.

However, their actions of pouring homemade napalm on draft records at Catonsville, though grotesque to some and unacceptable to others, did one thing. Robert McAfee Brown of Stanford University says it dramatized, in unforgettable fashion, the grotesque moral priorities that have been erected in America and what has happened to the collective conscience of our nation: We are outraged when paper is burned at draft boards, and we are not outraged when children are burned in the villages of Vietnam.

That statement is oversimplified, but it can't be dismissed without it tearing at your conscience.

Yet in spite of all this, Mr. Nixon says he will place no restraints on further bombing, except to rule out the use of nuclear weapons; that we will not be defeated in Indochina; and that he wouldn't speculate on whether South Vietnamese would invade North Vietnam on their own!

The verdict is in! Will you remain silent?

2—IF THE CHURCH ATTEMPTS TO FOLLOW JESUS, IT WILL RAISE ITS VOICE IN MORAL OUTRAGE

I am fully aware that I could be wrong in urging this parish to protest the war. I speak to you humbly acknowledging how often I have failed in my own discipleship.

There are no easy solutions and there are no neat black and white distinctions on the morality of war. If we make the mistake of thinking there is all black on one side of the issue and all white on the other, we will be wrong nine out of 10 times. I intend to reach out and put my arms around all who strongly disagree with this sermon, for we can live together in Christian love.

Yet we cannot allow this to immobilize us. The integrity of the church's message depends on raising our voice against a war no one wants being allowed to destroy our soul.

The Christian faith says the jury is in. We don't need to see how the devastation of Laos and Cambodia is going to affect the war; we believe that life is sacred everywhere. Everyone bears in his body the image of his membership in the human family and the image of the living God. How many Vietnamese is one American worth? One, five, forty, a thousand?

The Vietnam war is a sin against the human family; its dehumanization has left its scar on us all that will remain for years. The brutality of Indochina is reflected by the callousness in the streets of America. When life is cheap anywhere, it is cheap everywhere.

If this parish remains silent in the face of all that continues to brutalize us, what is there, then, to validate our Christian way of life?

When the great author, Albert Camus, was asked to address a Roman Catholic order, he told them bluntly that they were not practicing what they preached. Listen to him!

"What the world expects of Christians is that Christians should speak out, loud and clear, and that they should voice their condemnation in such a way that never a doubt, never the slightest doubt, could rise in the heart of the simplest man . . . that they should get away from abstraction and confront the blood-stained face history has taken on today."

3—WHAT CAN AMERICA DO IF IT IS NOT TO LOSE ITS SOUL?

First, America must repent. I think Sen. Fulbright was wrong when he said the great society of America has become a sick society. Eric Fromm says that this is another way of excusing ourselves since sickness is

something that happens to one involuntarily and for which one cannot be held accountable. Fromm asserts that American society is not sick but immoral. Our sickness is really sin. I believe he is right.

What is called for isn't guilt but repentance. So long as we try to justify the horrors perpetuated in Indochina, so long as we continue to talk about saving face and keeping our honor, so long as we figure the cost of war is a little too much and perhaps it was a mistake to get in so deep—the soul of the nation will continue to be eroded and within the grip of death.

There is one way left that leads to new life—repentance. The word of God judges this nation; and it can bring healing, too. What a rebirth could come to the greatest most powerful nation in the history of the world if she said "I was wrong! God have mercy!" The death of pride would be the rebirth of integrity.

Second, we should protect the lives of our soldiers but we must come home immediately. Let the President set a clear timetable of withdrawal. We will leave Southeast Asia and if the Thieu-Ky regime can't stand on its own, then let it fall. Integrity won't allow us to keep the Thieu-Ky government in power through American guns and dollars.

We know that government is corrupt and ruthlessly suppresses political dissent. When the political oppression of South Vietnam was mentioned recently, the response of one of our ambassadors was, "We do not condone it."

Billions of American dollars put that government in power and sustain it. If we came home the Vietnamese themselves might find a way to bring peace to that tragic land.

Third, we must pay the price for peace. Everyone wants peace—but so seldom have we been willing to use the great reservoirs of this nation for healing. "And nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." To have that vision and pay the cost of its fulfillment—what a great moment that would be in the history of civilization.

4—THE CHURCH SHOULD MOBILIZE ITS RESOURCES TO END THE WAR

In a recent "Peanuts" cartoon, the setting is a baseball game. Charlie Brown is about to pitch when his teammate, Lucy, suggests that he aim to hit the batter. Charlie reacts violently: "It wouldn't be right . . ."

There follows a long discussion with all Charlie's teammates joining in. Everything under the sun comes into the debate: "What about the children's crusade? Was that moral? What about those awful movie ads you see nowadays? Define morality . . ." Finally, in despair, Charlie Brown says, "We never win any ball games, but we sure have some interesting discussions!"

We've talked enough. I call upon this great parish of All Saints to take a step larger than we ever thought we would. I ask for a massive mobilization of the parish by establishing a "Peace Operation Center."

The protests of young radicals have made their mark but fallen short of any major reformation of the war system. My hope is to radicalize the Establishment—myself included—and take middle America and give its goodwill and desire to build a world of peace clearer focus and more effective power.

America is searching its conscience; the church is struggling for its soul, the integrity of its message and the courage of its convictions. We must not back away from this challenge.

This parish is small against the magnitude of the problem; yet I believe profoundly in the power of just a few who have caught the vision of a peaceful world.

I am confident that there are thousands in Pasadena and Los Angeles today willing to contribute their lives to the healing of the world. One of the high marks of the '60s was the response given to the Peace Corps.

The late President Kennedy proposed a

corps organized to bring light and knowledge to the underdeveloped nations of the world. Hardly had the announcement of the Peace Corps come from the lips of President Kennedy than there were four times the number of volunteers as could be sent.

Find all the faults you wish with the Peace Corps; but it still means this: Americans have a hunger to do something with hope and heart and love in it, something more than animal. We shall seek to provide the channel.

NEWS MEDIA MUST CLOSE OWN CREDIBILITY GAP

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of my colleagues to a timely column by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in the Washington Star. The commentary, titled "News Media Must Close Own Credibility Gap," alluded to the recent Boston speech of Vice President AGNEW where he spoke of the "widening credibility gap that exists between the national news media and the American people."

The gap is there; and it is widening, says Kilpatrick, and we must heal it ourselves.

The text of his column follows:
[From The Washington Star, March 25, 1971]
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

NEWS MEDIA MUST CLOSE OWN CREDIBILITY GAP

SAN FRANCISCO.—In his speech at Boston last week, Vice President Agnew once again took dead aim at the national news media. His particular target was the Columbia Broadcasting System, but his criticism covered a broader field. We of the press will shrug it off at our peril.

Agnew spoke tellingly of "the widening credibility gap that exists between the national news media and the American people."

The gap is there; and it is widening. We will gain nothing by the irrelevant defense that the Nixon administration is losing its own reputation for truth and veracity. Neither will we help ourselves by puerile howls that Agnew is "intimidating" us. The blunt and agonizing truth is that the vice president has hit us where it hurts. Little by little, we are indeed losing that reputation for integrity in the news that is like chastity to a woman; and by God, we had better pause and take stock.

I went through this shock of awareness here on the West Coast a few days ago. At about the time the vice president was flying to Boston, the Chronicle and Examiner were bursting with accounts of the "rout" in Laos. The headlines read: "Viets Flee." A typical story came from the Associated Press, which quoted one helicopter pilot by name. He described the action as "a retreat, and a bad one." The AP story continued: "Another pilot called it a rout."

For the first time in my life, so far as I can recall, I looked at that familiar AP logo-type, and knew doubt. In our business, the Associated Press is Grandmother; what Grandmother says, is so. Yet the skepticism would not go away. Was this in fact a rout? Who were the unidentified pilots? Did they exist? In Washington, the Pentagon was calling the affair "mobile maneuvering," which had the phony ring of a snake-oil ad. Probably the AP had it right. How had this flickering shadow of distrust intruded upon the printed page?

The shadow, I think, has been a long time forming. Little things. There were the New York reporters, some months ago, who took to the streets during one of the moratoriums as co-demonstrators for immediate withdrawal. There were the Chicago reporters, a few days ago, who demanded equal editorial space to oppose Mayor Daley. The journalism schools produce fledgling pundits, wet with opinions; they are eager to write "interpretations" or "in-depth analyses," but they seem little inclined to cover the news.

The television networks, precisely as Agnew says, have contributed heavily to the substance of doubt behind the shadow. The vice president singled out the 1968 CBS documentary on hunger, with its pitiful picture of a dying infant: "This baby is dying of starvation." But the baby on the screen, as it turned out, was not dying of starvation. The baby, prematurely born, was dying of septicemia owing to meningitis and peritonitis. Doubtless many babies do indeed die in America of starvation; but "this baby" was a lie.

Such dramatic fabrications may be rare, but they are exposed just often enough to leave doubt like a thin film of dust on the surface of fact. The process has its ironical consequences. I am satisfied, after a careful reading of the record, that the recent CBS documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon" was essentially fair. The producers pulled a snide trick on Congressman F. Edward Hébert, by implying that he had been "used" by the Pentagon; the script writers fell into a couple of factual errors, and they failed properly to attribute a certain quotation. But as fights go, this was a fair fight.

Yet CBS has so undermined its own reputation, through the relentless bias of its coverage of the war in Vietnam, that even a fair fight becomes suspect. The TV viewer, once believing, is not so believing now. What is straight news? What is opinion? He isn't sure.

This will not do. There is a place in our media—of course there is—for strong opinions, provided they are plainly labeled as such. But we ought to approach the news as reverently as any priest breaking bread, striving facelessly and dispassionately to hold an honest mirror to the world around us. And we ought not to need an Agnew to remind us. We must heal this credibility gap ourselves.

HANOVER'S BUSIEST

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, our everyday lives seem so riddled with news of crises and problems at home and abroad that we too often overlook good works and those responsible for them. I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the Ashland, Va., Herald Progress which appropriately lauds the unselfish contributions of America's volunteer firemen to the well-being of their fellow citizens and their communities:

HANOVER'S BUSIEST

Every time we hear a fire siren, every time we hear the monitor tone signaling an alert, every time a red vehicle tears down the street, we are reminded that all of us are only a lighted match away from desperation and only a telephone call from instant rescue.

The average Hanoverian at home, the office or school who doesn't hear all the sirens in his neighborhood or throughout the county, has no inkling of the day and night activity

of our eleven volunteer units. Especially right now when the winds are high and the grass is dry, these men are being called out hour after hour when they should be at work or sleeping.

They fight these fires for love of their community and their fellow man. They are not paid except on those very rare occasions when the state asks their help to fight fires on state land. Not only are they volunteers, but they are also expected to raise their own funds for some of their operations and equipment—the county helps each company as best as it can but the individual companies still rely heavily on neighborhood donations to keep going.

Probably the thing these men would like most to hear is an occasional thank you from the public. And a quiet siren. We can all help in this.

HARTFORD DRUG CENTER: MODEL FOR STATE, NATION

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, Washington television stations are calling attention to the drug problem by airing special programs during Drug Month. One such program will be aired Saturday, May 15, at 3:30 p.m., on channel 7. The program is entitled "If Hartford Can Do It," and deals with Greater Hartford's regional approach to the drug problem, which is fast becoming a model for the Nation.

I am proud to represent in this great body the capitol city of Connecticut, and the 12 towns which surround that city, which participate in the Capitol Region Drug Information Center.

I have cosponsored legislation for the creation of an executive office of drug abuse control which would coordinate programs aimed at stemming the terrible toll that drug abuse is taking in this country. I feel that much of the experience being gained by the Capitol Region Drug Information Center could be of value nationally and such an agency as I have called for could implement nationally the kind of programs which are being undertaken in my First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I not only commend to my colleagues the program scheduled for May 15, but also an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Times of April 1, which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

OUR REGIONAL DRUG CENTER: MODEL FOR STATE, NATION

The Capitol Region Drug Information Center, which serves all the communities of Greater Hartford, has already had a lot of national recognition.

The newest honor for the Center is to be chosen one of the first five participants in a Washington-based computer hook-up for the fast exchange of information. The data transmission system is being established by the federal government's National Institute of Mental Health.

The information center, run by the Capitol Region Council of Governments on Lewis Street, will be valuable to the federal government's new communication system on drug information for several reasons.

One is that the Hartford center is one of

the nation's major libraries on the subject of drugs and drug abuse.

Another is that the Capitol Region facility is regarded nationally as a model for metropolitan areas that want to launch cooperative programs against the drug menace.

There is a reminder in this: As Connecticut goes into the full-scale statewide anti-drug program Governor Meskill has promised, a great deal of the needed data and know-how is here to be utilized.

Part of the need is for coordinated police activities to hold down the inflow of drugs. The Capitol Region program now takes in the police departments of 32 communities, and the evidence shows that the joint effort pays off.

But the major emphasis in the Hartford-based undertaking is on reaching a maximum number of people with information and expert assistance before drug use has ruined their lives.

This is where the Capitol Region center can be particularly valuable to the planners of the Governor's program.

What works? Places where kids can talk to other kids, rather than to doctors? Places where addicts can get psychiatric help as outpatients? Hospital beds for addicts? Prolonged rehabilitation in group homes? "Crisis centers" for emergency treatment?

The Capitol region center has become one of the nation's best sources of knowledge on how to balance these facilities and services in order to cope most effectively with the drug problem that exists in Connecticut.

The Center has proved valuable as a source of advice on which aspects of the anti-drug program need the most help. Fighting drugs is a complicated business, and resources can be wasted if they aren't put where we need them most.

With the center's work so well advanced, and with our new, important ties, to the centers of drug expertise in Washington, Connecticut is in an excellent position to organize an outstanding state program.

SCHOOL BAND EARNS EXPENSES FOR CONCERT TOUR TO QUEBEC

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the good deeds and actions of our young people of today too often are overlooked because of the turmoil and violence taking place throughout the world.

Therefore, I would like to call to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives an outstanding group of young people in my congressional district.

These youngsters are members of the Fort Lee, N.J., High School Band, and their good deeds and actions are set forth in the following newspaper article. I applaud the band members, their director, and their advisers for their accomplishments, their good deeds and actions. They all have fully earned the title of good will ambassadors.

The article follows:

SCHOOL BAND EARNS EXPENSES FOR CONCERT TOUR TO QUEBEC

FORT LEE.—After a year of cookie sales, spaghetti dinners and similar fund-raisers, the 87 members of the Fort Lee High School Concert Band, headed by director Daniel Lorusso, have earned enough money for a goodwill tour of Quebec, April 29 to May 2.

Two concerts have been arranged for the

band by the Quebec Bureau of Tourism. The first on Friday, April 30, will be held at the 2,000-seat Palais Montcalm, under the sponsorship of the Quebec Symphony. The College Auditorium of Levis, Quebec, will be the setting for the second concert, by sponsorship of the Lions Club of Levis, on Saturday, May 1.

At the band's request, any proceeds from the concerts will be donated to charitable institutions in Quebec.

Numbers for the performances will include the well-known Beethoven's Fifth Symphony: "Second Suite in F for Military Band," by Gustav Holst; "Italian in Algiers Overture," by G. Rossini; "Pageant," by Vincent Persichetti; "Procession of Nobles" by Nicholas Rimsky-Korsakov, from the opera "Mlada"; and a medley of selections from "Man of La Mancha," by Mitch Leigh.

Between concerts, members will have time for sightseeing in the city.

Each band member has been responsible for earning his own way to Quebec. During the year, students busied themselves with selling ads for their concert program, sponsoring a "field day" for youngsters aged 5 to 10, working on the refreshment stand at high school basketball games, and other similar activities, until finally the money was raised.

"I wish that some people who complain about young people today could see these kids," says director Daniel Lorusso. "They've been really great."

In the past, the Fort Lee High School Band has performed in various places throughout the United States. In the spring of 1968, through arrangements made by the Sons of the American Revolution, they were able to perform on the steps of the Capitol in Washington, D.C. Lt. Jack Elein, assistant director of the Marine Corps Band, conducted the musicians.

During the school year of 1969-70, the band entertained various groups of veterans, performing at the East Orange Hospital in New Jersey and the United States Soldiers' Home in Washington, D.C. At the latter concert, the band was welcomed by General Lewis B. Hershey and Lieutenant General H. Nickerson, Jr.

The impact of the trips was so favorable that the band decided to try a more ambitious project: the good-will trip to Canada.

"The band is trying to set a standard for patriotism in this country by example, rather than by words," says Lorusso. "Youth speaks best to youth and the band feels that this experience would be most rewarding for our young men and women of both countries."

After returning from Quebec, the band will present its home audience with their annual spring concert. The performance to be given at 8:15 p.m., May 14, in the High School Auditorium, will feature the same numbers that will be played in Canada.

REMARKS OF DONALD R. LARRABEE AT THE MAINE MARITIME ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Don Larrabee has been a reporter of the Washington scene for many years. He gave the benefit of some of his insights to the graduating class at Maine Maritime Academy in Castine last Saturday. I commend his remarks on that occasion to the Members:

REMARKS AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, MAINE MARITIME ACADEMY, MAY 1, 1971

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

The news wires from Cairo carried a fascinating item a few weeks ago. It has nothing to do with the tensions in the Middle East. Perhaps that's why it caught my eye. The story said Egyptians were flocking to the seashore and to parks to celebrate their only non-religious, non-political holiday, the feast of Sham el-Nassim, the breathing of fresh air. I suppose it is an Arabic version of our Earth Day but I noticed that this feast dates back from the time of the pharaohs—so there's nothing new about this anti-pollution business.

There are winds of change in Washington but the basic problems remain. And the longer I stay in Washington and observe public men grappling with public problems, the more I realize how frequently the solutions come ping-ponging back.

It is wonderful to breathe the fresh air of Maine and get away from the problems of the Nation's Capital which, in the past few days, seem to have been magnified under the microscope of dissent and protest. But there is no escape for anyone, least of all for the President who came to office with a single overriding problem—the war in Vietnam—and the knowledge that everything else he might want to do would hinge on his ability to disengage our forces without consciously turning the country over to the communists.

There isn't the slightest doubt in my mind that Richard Nixon is engaged in the greatest gamble of his life. He believes he can end the war and have our combat troops out of Vietnam before the 1972 election. Whether he can succeed, whether Congress will allow him to do it his way, is the biggest unfolding story in Washington at the moment.

The protest movement has affected the routines of most of us. We are accustomed to planning our days around the schedule of the President or the listings of congressional committee hearings. Now we must at least be aware of other events. Last Monday, at my Press Building Office, the Peoples Lobby had its own list of what's happening in Washington. A partial run-down: 8:30 a.m., walling women start walling on Capitol steps. Also 8:30, two barrels start being filled with money, one cent for welfare, in the first, for every \$6,500 in play money for armaments, in the second. 9 a.m., Selective Service task force members meet with Curtis Tarr, draft director. They will ask him to sign the Peoples' Peace Treaty, quit his job and go on country-wide anti-draft speaking tour. He will refuse, the note says. And so it goes.

At the Capitol, the Akron, Ohio youth band performs in bright red jackets and the visiting delegates to the Chamber of Commerce Convention applaud admiringly. That is on the House steps. Across the way, at the Senate steps, a motley gathering of demonstrators provides its own music—crying, wailing, moaning. Tourists stare and say they don't understand. There is joy on the faces at one end of the Capitol and sorrow, resentment, frustration, bitterness on the faces at the other.

Inside, as Congress goes about its business, there is a perceptibly deepening anti-war feeling among the peoples' representatives. The lawmakers read the polls; they are aware of the protestors; they are impressed with the embittered Vietnam war veterans; they know the national frustration of being involved in a costly war that we are neither winning nor losing.

Democrats, almost to a man, who supported the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations in their handling of the Vietnam war, are now crying for a pullout by the end of this year. Republicans who feel their President is handling the pullout in the only manner that will uphold our credibility in the world, are against a fixed date. But there are no longer any voices against our with-

drawal—no such voices in either major political Party.

The voices that are coming through the loudest these days are those that challenge the concepts of government that have prevailed for three to four decades; they are voices that want the United States to withdraw not only from Vietnam but from much of the rest of the world; they are voices that want Congress to reassert itself, to the point of determining when we should become involved in military hostilities.

Congressional leaders are talking boldly and optimistically of limiting the President's authority to commit American forces throughout the world. After agonizing over the proper constitutional role of the President and the Congress for a couple of years, the Congress now seems to have laid the groundwork for a much broader assertion of congressional jurisdiction to declare wars, raise and support armies—and to end wars.

Most congressmen are willing to take the blame for the current situation. They acknowledge that the delicate constitutional balance was upset by a lazy and lethargic legislature that habitually acquiesced to executive demands throughout the years.

Now Congress is groping to find a way out—with honor. It is their Vietnam, too. And perhaps that is why Congress is today beating its breast and holding its head in shame at one and the same time.

Let's look back to a time when your parents were growing up. Congressional leaders in the 1930's very largely took their cues from the White House. An era of strong presidents began with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. The Congress routinely rubber-stamped the President's programs. The Congress acquiesced to executive demands and abrogated any power to commit the armed forces and to make war.

Quite apart from the wisdom of the decisions that were made—and most historians believe the courses we took were generally the right ones—the strong President was stifling all creativity, initiative and leadership in Congress. And Congress became weak, lazy, and satisfied.

We went through a war and talked of returning to normalcy again without realizing nothing would be the same in the nuclear age. We remained in an emergency. Our armed forces did not disband. The defense budget did not disappear. More expensive, more awesome weapons systems were devised. And with the consent of Congress—and I want to emphasize this—a permanent and powerful military establishment was maintained. It reflected the changed world and our position in it.

But—and few seemed to care or protest—the delicate constitutional balance between President and Congress on the power to commit our armed forces was upset. No longer did the President, regardless of Party, consider congressional action necessary to wage an undeclared war. Slowly, through Korea, the Middle East, the Dominican Republic, Cuba and Vietnam, we have seen how far the balance in foreign policy has tipped in favor of the President. Congress, in the interest of protecting American lives, has provided the money to support the troops that the President has committed to meet treaty obligations long since accepted by the Congress.

In a curious way, the Vietnam war has helped immensely to focus congressional attention on its own lethargy. As the public has tired of our Vietnam involvement, as this war has taxed our resources and prevented their use for gnawing domestic problems, the Senate, first, and more recently the House, have examined their roles. By the outset of the Nixon Administration, we saw a remarkable debate over defense spending, with important legislative voices questioning for the first time in our generation whether we should continue pouring billions of dollars into weapons systems to buy national security. Everyone recalls how President Nixon

preserved the Safeguard ABM by the narrowest of margins. It may not survive another year.

But ABM is merely a symbol of the agonizing reappraisal that is taking place in Congress. Clearly today, insofar as a majority of the Congress is concerned, military dollars are not sacrosanct and America's commitments around the world are no longer given blind acceptance.

You will be hearing more and more talk about reappraising our spending priorities, whether we should go to Mars or concentrate on cleaning up our own planet. The public is speaking and Congress is responding. The SST was shot down and almost any major new military weapons system is a sitting duck. There will be no more blank checks for military spending.

All of this will have its effects on the maritime industry. Federal subsidies for shipbuilding and for schools such as this one at Castine may suffer. This year, for the first time, as you know, the Government is imposing a ceiling on the number of individual subsidies paid for training merchant officers. The subsidies, of course, do not begin to pay the costs but a recent attempt to restore the past level of funding was beaten in the House. The money amount may be small but the long-range implications are more disturbing.

This happens at a time when the Government is wisely embarked on a buildup of our merchant fleet. Congress has authorized Federal assistance for a rejuvenated fleet of 30 new ships a year for ten years—or 300 ships. But there is a big difference between an authorization and an appropriation. Congress can undo all that it has done—simply by not voting the money.

And the program is not getting off to a fast start. I happen to feel that one of America's problems today is the failure of government to deliver on its promises. People become frustrated as their expectations go unfulfilled. The marine schools, for instance, were asked by the government to expand their enrollments during the Vietnam war buildup. Now, the Government is cutting back, changing courses in midstream and expecting the schools to adjust overnight. What makes it more incredible is that this appears to be contrary to the newly stated maritime policy. We are rebuilding our merchant fleet—and surely we will need men. We are exploring the oceans and ocean research will need men. But we are not encouraging maritime training.

Uncertainty is the order of the day in Washington. The Maritime Administration wants to use the authorized subsidies in the new program to build economical ships, meaning super tankers and the like. But such ships won't be able to enter any United States port.

So the Administration has contracted for a study of an offshore artificial island terminal to accommodate big ships, on the theory that dredging existing ports to 70 and 100 foot depths would be both prohibitively expensive and environmentally unacceptable.

The experts say this project would cost one billion dollars and the debt has already begun: Should the United States spend public money to build an offshore terminal to service the tankers and huge bulk carriers? There are those who see no better chance for this than the SST, in the current atmosphere of Washington.

The pending debate in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over a bill to limit the President's war-making powers is a striking illustration of how opinions and moods are changing in Congress.

The principal bill would limit to 30 days the President's power to commit troops in the absence of a congressional declaration of war—and then only in event of enemy attacks on the United States, its troops or in support of a U.S. Treaty commitment.

Chairman J. William Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee who now wants

to curb the President's war-making power, may not appreciate the remainder—but he wrote an article ten years ago in which he made an eloquent argument for unfettered presidential power to deal with international emergencies.

Writing in the Cornell Law Quarterly, Fulbright spelled out the definitive case for making a greater, not lesser, grant of power to the President when it comes to foreign policy making. Fulbright said it was highly unlikely that we could successfully execute a long-range program for containing the aggressive and revolutionary forces of the day by continuing to leave vast and vital decision-making powers in the hands of what he called a "decentralized, independent-minded and largely parochial-minded body of legislators."

But that was pre-Vietnam. And today, the lonely voices are those that are hesitant to tie the President's hands. Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona, who once opposed an excessive grant of power to the Executive, argued almost by himself the other day that it would be suicide to turn over the day-to-day calculations of strategic military and policy decision-making to the Congress.

Goldwater argued that limitations on the President's power to commit troops overseas could endanger U.S. security commitments or lead the Nation to the brink of nuclear destruction.

By what rationale does J. William Fulbright today urge a stronger congressional role in foreign policy-making when he rejected congressional meddling in 1961? The world of the 1970's is not that much different from the world of the 1960's but Fulbright now wants to make the congressional grant of power to the President far more niggardly than it has been.

Is Congress better able today to shape and initiate foreign policy or is this again a reflection of the congressional—and public—frustration over an unpopular war? The latter seems very likely to be the case. As one commentator put it, had that war been quickly and easily won, as Congress apparently thought it would be when it started, there would be no clamor for curtailment of presidential powers. Indeed, Fulbright and others might still be advocating their expansion.

Let us look at the tensions that beset Congress now. It is a bit frightening, to say the least, to sit in a senator's office, as I did last week, and to hear a Maine Vietnam veteran say that his patience is running out with a Congress that cannot force the President to halt the war. This man said he had been protesting non-violently up to now but had thought of taking a machinegun into the Congress to scare the legislators into action.

This kind of talk from young Americans has had its effect on Congress. It has not reached a point where the Senate will vote to withdraw all our forces by a firm date—but it will probably take a formal vote by mid-summer on a resolution urging the President to fix a deadline. This kind of action was unthinkable a year ago—and, certainly in the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson eras, would have bordered on a crisis of confidence with the Executive.

Yet today, parading before the Fulbright Committee to support restraints on the Executive are men who helped to prosecute the Vietnam war under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, notably former national security adviser McGeorge Bundy who vividly recalls the broad, undemarcated war powers Congress gave President Johnson in the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. A repentant Congress last year repealed that resolution which passed originally with only two negative votes.

Both Bundy and former Johnson press secretary George Reedy now say that a procedure such as envisioned by Senator Jacob Javits might have forced Congress to specify how far it wanted the President to go. It

would, they said, have forced Mr. Johnson to defend his policy in much more precise terms.

In addition, to repealing the Tonkin Gulf resolution, the Senate has in the past year adopted a resolution defining a national commitment as one resulting exclusively from both legislative and executive action—not executive action alone. And the Senate has approved the Cooper-Church amendment prohibiting the use of American ground forces in Laos and Cambodia.

Now, we have pending—in both the House and Senate—proposals to stop the President from involving us in future Indochinas, at least without the full informed consent of the Congress.

Richard Nixon may seem to be ignoring all this activity at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue—but I doubt it. He served in the Congress. He is not a novice at assessing the mood of Congress or the electorate. The pressures are building on Capitol Hill.

It is almost as if the protesters have discovered that Congress is *THERE*—and frankly, I think Congress likes the attention it is getting. The Senate discovered this first but now the House is aware that it has a traditional role as the body closest to the people. The House has been the predictable branch for many years. Now it is listening more to the people than the President.

The final arbiter, of course, is the ballot box and next year is an important national election year. This is what makes the current political metamorphosis so interesting and perhaps ominous.

One of the major tests of presidential prestige, power and effectiveness will come when Congress goes for the jugular—which is the money to carry out the program, the essence of power in Washington.

There will be unprecedented attacks on military and related spending this year and these votes will reflect how far we have gone toward abandoning the concept of peace-through-strength which has guided government policy for more than 30 years.

There are voices in Washington today that warn of disarming too quickly and letting down our guard—but they are somewhat muted at the moment. The Secretary of the Navy, John H. Chafee, for example, is saying in almost every speech that he is concerned over the naval power of the Soviet Union. He sees it as a serious and growing threat but his warnings receive little attention.

As Chafee assesses this threat, he looks back to the summer of 1962—only eight years ago—when the Soviets conducted their major naval exercise of the year in the North Atlantic and the Norwegian Sea. Taking part were four surface warships, about 20 diesel submarines and a small number of land-based patrol planes. It was a limited operation designed strictly to improve the ability of Russian naval forces to protect their homeland.

Last April, less than eight years later, the Soviets conducted another naval exercise which they labeled "Okean" or ocean. They conducted it with about 150 surface ships, 50 submarines and several hundred planes. The surface ships included two new guided missile helicopter carriers and many new fast missile-equipped cruisers and destroyers. Many of the submarines were nuclear powered. And they ran the exercise in the Baltic, Norwegian, Barents, Black, Philippine, and Mediterranean Seas, the Sea of Japan, and the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian oceans. Chafee concludes that America still has a small overall gap of qualitative superiority in its naval power but he warns that it is closing.

The Navy, faced with reducing its budget, has decided to retire many of its older ships and is putting the money into research and into building new and more capable ships—rather than trying to maintain larger forces at sea.

Overall, I think we can expect to see an end to investments of billions of dollars in

armaments that are outmoded before they are built. This reflects public disenchantment with our overstuffed military posture. It is manifested in the Nixon doctrine.

If that doctrine means anything at all, it is that we are not going to fight everybody's wars from now on. We are going to reduce our presence and stop trying to police the world. At the same time, the President is telling Congress that there is an absolute point below which our security forces must never be allowed to go. The current strategy is to rely on deterrent forces—in actual existence and ready for action.

It remains to be seen whether Congress, in the atmosphere I have described, will march to the same drummer as Mr. Nixon. It is worth noting that only one candidate for the presidency on the Democratic side (or potential candidate) is supporting the kind of security measures that have marked our foreign policy of the past three decades. He is Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington State whom the journalistic pundits do not give a serious chance for the nomination at this time. Such is the mood of the Senate where most of the presidential material or fodder seems to be based.

I do not mean to give the impression that Congress is in headlong retreat or ready to hole up in a Fortress America. But I do sense a new willingness to withdraw and retrench and I can't help but wonder if this is leading inexorably to a new Isolationism.

I am not saying that this war should be continued any longer than necessary or that America needs to take on any more Vietnams. I believe deeply that we cannot afford them, either financially or morally. We have learned some important lessons about the American purpose and the American will.

But I am saying that we must be careful in our zeal to wash the blood of Vietnam from our national conscience that we not forget the lessons of the past and not forget what the old scars were all about.

We have seen a great many concerned Americans in Washington this Spring, most of them peacefully exercising their right of petition. The best elements have told their story eloquently. The worst elements are there now to break the law and do violence. The activities of the professional agitators are disruptive and counter-productive to the cause of peace.

Watching the youthful marchers along Pennsylvania Avenue last Saturday afternoon, I wondered where they will direct their energies when the Vietnam war ends next year, as I am sure it will.

There are domestic problems galore that cry out for solution—the problems of an adequate education for everyone, better hospitalization and health care within everyone's ability to pay, better housing, cleaner air and water. All of these problems require the imagination, the energies and the sacrifices of all of us.

And for you men of the graduating class, the challenge lies in the sea around us. What greater challenge, really, than the ocean—covering 70 per cent of this planet. We are only beginning to explore its potentials. There are jobs to be done that haven't even been calculated in terms of human betterment and personal satisfaction and reward.

Technologically, we are at the threshold of making it possible for man to live and work productively beneath the sea in underwater habitats. How ironic, as well as tragic, it will be if man learns to live in the sea at the same time that he makes the sea unlivable for marine life!

You have been trained to master the ocean—and it is within your grasp to keep it as clean as your bath-tub. Oceans are the ultimate depository for nearly all the wastes of civilization—and we continue to treat them as if they were limitless cesspools.

Congress, happily, is at work on bills to prohibit indiscriminate ocean dumping. This

is something you can get behind. This is worth a small demonstration. It is even worthy of a world revolution.

Perhaps this morning I have painted a picture of a country in crisis. It is divided certainly by war. We have too much crime, too much inflation, too much pollution, too much disaffection. We have also I fear, a malaise of the national spirit. There are too many young people who are willing to give up on America, who want to drop out of a system of government that they feel has failed them. They have a serious problem communicating with their families, friends and public officials. They have lost faith in each other—and in their government.

One of Washington's prominent attorneys, Edward Bennett Williams, says we have lost the spirit that changed a people into a citizenry and a territory into a nation. That may be true of a great many young Americans. I don't believe that men who have prepared themselves, as you have, for a proud vocation that demands the best in men are going to turn off on America—or find America lacking in exciting opportunity.

I believe, with Edward Bennett Williams, that what Americans sorely need at the moment is a sense of vocation, a desire to do something and to do it with excellence.

The commitment to excellence has indeed faded from the scene. The proud craftsman has departed. The man who cares has been replaced by the man who is careless. Even the good repairman seems willing to toss away the old product and settle for a new one of inferior quality.

I don't believe we have stopped trying to achieve the best that is within us. I don't believe we have lost faith in each other or our government. But I do believe we may be in trouble if we stop trying to do the best that we can at whatever our job may be—politician, doctor, barber, paperhanger, deckhand, skipper, engineer—yes, garbage collector.

Those of you who are graduating today will find that the happiest, most exciting, most admirable people you will know in your chosen careers are those who dedicate themselves with their own talents to give it all they've got. Something tells me you will be driven by this spirit—and something tells me that America will regain it, if, indeed, it is lost.

I leave you with this thought from John Gardner, who heads a new organization known as Common Cause—a sort of citizens lobby which is trying to help Americans become more involved in the political process: "An excellent plumber," Gardner says, "is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water." Thank you.

THE LAWYER—NEW CONSUMERISM

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no Member of Congress has done more to launch, nurture, and advance the consumer movement than my colleague from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

The special Law Day USA issue of the New York Law Journal featured a front page article by Mr. ROSENTHAL about the lawyer and consumerism, which I wish

to bring to the attention of all Members of the House.

He writes as a lawyer of the role of members of the legal profession as social architects, of the revitalization of the profession by young lawyers and of changes he sees as vital if justice and the public interest are to be served.

At this point I insert his article in the RECORD:

[From the New York Law Journal, Apr. 30, 1971]

THE LAWYER—NEW CONSUMERISM

(By Representative BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL)

In the fall of 1970, fifteen law students associated with Ralph Nader picketed one of the nation's most prestigious law firms, Wilmer, Cutler and Pickering, in Washington, D.C. While the students' signs protested that firm's handling of a Los Angeles auto pollution case on behalf of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, their actions suggested the words of Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, sixty-five years earlier:

"The leading lawyers of the United States . . . have, to a large extent, allowed themselves to become adjuncts of great corporations and have neglected their obligation to use their powers for protection of the people."

Former Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone sounded a similar theme when he said: "Before the Bar can function at all as a guardian of the public interests committed to its care, there must be appraisal and comprehension of the new conditions, and the changed relationship of the lawyer to his clients, to his professional brethren and to the public. That appraisal must pass largely beyond the petty details of form and manners . . . to more fundamental considerations of the way in which our professional activities affect the welfare of society as a whole."

That quotation, which is printed in the preface to the American Bar Association's "Code of Professional Responsibility and Canons of Judicial Ethics," is especially relevant at a time when our institutions and political processes are under persistent attack.

My purpose is to examine with you the "State of the Legal Profession" and the role of lawyer as social architect, particularly as that role affects the right of consumers to justice in the marketplace. Quite frankly, there is an urgency to my message. For the reality of life as I have seen it, both as a lawyer and a United States congressman, is that the political and corporate institutions in our nation—and the public policy they create—have exhausted the patience of great masses of Americans.

The signs are all around us—in the anguish of low-income Americans and in the callous gamesmanship which too often characterizes our free enterprise marketplace.

But I see hopeful signs, too, that the malady is creating its own antibodies. I speak chiefly of young lawyers and law students—The promising new generation of our profession.

Last fall, forty students from Harvard Law School picketed recruiters from the Wall Street firm of Cravath, Swaine and Moore, on the ground that the firm defends the apartheid practices of its South African clients.

FEWER ENTER FIRMS

The University of Michigan Law School has reported that twenty-six of its graduates entered Wall Street law firms in 1969 as compared with an average of seventy-five in preceding years. Harvard Law School reported that the percentage of its graduates entering private law practice declined from 64 per cent in 1964 to 41 per cent in 1968, with a more significant decline expected. Moreover, one out of every sixteen law school graduates in 1969 applied for the VISTA

Lawyers Program and hundreds of law students and recent law graduates have applied to Ralph Nader's Center for the Study of Responsive Law.

I understand what these young lawyers are saying. They see that our institutions are failing because the legal profession has not taken seriously its responsibility to serve all segments of society. They are failing because the public and private persons who make the decisions that create public policy must deal in competing ideas evenhandedly. Our profession, however, has traditionally served the "haves" and ignored the "have-nots."

Public policy is determined like decisions are made in a court of law: In an adversary setting—and one set of adversaries is not getting a fair share. Let's look at whose interests are represented before the three branches of government and in the private sector.

What we see, of course, is that with certain rare exceptions, narrow special interests are well represented—and the public interest is not.

If we wish to understand why, we need only look to the typical lawyer's conception of his role in society. That conception begins with the proposition that the interests of a private-client are paramount and only incidentally related to the interests of the public-at-large.

Given the narrow orientation, "justice" is nothing more or less than success on behalf of a client's cause, even though that cause leads to the perpetuation of bad law or bad public policy.

It is disturbing that lawyers have failed to recognize the relationship between these single-minded services to their private clients and the breakdown of our court system, of the marketplace, and of our governmental institutions.

NADER STATEMENT

What we have, according to Ralph Nader, is "lawyers who labor for polluters not anti-polluters; for sellers, not consumers; for corporations, not citizens; for labor leaders, not rank and file; for, not against, rate increases or weak standards before government agencies; for highway builders, not displaced residents; for agricultural subsidies to the rich but not food stamps for the poor; for preferential business access to government and against equal citizen access to the same government."

To this sad bill of particulars we could quickly add: For landlords' and not tenants' rights; for "holders-in-due-course" and not those who cannot get performance on their contracts; for tax loopholes for business and not tax uses for the public; for "sewer service," not due process of law.

The important question for us today, then, is what changes you and I can make in the rules of the game and how we can achieve them.

I respectfully suggest that two basic changes are needed:

First, lawyers themselves must recognize that their activities have a rippling social effect which extend far beyond an individual client's cause;

Second, the institutions which make public policy must be restructured to encourage and take account of public-interest considerations.

I think we are very close to achieving the first change.

PUBLIC INTEREST FIRMS

One striking example of this heightened social consciousness is the growth of public interest law firms. There is mounting evidence that public interest lawyers are beginning to neutralize the monopoly of private interest firms in Washington, D.C. By my latest count, there are fourteen public interest law firms or standing law groups now active in the nation's capital.

In addition, many of the major corporate law firms across the country have now authorized pro bono ventures.

We can only hope that this trend toward public interest representation will be continued and even accelerated across the country.

The second major change mentioned earlier—the need to restructure our institutions to accommodate public interest views—is hardly underway.

In the private sector, a few corporations have become more tolerant of consumer legislation which has been proposed in Congress but opposition is still the normal response of most. My own bill to establish an Independent Consumer Protection Agency at the federal level was violently attacked by the chief business groups, as were bills to provide for consumer civil class actions in federal courts in cases of fraudulent or deceptive practices.

It is my judgment that the single most divisive influence in corporate and consumer relations is the Washington-based trade association. It has been my experience during the past four years as chairman of the Special Consumer Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, that trade associations, particularly those identified as part of the "Food Lobby," are highly antagonistic to consumer reforms because they service their most conservative and reactionary members.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, for example, reported to its thousands of members throughout the country that enactment of the Consumer Protection Agency bill would "destroy the free enterprise system." I think that the democratizing of Washington's many trade associations and business groups would go a long way toward normalizing relationships between consumer interests and producers interests.

AMEND TAX LAWS

But Congress must also participate in enacting reforms. The first priority, as I see it, is to amend the tax laws which now prevent most public interest groups from substantial lobbying activities. The right to lobby Congress, which is grounded in the First Amendment's guarantees of free speech and right to petition for the redress of grievances, should be extended to representatives of all points of view in our society, including those who represent the public interest.

Representatives of private enterprise in Washington are now permitted to lobby the Congress and deduct the cost of that lobbying on federal tax returns. The inequity is obvious. The special interest representatives of the oil, steel and automobile industries, for example, are permitted to influence legislation where it counts—not at public hearings, but in the back rooms of committees and in member's offices—with the public footing the bill. But those who lobby for the public are prohibited from this type of activity if they wish to maintain their tax exempt status.

Congress somehow must also regulate—perhaps by public disclosure—the frequent ex parte communications between groups interested in influencing legislation and the members of Congress who pass on that legislation. While the substance of ex parte communications should be held confidential, there is no reason to prevent disclosure of the fact that a contract or a communication for the purpose of influencing legislation has been made.

In addition, in order to insure that the consumers' voice is heard before federal agencies which make countless decisions affecting the public's health, safety, and economic well-being, I have urged the establishment of a Consumer Protection Agency. Its responsibility would be to serve as a sophisticated advocate for the consumer in Washington—something consumers do not have now.

I would also urge the enactment of federal class action legislation to permit persons similarly involved in deception and fraud to combine their resources for a single suit.

ABA REFORMS

Finally, let me address myself to reforms needed within the American Bar Association itself.

Last April, I wrote to the president of the American Bar Association regarding a report to Congress critical of a major consumer bill, and submitted by the Special Committee on Consumer Legislation of the ABA's Section on Antitrust Law. This critical report was drafted by a committee composed of members who did not represent the interest of consumers. Moreover, the report was not submitted for approval to the members of the section, the board of governors, the house of delegates, or other sections of the Association which might have had an interest in the legislation. While I understood that the report did not formally represent a position of the full association, that impression was created.

I have since learned that members of that Special Consumer Committee and units of other American Bar Association Sections frequently represent special interest clients who have a substantial economic stake in the reports and recommendations of those sections. Let me note the 1970 affiliations of the members of the ABA's Division of Food, Drug and Cosmetic Law of the Section on Corporation, Banking and Business Law.

At that time, the vice-chairman of the division was general counsel and vice-president of the manufacturer of Hellman's Mayonnaise, Mazola Corn Oil and other food products; the secretary and vice-president and general counsel for a major drug manufacturer; the chairman of the Standing Committee on Food Additives was employed by a manufacturer of food additives and pharmaceuticals; the chairman of the Food Law Committee was employed by Coca Cola; the chairman of the Drug Law Committee was employed by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association; the chairman of the Committee on Beverage Law was in the legal department of Coca Cola.

A few additional examples are in order:

The chairman of the subcommittee on Regulations Affecting Advertising on the Antitrust Law Section was a partner in a law firm whose clients included the Association of National Advertisers, the Advertising Research Foundation and the Direct Mail Advertising Association.

The chairman of the subcommittee on Public Utility and Holding Companies was executive vice-president of the American Electric Power Service Corporation.

The chairman of the Aviation Law Committee of the Section on Insurance, Negligence and Compensation was a member of the law firm whose clients included Trans World Airlines.

The chairman of the Environmental Quality Committee of the same section was in the legal department of Continental Oil Company.

The chairman of the Communications Committee for that Section was vice-president and general counsel for the Bell Telephone Company.

IMPROPRIETY SEEN

It is my judgment that where lawyers serving on sections of the American Bar Association represent, for profit, special interest groups which might have a stake in decision and recommendations made by those sections, an "appearance of impropriety" is inescapable. This is especially true if the fact and nature of a possible conflict of interest are undisclosed.

Moreover, in appointing members to serve on committees, the ABA should take far greater cognizance of the existence of public interest lawyers and legal experts from the academic community. Of the 410 lawyers who were members of consumer-related ABA committees in 1970, only five derived their principal income from the academic community, and none to the best of my knowledge, were members of public interest law firms.

Certainly, it would seem to be desirable to utilize the considerable talents of academicians and public interest lawyers whose academic interests are unlikely to be in conflict with the public interest responsibilities of the Bar association.

We can be assured that the public interest is being served only when public policy reflects a balance between the wants of the few and the needs of the many. But in the final analysis, individuals control institutions and individuals make public policy. It is individuals, therefore—and, in this society of laws that we have created, lawyers especially—who must ultimately take a private oath to maintain that vital balance between private gain and public good.

A RESOLUTION BY THE RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY FOR A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN GLOCESTER, R.I.

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN
OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Rhode Island General Assembly recently passed a resolution memorializing Congress to establish a national cemetery in Glocester, R.I.

This is a matter of great interest to me, and I appreciate the action of the Rhode Island General Assembly. Since 1966 I have introduced legislation for a national cemetery in Glocester. Last year I fought for this proposal in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee hearings.

At present there still remains to be decided whether authority over the national cemetery system should be transferred from the Secretary of the Army to the Veterans' Administration. Once that jurisdictional question is settled, I hope that favorable action will be taken this year on my bill, which I am again introducing, for a national cemetery at Glocester.

The need for it seems obvious to me. In 1948 the Congress passed legislation that gives to all veterans the right to be buried in a national cemetery, yet Rhode Island veterans have no national burial place within a reasonable distance. There are 98 national cemeteries in the United States, but not a single one in New England.

Rhode Island veterans and their families are, in effect, denied a privilege and an honor which is their right.

Many of the national cemeteries are reaching capacity, and Army estimates show the need for expanding their number in the immediate future. With more than a million and a half veterans and no national cemetery, the New England area should be first on the list.

The veterans organizations have a right to be heard when they ask for burial facilities near to where they live and where their families reside. It is a reasonable request. It should be granted. It is the least we can do to honor their service.

George Washington Park in the town of Glocester is Federal property, so there would be no land acquisition problems. A cemetery there, in a setting of much natural beauty, could serve not only

Rhode Island but much of southern New England.

The text of the resolution passed by the Rhode Island General Assembly and signed by the Governor on April 16 follows. I am also sending a copy to Chairman TEAGUE of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee asking for favorable committee action:

H. 2439

Resolution memorializing Congress to establish a national cemetery in Glocester, R.I.

Whereas, Rhode Island, one of the most densely populated states in the country, has no national burial facilities; and

Whereas, Adequate and proper burial facilities for Rhode Island's honored veterans are badly needed and earnestly desired; and

Whereas, In every other region of the country there are at least four national cemeteries, but in New England there are none; and

Whereas, It is grossly unfair that the New England area which gave birth to this nation and particularly Rhode Island, the first of the original American colonies to formally renounce allegiance to Great Britain, remains without a national cemetery; and

Whereas, The historically rich state of Rhode Island, which has contributed so much to the greatness of this nation, should be permitted a national cemetery within its boundaries; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the general assembly of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby respectfully requests Congress to enact such appropriate legislation to establish a national cemetery in Glocester, Rhode Island, so that veterans can be properly laid to rest in a cemetery befitting their service to this country; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in the congress of the United States in the hope that they will give this matter their personal attention.

"REAL WORLD" M.B.A.'s

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, business is not as usual at the University of Texas at Austin Business School since Mr. George Kozmetsky assumed the deanship there in 1966.

As a New York Times reporter describes it, Dean Kozmetsky arrived like a "welcome tornado." And through the whirling dust of the past 5 years, he has molded the school into an "internationally recognized training ground for managers of 21st century industries."

Combining zeal and flexibility with structure, Dean Kozmetsky has lured to the University of Texas campus top business professors from all over the country and has regularly turned out polished and talented graduates with an ingrained instinct for upgrading and modernizing businesses, as well as making them just plain grow.

New York Times reporter Marylin Bender describes how this school ticks and what comprises its special formula for success. Mr. Speaker, I insert Miss Bender's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1971]
DEEP IN THE HEART OF TEXAS, "REAL-WORLD"
M.B.A.'S—MILLIONAIRE DEAN PULLS B
SCHOOL TO NATION'S FOREFRONT

(By Marilyn Bender)

AUSTIN, Tex.—In a conference room at the Alumni Center of the University of Texas the other evening, Jack Wrather, an oil heir turned entertainment conglomerateur was distributing wisdom to graduate students.

"You learn from the mistakes you make," said Mr. Wrather who describes himself, according to the custom of these parts, as "a country boy from East Texas."

"We bought a company, A. C. Gilbert, that looked like a bird's nest from the ground, but when it went down we took a \$10-million bath on it," he said, and then told how he had managed that disaster.

Simultaneously in a nearby room, Mrs. Wrather (the former movie "brat," Bonita Granville, now associate director of the Wrather Corporation's television property "Lassie") was educating the students' wives.

"My husband had this disaster in his business last year and almost had a nervous breakdown," she confided. "But I built him up and I went so far as to tell him he was a genius."

Student exposure to the "real world" in various forms such as the Wrathers, distinguishes the University of Texas College of Business Administration and its Graduate School of Business from heretofore more famous schools. But then how many business schools have a dean who started a billion-dollar electronics-based company of which he is still director and second largest shareholder?

Calculating how rich Dean George Kozmetsky is, both in the stock of Teledyne, Inc., and sundry pieces of Texas action, is a prideful pastime around here. (Estimates run from \$10-million to \$40-million.)

Dr. Kozmetsky arrived in 1966 like a welcome tornado to try to mold a regional accounting school into an internationally recognized training ground for managers of 21st century industries.

He had just the Horatio Alger pedigree for a wide-open growth state where both wheeler-dealer and educator are terms of reverence. The son of a Russian immigrant factory foreman, he had worked his way through the University of Washington and earned a doctorate at the Harvard Business School. He taught management there and at Carnegie-Mellon, and then tested his theories in the new technology at Hughes Aircraft and Litton Industries. He wrote a prophetic book "Electronic Computers and Management Control" (McGraw-Hill 1956) and founded Teledyne with Henry Singleton and \$350,000.

Now, deep in the heart of Texas, he is creating a different business school elitism, based on a mix of dazzling theory and practice, technology and humanism.

Under a deceptively low-key manner (tastefully coordinated in blues and greys in a land of peacock colors and male diamond jewelry), the 53-year-old dean spews forth theory, stimulates and exhausts his colleagues and presses for results.

He relentlessly covers paper pads and blackboards with systematic analyses of every conceivable problem from executive family tension to portfolio management and population and employment shifts.

When speaking, he seldom uses standard business lexicon. "When will blacks cease being black? All of a sudden I stopped being a Hunky," covers a directive to find a manpower forecasting technique.

For George Kozmetsky, banks are "financial vultures," and the hippie peddlers sprawled along the sidewalk facing the university are "street entrepreneurs."

His admirers pay him equally unorthodox compliments.

"That George is a wheeler-dealer. That's why I'm here," says Professor James Bright

who was lured from the Harvard B-School to be professor of management and associate dean.

"That George is an instinctive Texan," says Colonel Seymour Schwartz, a retired Air Force officer who serves as the dean's assistant and secretary of the College of Business Administration Foundation, which nourishes the dean's supply of magic tricks.

The first of Dr. Kozmetsky's obvious moves to transform the school was recruiting a stellar faculty. Salaries at this university compete with other state institutions but the \$25,000 maximum falls short of what top scholars can earn at Harvard or M.I.T.

So Dr. Kozmetsky tapped several Texas fortunes to provide named professorships at \$100,000 minimums. Abraham Charnes, the mathematician, came from Northwestern to be Jesse Jones Professor of Statistics and to seek interdisciplinary approaches to solving control problems through the Center of Cybernetic Studies recently funded by William Farah, an El Paso work-clothes manufacturer.

Eugene Konecni of NASA became Alice G. K. Kleberg professor of management, biomedical engineering and aerospace engineering. He is researching health care and food technology.

Other faculty salaries and increments, as well as some of the research projects vital to scholarly contentment and institutional prestige (120 research projects and 50 textbooks are in the works), are financed from the C. B. A. Foundation. It has grown from \$75,000 to \$700,000 since the dean applied his fund-raising technique.

Many contributions to the fund and to research projects have been made in lieu of consulting fees for Dr. Kozmetsky, who may "straighten out a little oil company" and tell the grateful owners to send a check or securities to the fund.

"Money listens to money, and a lot of the big names of Texas look to George as the real disciple of modern management," Col. Schwartz said.

"If you have a good idea, George will release any kind of energy to get it backed," says Professor Bright, who was able to pioneer, programs in technological and environmental forecasting here quicker than he could say "jack rabbit" at Harvard.

Of course, Dr. Kozmetsky bought a Control Data large-scale 3100 computer for the school, financing it through the fund and then persuading the state to pay for it. And, naturally, there is a \$6-million building for the graduate school of business scheduled for 1975.

Dr. Kozmetsky's game plan included upgrading the graduate school of business by numbers and standards. There are currently 537 students working toward the Master of Business Administration and Master in Professional Accounting degrees.

They had to score 500 on the Admission Test for Graduate Study and have a 3.0 grade point average (which would not have gained them entry to Harvard or Stanford's business schools). They must also qualify in mathematics through calculus or remedy the deficiency during the first semester. Expectedly, the school has taken a strong quantitative turn under Dr. Kozmetsky.

"Structured flexibility" is the aim of the undergraduate program in which enrollment is leveling off at 4,600. The Bachelor of Business Administration degree is given to secretaries who can operate computers, as well as to Texas farmers and small businessmen.

"This school runs on two levels," said associate professor of accounting Edward Summers, sizing up the student body, which is largely state-drawn and noticeably more conservative and docile than in other major business schools.

"The top 10 per cent is equal to anybody, a challenge to teach. They gobble up knowl-

edge. For the rest, well that's a problem very important to our society. How do you take average people and turn them into competent administrators?"

The doctoral program has doubled in the last five years—123 doctoral candidates are currently enrolled. Zest for entrepreneurship sets the Texas business Ph.D.'s apart from their peers elsewhere.

A recent Ph.D. is teaching at the London School of Economics, but another one turned down an offer from M.I.T. in order to go with Continental Oil in operations research. A third started at \$25,000 as a bank vice-president in Houston.

Since business schools are judged by alumni standing in the market place, Dr. Kozmetsky has waged an aggressive placement campaign that capitalizes on the Southwest's growth, while also pushing some of the ablest M.B.A.'s northward out of the regional nest.

"The Harvard Business School may be a state of mind, but so is Texas," says Bruce Schnitzer, a 1967 Texas M.B.A. who is now an assistant treasurer in financial services at Morgan Guaranty. "We have an esprit de corps, an impetus to solve problems. When your whole damn state has gotten rich, why can't you?"

Back in Austin, the placement office has been receiving 500 company recruiters a year, experiencing only a 17 per cent drop in the recent business drought.

Starting salaries for holders of Texas M.B.A.'s have been averaging \$12,360 for those with non-technical backgrounds and \$14,676 for those with technical backgrounds.

Meanwhile the dean is running in all possible directions.

He and his wife, Ronya, teach a course in executive families. His door is open to students most afternoons, and she runs the Wives Club like a mother hen, coaching "my girls" in executive wifeliness along pre-Women's Lib lines.

Women and other minority students are in conspicuously short supply. There are 24 women candidates for the M.B.A. Less than one per cent of the students are black.

JUDGE FULD ORDERS SPEEDY TRIALS IN NEW YORK

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing sentiment across the country, and even in the Congress, that something must be done about the deplorable way in which our criminal justice system operates. Overcrowded jails, which are understaffed and underfinanced, are unable to do more than make gestures at meaningful rehabilitation of convicted criminals.

Why are the jails overcrowded? Not because of an increase in crime or an increase in the number of people convicted of committing crimes. The fact is that well over 50 percent of the people in jail around the United States have not been convicted of doing anything. They are there awaiting trial for accusations which may or may not be proved true. They are there because they are too poor to make bail so they can go free and continue to work, to support their families, and work with a lawyer to prepare their defense. It is not unusual for some people to sit in jail as much as a year, awaiting trial. In fact, fewer than 10 percent ever go to trial. Over 90 percent

of all persons in jail awaiting trial eventually plead guilty rather than go to trial. In some instances, innocent people plead guilty so they can get out of jail sooner. Criminal court delays are therefore adding to crime in two indirect but important ways. First, by overcrowding our jails, and second by adding to the disrespect for the law which lies at the heart of so much crime.

To deal with the problem of trial delays, and to insure the constitutional right to a speedy public trial, I have introduced legislation which would require that people charged with a crime be tried within 60-120 days. H.R. 7107 would impose penalties on both the prosecution and the defense for unexcused delays—dismissal of the case in the former instance, and contempt citations in the latter. Similar legislation has been introduced on the Senate side by Senator ERVIN.

I was pleased to note that the chief judge of New York's State court system, Judge Stanley H. Fuld, recently announced that beginning 1 year from now, criminal charges against all but homicide defendants would be dismissed if the prosecution delayed trial of the case for more than 180 days. In addition, Judge Fuld announced that defendants will be released from jail either on affordable bail or on parole, if they have not been brought to trial within 2-3 months after arrest.

Judge Fuld's order makes even more clear the need for legislation such as that proposed by Senator ERVIN and myself. The simple fact is that an announcement alone will not produce results. In the case of New York courts, the State legislature will have to provide additional resources—courtrooms, prosecutors, judges, and the like. The present criminal justice systems are not capable of meeting stringent time requirements such as those set down by Judge Fuld. Compliance will not be possible without substantial reforms in administrative practices, along with increased resources in the way of manpower and facilities. H.R. 7107 places the responsibility squarely where it belongs—on the people of the United States. It provides that a Federal judicial district need not comply with the stringent time requirements if it can show that additional resources and personnel are needed. The Attorney General would then be required to submit to Congress the necessary legislation providing such assistance.

Ultimately, it must be the responsibility of the people, through their elected representatives, to provide a criminal justice system which works.

The New York Times article reporting Judge Fuld's order follows:

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1971]
STATE PUTS 6-MONTH LIMIT ON CRIMINAL TRIAL DELAYS

(By Leslie Oelsner)

The chief judge of New York announced yesterday that beginning a year from tomorrow the state courts, in all but homicide cases, would dismiss criminal charges against any defendant who through no fault of his own had not been brought to trial within six months of his arrest.

In addition, again in all but homicide cases, defendants in jail pending trial will be

released to await trial, on either affordable bail or parole, if their trials have not begun within three months of arrest.

"We are convinced," said Chief Judge Stanley H. Fuld, "that these rules are needed if the trial and disposition of criminal cases are to be facilitated and expedited, if our criminal case backlog, especially in the metropolitan areas of the state, is to be reduced and, even more important, if the rights to which both the accused and the state are entitled are to be made more meaningful."

PROVIDES FOR EXCEPTIONS

The ruling, which allows some exceptions for "good cause," makes New York State one of the few jurisdictions in the country to attach a specific time period to the defendant's right to a speedy trial.

Only California, Illinois and the District of Columbia have such rules; the Federal courts in the Second Circuit (New York, Vermont, Connecticut) will adopt the practice in June.

The move comes at a time when criminal justice systems in the state—and particularly in New York City—are beleaguered by trial delays that often range to 18 months, by insufficient court facilities, by overcrowded jails.

It also comes, as Judge Fuld noted, in the wake of the riots last August and October in the city's jails—outbreaks that were marked in large part by the rioters' demands for quicker justice.

But whether the new rule can alleviate the problems is, as Judge Fuld pointed out, uncertain.

Speaking on behalf of the Administrative Board of Judicial Conference, which enacted the rule, Judge Fuld said that it "cannot achieve the desired purpose unless the fiscal authorities see to it that the district attorneys, legal aid and the other agencies performing auxiliary services receive the necessary financial assistance" to run their operations properly.

It was a sentiment repeated over and over yesterday, as groups and officials who make up the justice system offered their responses.

"We are delighted with the new rule as a very positive and significant step forward," said Leon Silverman, the new president of the Legal Aid Society. But he said the society, which handles the case of about 75 per cent of the defendants in the city, "will certainly need significantly more lawyers to implement this."

"LAUDABLE," HOGAN SAYS

"How are we going to achieve this laudable purpose?" asked Frank S. Hogan, the Manhattan District Attorney. Only with more personnel and more facilities, he said, answering the question. And he added "Where's the money coming from?"

City Hall, which expects to be inundated with requests for more funds for each of the groups in the court system, from Legal Aid to probation officers and prison guards, declined to comment on the new rule. But as Mr. Hogan pointed out, Mayor Lindsay has lately been broadcasting the city's financial plight.

William vanden Heuvel, chairman of the city's Board of Correction, praised the new procedure as "the greatest single advance in the prison system in years" and added, "As a lawyer, I'm proud today."

But Burton B. Roberts, district attorney of the Bronx said the rule "takes a crisis situation in our courts and makes it chaotic."

THE PLEA ISSUE

For Mr. Roberts, like every other district attorney in the state, had opposed the rule from the moment it was first suggested, last fall. Their reason; as Mr. Roberts put it, was that it would "turn off the faucet with regard to pleas."

About 90 per cent of all cases are disposed of by guilty pleas, he said—often to lesser offenses than the ones originally charged;

now, he warned, defendants might decide to wait out the six months on the chance the case would be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

None of the officials could even estimate the number of people potentially affected by the ruling. Mr. Hogan could only point to his present backlog of 3,245 cases. This, he said, would take his office six months to handle, even if it did nothing else.

As for the New York City Correction Department, it had a figure for at least the number affected by the three-month ruling: on March 31, a spokesman said, 1,865 of about 6,800 prisoners awaiting trial had been waiting more than three months.

RESTORATION OF DIVERTED AIRWAY SAFETY FUNDS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, no more than 2 years ago, our daily newspapers ran regular editorials bemoaning our crowded skies and congested airports. They, no less than the air traveling public, were concerned that the takeoff and landing delays at the New York airports—as well as those in other major metropolitan areas—were reducing the time-saving value of aviation and were reducing necessary safety margins.

Congress, the executive branch, and particularly the aviation industry itself, were urged to come up with short and long-term solutions. The FAA ruled that, temporarily, the number of operations into John F. Kennedy International Airport would have to be limited in the interests of air safety.

Let me mention that the committees of Congress were fully apprized, and deeply concerned, with the inadequacy of many of our airports. This was not a projected threat of inadequacy for years in the future. It was instead the existence of glaringly inadequate facilities in most of the airports for the Nation. Dangerous overcrowding, long delays, missed connections, missed appointments were the end product. They were not threats, they were daily occurrences, occurrences reasonable men could not condone.

And so, the Congress enacted major legislation last year which was to provide a major catch-up effort for airway and airport capital development in the 1970's. Equally important, those who use the aviation system—airline passengers, shippers, airlines, and general aviation—were to pay for the new capacity through new and increased excise taxes. Finally, a new Airport and Airway Trust Fund was created to protect the user taxes from being diverted to other purposes.

The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970—Public Law 91-258—provided that not less than \$280 million of these tax revenues were to be used annually for airport safety improvements and no less than \$250 million expended for airways modernization annually. This means safer runways and more radars, towers, and the like. Internal FAA administrative costs were to be paid, as in the past, from general tax funds. In the latter years of the 19-year

program, the increased user tax receipts would be sufficient to cover these routine costs as well as the high priority airport and airway capital expenditures.

The President's Office of Management and Budget, however, has not kept faith with the agreement made in Public Law 91-258, with those whose aviation user taxes were substantially increased. Instead of expediting the promised airport development program, the OMB has, because of a narrow interpretation of some language in Public Law 91-258, attempted to place the routine FAA operating costs on an equal footing with the aviation capital improvement program. In the first 2 years of the program, more than \$600 million would be diverted to these lower priority purposes. This is not what Congress intended.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a background statement from the Federal Aviation Administration relating to budget estimates for fiscal years 1971-72 for the allocation of airport and airway trust fund moneys. This statement and the attached chart point out the intent of the administration and the Office of Management and Budget to use the moneys' intended by the Congress for safety improvements, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

BACKGROUND STATEMENT RELATING TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971-72

1. The allocation of Airport and Airway Trust Fund monies included in the President's budget proposals for the Federal Aviation Administration provides only for funding airport planning and development, airways facilities and equipment and research and development, operation and maintenance of the Federal airways system, administration of the airports program, including related support and administrative expenses, which are clearly contemplated and authorized by Public Law 91-258. In addition, expenditures from the Trust Fund for the air security guard program were provided for by a specific appropriation included in the Department of Transportation Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1971. To finance the total cost of Trust Fund activities, the Act further provides for a General Fund contribution to the Trust Fund for the difference between tax collections and total program costs. The Trust Fund, therefore, consists of funds from two sources, user tax revenues and payments from the General Fund of the Treasury, which are both available for appropriation by the Congress for any authorized Trust Fund purpose. Under the Airport and Airway Act, Trust Fund monies are not available for non-aviation purposes and there has been no diversion or expenditure of funds contrary to law or for purposes not authorized by law.

2. The budget proposals for the two fiscal years—1971-1972—meet the funding commitments (for improving airports and airways) made in testimony before the Congress approximately one year ago. Apparently, some of the misunderstandings that have come to light concern the levels of our fiscal year 1971-1972 budget requests and the application of Trust Funds to finance some Federal Aviation Administration activities. While the amounts requested from the Congress are below the amounts authorized in the enabling legislation, it has been determined that there is no legal requirement that budget requests be submitted or that appropriations be enacted at the funding levels contained in the Act; or, that the use of Trust Fund monies, as appropriated, constitute any improper application of funds.

The budget levels for Airport/Airway activities included in the President's 1971/1972

budget for the Federal Aviation Administration are summarized as follows:

	Annual authorized per Public Law 91-258	1971 appropriation	1972 estimate	Total
Appropriation/estimate:				
Operations.....		\$902.8	\$991.8	\$1,894.6
Airway system investment development.....	\$300	300.4	322.8	623.2
Facilities and equipment.....	(250)	(238.0)	(250.0)	(488.0)
Research and development.....	(50)	(62.4)	(72.8)	(135.2)
Grants-in-aid for airports:				
Planning grants.....	15	10.0	15.0	25.0
Development grants:				
Obligations.....	(280)	(170.3)	(205.0)	(375.0)
Appropriation to liquidate obligations.....		60.0	92.0	152.0
Aviation Advisory Commission.....	2	1.5		1.5
Total appropriations.....		1,274.7	1,421.6	2,696.3
Funding:				
General-fund appropriations.....		1,097.2	293.1	1,390.3
User-tax revenues.....		177.5	1,128.5	1,306.0

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

The budget estimates for airport grants provide for obligation of \$180 million in 1971 (\$10 million for planning grants and \$170 million for development grants) and \$220 million in 1972 (\$15 million for planning grants and \$205 million for development grants), a total of \$400 million for the two year period. Although the \$400 million funding level is below the two year authorization contained in the Act, it does meet the original commitments that were made in hearings before the Congress in support of the legislation.

Section 14(b) of the Airport and Airway Development Act authorizes the obligation of \$840 million for airport development without further appropriation action by the Congress. Because of this provision, annual appropriation requests to pay bills for completed airport development as a result of grant agreements already entered into between the Federal Government and airport sponsors under the obligational authority made available in the basic Act. The appropriation requests of \$60 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$92 million for fiscal year 1972, therefore, represent cash needed to pay bills and are not directly comparable to the language of the Act which authorizes the obligation of "not less than \$280 million."

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I introduce today is designed to protect the revenues in the Airport and Airway Trust Fund for the purposes for which they were intended. The bill would, if enacted, tighten up the language of the Trust Fund and release available moneys for safer skies and runways and taxiways. It would result in the reduction, within the New York area, of the air and ground congestion which is forcing passengers and traffic away from our city and other major metropolitan areas.

Everyone is aware of the inconveniences that airport congestion causes. New York City is the prime example. Stacks of airplanes circling around the area airports, filled with people anxious to make scheduled appointments or to return home after a tiring trip. And long queues of harried travelers on the ground disgustedly trying to find a flight taking off for anywhere near their intended destination. There is also a staggering loss of income to the city of New York due to the avoidance of the city by tourists and business and air cargo shipments.

Hopefully, these and other problems in air transportation will be carried by the expenditure of moneys allocated specifically for airport modernization and op-

eration. But our most immediate attention must be devoted to the correction of the safety hazards that are created by this overcrowdedness.

I urge the support of my colleagues for this legislation to clarify the intent of Congress as to priorities for airway modernization and airport development.

A BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORTS—UNCERTAIN FUTURE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE (PART I)

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel Supplemental Report says:

The situation which our country faces is without precedent. . . . Within the span of two decades we have moved from complete security to perilous insecurity.

The prospects for the long term survival of our Nation have been called into doubt by a sobering supplemental report from members of a Presidentially appointed Blue Ribbon Defense Panel.

Appointed in July of 1969 to make a thorough study of the Department of Defense and recommend necessary changes, the panel submitted its major report in July 1970. Several of the changes advocated by the panel concerning Defense Department organization have already been acted upon.

During the year's study, however, seven members of the panel became so concerned about the deteriorating state of our defenses in relation to massive Soviet increases in their strategic offensive and defensive forces that they reserved the right to issue a supplemental report. They stated that:

In the course of the Panel's study during the past year it became increasingly clear to the undersigned that if . . . observable trends continue the United States will become . . . incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people.

To date this supplemental report which, although submitted in early October 1970, was not officially released until the middle of March 1971, has not even been officially commented upon.

The supplemental report identifies eight major trends operative today which, if not rapidly and radically reversed, lead the panel members, and myself, to believe that:

The United States will become a "second rate" power subordinate to manifest Soviet military superiority. In that case, the world order of the future will bear a Soviet trademark, with all peoples upon which it is imprinted suffering Communist repressions.

The first fact which the panel members considered when coming to this conclusion was the enormous increase in the size of the Soviet strategic forces in the last several years. By June of this year the number of Soviet ICBM's will have increased six fold over what it was in 1965. Adm. Thomas Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, projects a Soviet ICBM force numbering 1,500 at that time, a force 50 percent larger than that possessed by the United States.

But numbers alone do not tell the whole story. The 300 Soviet SS-9 missiles now deployed, a weapon which makes our Minuteman ICBM look like a pygmy, by themselves possess several times the destructive capability of our entire land and sea based missile force.

Since the supplemental report was compiled Secretary of Defense Laird has noted that the Soviets have started "a new—and apparently extensive—ICBM construction program." Senator HENRY JACKSON has pointed out that these new ICBM's will be at least as large if not larger than the SS-9's. Weapons of this size are not designed to destroy cities but rather to be used as a counterforce weapons, that is, used to knock out our Minuteman force and help preclude a U.S. response to a Soviet attack on our Nation.

This confirms another significant trend identified by the panel:

The evidence is now reasonably conclusive that the Soviet Union . . . is deploying strategic weapons systems designed for a first strike capability. The characteristics of their offensive and defensive weapons systems, which the Soviets continue to expand, are consistent *only* (emphasis added) "with a preemptive strike capability."

WHAT YOU CAN DO

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, recently several members of the Bethesda Jaycee Wives Club visited me to discuss the problem of environmental pollution and to show me a booklet that their club has prepared entitled "Community Action on Environmental Problems: What You Can Do."

These ladies have done an admirable job in devising some practical suggestions for everyone to follow and I would like to share their suggestions and findings with my colleagues. It is this type of positive community action addressed to a specific problem that is the mark of concerned and involved citizens. Environmental cleanup is everyone's problem and efforts such as this must be

forthcoming from local citizens if we are to effectively and efficiently tackle the problems caused by pollution.

The suggestions and findings of the Bethesda Jaycee Wives Club, which translate concern into practical action, follow:

COMMUNITY ACTION ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS—WHAT YOU CAN DO

(Compiled and Distributed by: The Bethesda Jaycee Wives Club)

I. WATER CONSERVATION

A great deal of pollution comes from the phosphate chemicals in the detergents you use. We as consumers can hasten the production of non-polluting detergents by soap manufacturers. The following is a list of the percentage of phosphate in major detergent brands. The less phosphates, the less the product harms our waters.

	Percent
Axion.....	43.7
Biz.....	40.4
Bio-Ad.....	35.5
Salvo.....	35.3
Oxydol.....	30.7
Tide.....	30.6
Bold.....	30.2
Ajax.....	28.2
Punch.....	25.8
Drive.....	25.3
Dreft.....	24.5
Gain.....	24.4
Duz.....	23.1
Bonus.....	22.3
Breeze.....	22.2
Cheer.....	22.0
Fab.....	21.6
Cold Power.....	19.9
Cold Water All.....	9.8
Wisk.....	7.6
Trend.....	1.4

AUTOMATIC DISHWASHING DETERGENTS—PER LOAD

	Tablespoon	Gram
Electrasol (soft water).....	1½	4.0
Electrasol (hard water).....	1½	6.0
Finish (soft water).....	1½	6.3
Sears automatic.....	1½	6.6
Finish (medium water).....	1½	6.9
Amway.....	2	8.3
Calgonite.....	2	8.5
All.....	2	9.8
Finish (hard water).....	1½	10.0
Cascade.....	2½	12.0

What you can do

1. Do not use colored tissue, colored paper, or colored napkins. Dyes released in the manufacturer's effluent pollute streams.
2. Switch light bulbs not used for reading to a lower wattage. Lower electrical power consumption reduces home or office operating costs and reduces pollution at the electrical generating plant.
3. Adjust the float or put a brick in the flush tank of every toilet you use. This will reduce the amount of water used without decreasing efficiency.
4. If you must fertilize your lawn, use organic fertilizers.
5. Do not run your faucet unnecessarily.
6. If you know of any industrial water polluters in our area write and express your concern. Ask what they are doing about it.
7. Use sand instead of salt on snowy streets and sidewalks because salt adds harmful chlorides to the water system.
8. Boat owners should dispose of the sewage on their boats at marina facilities, not in a river, a bay or a lake.

Test for drinking water

Fill a glass of water from your tap: hold it up to the light. It should be colorless and free of sediment and suspended floating matter. Smell it; it should be odorless. Drink some; it should have no taste.

II. AIR POLLUTION

1. Do not let your automobile idle unless it's absolutely necessary.
2. Use non-leaded gasoline.

3. When buying a new car, consider only models equipped with pollution control devices.

4. Walk, bicycle, or use public transportation whenever possible.

5. Report air pollution violations. The following is a list of telephone numbers to call when reporting violations: District 629-3748; Montgomery 948-6442; Arlington County 568-2664; Fairfax County 691-2541; Prince Georges 864-3874.

III. PESTICIDES

Pesticides may kill organisms considered undesirable, but they are also toxic to other forms of life which are necessary to maintain the balance of nature.

1. Chemical poisons should not be used for pest control except when absolutely necessary for health or economic reasons. Pesticides should never be used for nuisance insects like mosquitoes.

2. Consider alternatives before using chemical poisons. Use only recommended dosages at the proper time of year. Check labels carefully.

3. Acceptable pesticides include brands that contain: rotenone, sevin, malathion, pyrethrum, methoxychlor, and diazinon.

IV. SOLID WASTES

Solid wastes cause land, water, and air pollution either directly or indirectly. The average American generates about five pounds of solid wastes per day.

1. Support the separate collection of paper and aluminum in your community to encourage re-cycling.

2. Use returnable bottles where possible.

3. Remove excess packaging at the store and ask the sales personnel to return it to the manufacturer.

4. Use glasses instead of paper cups.

5. Do not purchase liquids sold in milk-white plastic containers.

6. Refuse or return hangers given to you by your cleaning store.

7. Use junk mail for children to color or write on.

8. Don't throw away potentially useful items, such as clothing, furniture and household items. Give them directly to people who can use them or donate them to groups or organizations that will see they reach users. Local organizations which accept most items that are in usable condition are: The Salvation Army, St. Vincent de Paul Society, Goodwill Industries and Volunteers of America.

V. NOISE

1. Be sure your own muffler, radios, TV's, air conditioners, etc. are not part of the noise pollution problem.

2. Encourage the FAA to set noise abatement standards for airlines.

VI. VISUAL PROBLEMS

1. Combat the litter-bug by picking up the litter you encounter.

2. Support community efforts to clean up your local environment.

VII. POLITICAL ACTION

1. Urge your local school board to institute conservation and ecology study units at all grade levels.

2. Become informed on conservation issues.

3. Join local and national organizations which are fighting to save our environment.

4. Encourage the local government to conserve its land and water resources through zoning and acquisition.

5. Seek better playground design and ask if local government is providing adequate funds for proper supervision and maintenance of existing facilities.

6. Ask your community to make use of Federal Beautification grants, to press for better "street furniture", to seek effective billboard controls and underground utility lines, to plant trees and flowers and to stage an anti-litter drive.

These Guidelines have been compiled by the Bethesda Jaycee Wives Club.

The following sources were used in gathering our information:

1. "Consumer Reports Magazine," September 1970.
2. "The Sunday Star", October 18, 1970.
3. "Saw Mill", Audubon Society.
4. U.S. Government Printing Office.
5. "Community Action for Environmental Quality", The Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality.

THE REWARD OF MAO TSE-TUNG'S ATHLETIC FACTORIES

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, a disillusioned athlete from Red China wrote an appropriate article for the Reader's Digest, in June of 1967, analyzing the realities and priorities of Mao Tse-tung's athletic corps. Because Shih Pen-shan found his idealism about Communist China's athletic program totally shattered, he was able to clearly define, for all those who are willing to listen, the utter nonsense of "Ping-Pong diplomacy." In describing the part that athletics, specifically table tennis, play in the automated state of Communist, Shih Pen-shan was instructed by his cadre leaders:

Your primary purpose is to serve the political aims of the state.

Hopefully, all of us can listen and learn from the suggestions made by this man whose ideas should serve as guidelines for our Congress, the executive branch, and the State Department.

The article follows:

I FOUGHT IN RED CHINA'S SPORTS WAR

(By Shih Pen-shan, as told to Lester Velle)

The first lesson an athlete learns in Red China is that sports are not for fun. They are a form of war waged for world revolution. Inside China, sports serve "proletarian politics" by spreading the idea that Mao Tse-tung's thought arms the athlete for victory and so can bring success. Abroad, athletes become an "important adjunct in the communist struggle," i.e., an instrument of subversion.

I helped play these deadly games for the Chinese communists as an international competitor in China's major sport, table tennis. Red China had held the world's men's singles championship since 1959. I was part of a sports elite that is trained like soldiers by the state to win in amateur competition. My body was hardened by dawn-to-dusk drill, my mind molded by "ideological preparation." Even my emotions were not my own. While my story deals with sports, it should shed some light on the larger story of life under Maoism that is unfolding in China today.

Like millions of other Chinese kids, I began to play table tennis before my head could reach a table top. Boys in China dream of becoming the table-tennis players as American boys dream of becoming baseball or football stars. We played on kitchen tables, on slats of beds and even on floors. I had a natural knack for the game, and at the age of 11 I won the primary-school championship of Canton. Two years later, after I had become schoolboy champion of Kwangtung Province, my principal, who was also secretary of the school's Communist Party branch, called me to his office. "Congratulations," he said. "I've

been instructed by the Party to transfer you to the Canton Physical Culture Institute." No one had asked me whether I wanted to go to this college—one of ten "physical-education institutes" built by the communists since the revolution—and I had no more choice in the matter than if I had been drafted for military service. Of the 1000 students at the college, about half are schooled as physical education teachers. The other half are trained to represent Communist China in international amateur competition in sports from archery to swimming.

CHINESE TORTURE

The Canton Physical Culture Institute turned out to be an unusual school. For one thing, it awarded titles in table tennis, weight lifting, high jumping. For another, the athletes stayed on as "students" for as many years as they kept winning, drawing regular pay just as government employes did. (My hero, world-champion table-tennis player Chuang Tse tung, received 70 yuan monthly. With room, board and clothing free, this equaled the pay of a mayor or government department head.)

Then too, our part of the college was more of a military barracks than a school. We wore uniforms and were tumbled out of bed at 5:30 a.m. Except for meals, a nap after lunch and several hours of "ideological instruction," there was nothing but practice matches, body building and endless drill until—at the end of a 17-hour day—we dropped exhausted into bed at 10:30.

We had academic classes on only two afternoons in the six-day school week. And even these classes, as in the military, were given over to tactical problems. The 16 boys and girls in my table-tennis program used geometry to figure the most effective angles of arm to table, or paddle to table, at which a ball could be hit with most force or most spin.

Our training was divided between two areas, physical and ideological. The physical, I can only describe as Chinese torture. The Chinese know that in table tennis it isn't only the wrist that counts, but the upper legs and lower back. To build stamina we began where the athletes of other countries leave off. After running miles over hilly country or swimming dozens of laps in the pool, we'd tie sausage-like sandbags around our calves and thighs and run in place until tears of agony rolled down our cheeks. Or we'd use an iron paddle ten times the weight of the ordinary one, and stroke the ball until our wrists and forearms swelled.

But it was in the exercises for sharpening our reflexes to camera-shutter speed—to cope with the lightning pace of the modern game—that the torture pressed against the borders of human endurance. In the body-building work we could switch our minds off, but we had to be trigger-alert here. The coach would stand beside a lamp that flashed signals in five colors. We'd run forward at top speed at the green, backward at blue; stop dead at red; hop sideways to the left at yellow, right at white. Woe to the sluggard who didn't respond fast enough. For punishment, he'd continue starting and stopping like a puppet at the end of a string, until—like a puppet—he would fall in a heap to the floor.

AUTOMATION FOR THE STATE

But the communist cadre played an even more important role in our lives than the coaches. For while the latter had charge of our bodies, the cadre had charge of our minds. "Your primary purpose," he would say, "is to serve the political aims of the state. The American imperialists and Japanese bourgeoisie preach sport for sport's sake, but in fact their sports serve as an instrument of imperialist aggression."

The communist cadre didn't have to tell us how important sports were in the Chinese communist scheme. Sports training was entrusted to the highest and most respected

men in government. Mao Tse-tung himself was the source of the "ideological instruction" which was to arm us for victory. So, twice daily, we pored over Mao's *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War* which, we were told, contained universal truths applicable to table tennis (or to basketball or whatever). One Mao "truth" was that we'd win if we "despised the enemy strategically" (regarded him as a paper tiger) "but respected him tactically" (equipped ourselves to cope with him technically).

Mao's rationale for playing the deadly game of war was carried over into our games with harsh and humorless fidelity. Since Mao held that in war all thoughts of self must be suppressed, we were allowed no private lives. We trained in the greatest secrecy, and even athletes and coaches from other sports were barred. When we visited our families on Sundays, we were warned not to discuss our work. And when we returned to the college, we would be questioned. Where had we been? What vehicles did we take and over what route? Whom did we talk to? Although attractive young girls trained with us, boy-girl friendships were barred as "indulgences in petty self." If a boy and girl fell in love, the full might of the college Communist Party would be marshaled to break up the affair. I know, for it happened to me.

BRIEF ENCOUNTER

I first became aware of Mei-ling (that's not her name) one summer when we were both drafted for "socialist labor" in the rice paddies just outside Canton. Here the surveillance wasn't as rigorous, and we were soon stealing out nights for a stroll along the river, content only to hold hands—a new experience. I was 18 then, and these were the first truly happy days of my life. Mei-ling was a tall girl, with a warm, sweet face. She was being groomed for international swimming competition.

Back at the college that fall, under the eyes of the cadre watchdogs, seeing each other became a frustrating and dangerous business. Even so, Mei-ling and I managed it. At lunch in the cafeteria we would watch each other closely and finish our bowls of rice so we could arrive together at the counter for a second helping. Here, we'd hurriedly arrange to meet outdoors after lights-out. This was our undoing. Missing sleep at night, I began to play listlessly, arousing the suspicion of the cadre. He watched my movements and discovered our secret.

Mei-ling and I were hauled separately before "criticism meetings" at which our fellow students and the cadres abused us for our weakness. I was required to write ten "regret reports" confessing the "betrayal of my revolutionary responsibility" as an athlete for the state. I could no longer see Mei-ling, and was told that she had been expelled. Since she ranked fourth in her swimming program while I stood first in my table tennis group and often won international matches, the Party—always practical—had cut short her athletic career instead of mine.

Body and mind could stand no more. I broke down, and the school doctors ordered me to bed. It was then, in the summer of 1964, as I lay with my face turned to the wall, that the desperate thought of fleeing China first entered my mind.

REVOLUTIONARY FERVOR

This idea deepened as I was subjected to other parts of the "ideological preparation"—the training in obedience, for instance. In a match with Indonesia, which China was wooing politically, the cadre told me to let an opponent win some games. Spectators familiar with my play knew I was throwing games, and shouted insults at me. But I had to swallow my humiliation—I was merely a tool of state policy.

Everywhere we went, we had to study Mao's works right through the very morning of the

day on which our matches were played. I'd be sick with shame when I had to go through this idiocy, and I'm sure other athletes were, too, for I wasn't the only one to rebel later. Still, none of us could say anything and, win or lose, Mao always won.

When the Chinese men's team beat the Japanese in May 1966, Mao got the credit. When our women lost to the Japanese, they confessed tearfully at self-criticism meetings that they had not studied Mao enough. Thereafter, they tied Mao slogans to their table-tennis nets before practicing.

During the height of the Great Cultural Revolution last September, another kind of madness took place in the 100,000-seat Peking Workers' Stadium, where Chinese track-and-field athletes were to be selected for a forthcoming international meet. The stadium was virtually snowed under with huge portraits of Mao. Loudspeakers blared revolutionary songs and Red Guards exhorted spectators to join in chanting slogans. As the athletes marched onto the field they carried banners of Mao quotations. One weight lifter, before hoisting several hundred pounds, raised a five-ounce, red-covered Mao booklet above his head to give him strength. A high jumper consulted the little red book for inspiration before each fling at the bar. And Red Guards darted about, handing the athletes encouraging Mao slogans sent down by the spectators.

The same revolutionary fervor goes abroad with the athlete. When the Chinese table-tennis team won the world championship at Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, the players startled the audience with the deadpan explanation that Mao had done it. "It wasn't because of our better playing, but because we held high the banner of Mao's thought."

In the last few years, the Chinese have also used their athletes as a front to hide a grand design: the development of an Asian Comintern led by China. Fantastic? Consider the "Games of the New Emerging Forces" (developing nations) engineered by the Red Chinese in Cambodia last November. China sent 117 technicians to erect a new "sports city" at Phnom Penh, and supplied the athletic equipment. "The purpose of these games," the Chinese announced, "is to promote the Asian people's unity against imperialism and to give impetus to the forces of revolution struggling against U.S.-led lackeys." Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's chief of state, decorated the Chinese experts who built the Phnom Penh sports city and described it as "the crystallization of the pooled wisdom and labor of the peoples of Cambodia and China."

PRECIOUS GIFT

Although it was increasingly painful for me to play the pawn in this political sports game, I hesitated to make the final break. Two other athletes had already tried to flee, and had been caught and punished. Ironically, it was the big-character posters of the Cultural Revolution that suggested my escape route. Written by Red Guards, these demanded that China seize the imperialist outpost of Macao, the Portuguese colony 65 miles south of Canton on the China Sea. I became obsessed by the thought that the free world was so near.

I left college one Sunday last December to "visit friends" and made my way by bus halfway to Macao. Then I walked by night and hid by day until I reached the low-lying mountains that overlook Macao—a half mile across the water. I threaded my way past the frontier observation posts and patrols, sprinted across the beach and plunged into the water. A strong undertow kept pulling me out to sea. (I learned later that hundreds had lost their lives in this dangerous crossing.) It took three hours of desperate swimming, but I made it. The communists who had trained by body to win in sports had

given me the stamina with which to win the precious gift of freedom.¹

Today, in Taiwan, I'm in a normal world where a country's playing fields serve the happiness of the people and not the political aims of a state. I want to teach the free people of the world my skills. And there are things even more important I can teach them. I would like to prove that a free man can defeat a brainwashed automaton and that games are games—not war.

BATTLE OF PUEBLA

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of a most important day in Mexican history and I would like to have your indulgence for a few moments and also ask my colleagues to join with me in extending our most sincere best wishes to the people of Mexico on this occasion.

Today marks the 109th anniversary of the Battle of Puebla which was fought on May 5, 1862, where the Mexican armies defeated the French troops of Emperor Maximilian.

This day is celebrated throughout Mexico with appropriate ceremonies as well as in many areas of our own country. I remember from my very early years in south Texas the celebration of "El Cinco de Mayo" because the hero of this famous battle in Mexican history was Ignacio Zaragoza, who was born in what is now Texas—although at that time it was called Bahia de Espiritu Santo. It is now known as Goliad, Tex.

It might be well—since this great patriot of Mexico was what we might say "one of our own" to south Texas and a product of the pioneer families who settled all of this area of the new world—to mention some of the leading facts of his life.

Ignacio Zaragoza was born on March 24, 1829, in what was then part of the state of Coahuila; the son of Miguel Zaragoza and Maria de Jesus Seguin. He first studied in Matamoros, which is now across the river from Brownsville, Tex., and later continued his studies at Monterrey where he also entered into business at a very young age.

Mr. Zaragoza enlisted in what would now be known as the National Guard where he obtained the rank of sergeant, and in 1853 he began his active military career as captain. He fought in the battle of Saltillo and toward the end of 1856 he was also in the battle for the defense of Monterrey. In 1857 he began his military career in defense of the Constitution of 1857 and for the ideals and principles of the leaders of the Reform. In 1860 he was head of the military forces situated at Guadalajara. In 1861 he was named Minister of War and in that same year left that post to take command of

¹ I was one of the last to get out. Today, Macao turns back all refugees under an agreement forced on her by Red China.

the military forces in the eastern part of Mexico which he led in several battles until the famous battle of May 5, 1862.

It was unfortunate that shortly after this battle he died from typhoid on September 8, 1862—in the same city of Puebla where he had led the troops to victory. His remains now rest in San Fernando Cemetery in Mexico City.

The Mexican people have honored this great patriot in many instances—many cities have been named in his honor—and it might be well for us to remember that he was only 33 years old when he commanded the armies that led to Mexico's victory in this battle.

So once again I thank you for your indulgence and ask you to join with me—as I stated in the beginning—to extend our most sincere best wishes to the Government and the people of Mexico on such an important day in the history of their country and that this be done as an expression of our solidarity with them in the cause of peace throughout the world and as a demonstration of our love, admiration, and respect for Mexico and the Mexican people. I thank you Mr. Speaker.

THE BILDERBERGERS' WOODSTOCK MEETING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, some 100 Bilderbergers from 12 European nations, Canada, and the United States—representing nobility, international bankers, and international bureaucrats—met at Woodstock, Vt., April 23–25.

Reportedly, the Bilderbergers' only statement, issued following the meeting, indicated they had discussed two points: first, "the contribution of business in dealing with current problems of social instability," and second, "the possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequence."

Notable among those attending the Bilderbergers' meeting at Laurance Rockefeller's Woodstock Inn were Prince Bernhard of The Netherlands; Henry Kissinger, assistant to President Nixon for National Security; Baron Edmond de Rothschild of Germany; former West German Foreign Affairs Minister Gerhard Schroeder; former Under Secretary of State George Ball; former U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance; banker David Rockefeller; William Moyers, former U.S. presidential press assistant; Robert L. Anderson, president of Atlantic Richfield Oil; Canadian National Defense Minister Donald McDonald; John D. Rockefeller IV, West Virginia secretary of state; Princess Beatrix of The Netherlands and her husband, Prince Klauss; Lt. Gen. John W. Vogt, U.S. Army, Director of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Joseph Luns, The Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Leif Hoegn, Norwegian shipping magnate.

The meeting was top secret and unreported in any news media except the Rutland, Vt. Herald. Reportedly top security was handled by the FBI and said to be justified because of the presence of Heads of State. And the secrecy to protect the participants freedom of speech rather than to hide their plans from the people.

It should strike most Members as strange that at a time when a bunch of fired up hippies and other demonstrators are receiving front-page publicity with glowing analytical commentaries to explain the need and purpose for change, the real masterminds of the international movement, including custodians of great wealth, are able to arrange secret meetings in New England without one wire service or TV network carrying this story. Apparently at this time the people's attention is to be focused on the pressures from the bottom while plans are made for later pressures to be applied at the top.

Had this meeting in top secret been arranged or held by concerned Americans dedicated to constitutional government for the purpose of saving the country rather than for plotting its destruction, they could have expected mass exposés by the news media, accusing them of secret plots as well as attempts by the news media to brand them as a threat to the Nation. Yet the Bilderbergers come and go, admittedly planning change in the American role in the world, and the news people can't even see a story. The Bilderbergers are not denounced as plotting in secret nor as constituting any danger to our Republic. They seem to approve of the new line of thinking—if it was not reported, it did not happen.

I ask that two news reports by Howard Coffin of the Vermont Press Bureau, which were carried by the Rutland Herald of Rutland, Vt., be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald, Apr. 23, 1971]

WOODSTOCK AGENDA: U.S. GLOBAL ROLE
(By Howard Coffin)

WOODSTOCK.—His Royal Highness Prince Bernhard of The Netherlands announced in Boston Thursday that the chances for change in the world-role of the United States may be discussed during a world affairs seminar beginning in Woodstock on Friday.

The prince, during a press conference at Logan Airport, announced that presidential advisor Henry Kissinger and former West German foreign affairs minister Gerhard Schroeder will be among those attending the conference.

Canada, the U.S., and 12 European nations will be unofficially represented at the conference.

Prince Bernhard said the Woodstock conference will be the 17th session of the "Bilderberg meetings" which have been sponsored once a year throughout the world by the prince since 1954.

The Bilderberg Meetings this year will be held at Laurance Rockefeller's Woodstock Inn in Woodstock.

Prince Bernhard made it most clear during his late afternoon press conference that the Woodstock meetings will be private in the strictest sense of the word.

The Woodstock Inn will be closed to the public until Monday.

No press coverage of the meetings will be sought to the extent that no information on the proceedings will be disclosed, even at the meeting's end. But some prominent newspaper and magazine figures will be at the sessions—as participants only.

The two prime topics of discussion for the Bilderberg Meetings this year, the prince said, will be the following:

"The possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequences.

"The contribution of business in dealing with current problems of social instability."

Attending the Woodstock conference will be citizens of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Great Britain, and the U.S.

A total of 85 persons will be attending the conference "as individuals," the prince stressed, not as the representatives of any governments or private concerns.

Prominent among Americans attending the meeting in addition to Kissinger will be Undersecretary of State George Ball, former Army Secretary Cyrus Vance, banker David Rockefeller, brother of the Woodstock Inn's owner, publisher William Moyers, and Robert L. Anderson, president of the Atlantic Richfield Co.

Quebec Prime Minister Robert Bourassa and National Defense Minister Donald McDonald will represent Canada at the conference.

Baron Edmund DeRothschild and Schroeder will head a group of German dignitaries attending the meetings.

The guest list will be heavy with government officials and financiers.

One state official, West Virginia Secretary of State John D. Rockefeller IV, will be in attendance.

Security at the Woodstock Inn will be tight, with the Federal Bureau of Investigation directing those efforts. That is because of the presence of heads of state.

The three-day Woodstock session is the third Bilderberg Meeting to be held in the U.S.

The meetings were held at St. Simons Island, Ga., in 1957, and at Williamsburg, Va., in 1964. All, by coincidence, are owned by Rockefeller interests.

Prince Bernhard, as he has been since the first Bilderberg Meeting was held, will be chairman. He will preside over all formal sessions of the meetings, limiting all speakers to five minutes each, with a stopwatch. There will be ample time for private informal talks and casual get-togethers.

Prince Bernhard flew into chill, windy, overcast Logan Airport in Boston Harbor at 3:45 p.m. Thursday afternoon.

He arrived aboard his private jet, after a fishing trip to LaPaz, Lower California.

Prince Bernhard, in his late 50's, trim and graying, faced the press for 30 minutes in a Pan American Airways executive lounge.

The prince, clad in a brown suit and desert boots, spoke in near-perfect English. About 20 reporters were present in the lounge which commands a view of the windswept airport and Boston Harbor.

The prince briefly described the purpose of the meeting, read the guest list, and answered a few questions.

Then he boarded an Executive Airlines plane for the West Lebanon, N.H., airport.

He motored from West Lebanon to Woodstock, arriving at the Woodstock Inn in the early evening.

The prince explained Thursday that, in the early 1950's, a number of people on both sides of the Atlantic sought a means of bringing together leading citizens, in and out of government, for informal discussions of problems facing the Atlantic community.

Such meetings, it was felt, would create a better understanding of the forces and trends in Western nations. In particular, it was felt that direct exchanges could help

clear up differences and misunderstandings that might weaken the West.

The first meeting brought Europeans and Americans together in May, 1954, and was held at the Bilderberg Hotel in Oosterbeek, Holland.

Ever since, they have been called the "Bilderberg Meetings."

The official languages of the meetings are English and French. Discussion is centered upon topics of current concern in the fields of foreign policy, world economy, and other contemporary issues.

Basic groundwork for the meetings is laid by means of working papers. General discussion follows.

In order to assure freedom of speech and opinion, the gatherings are private and off the record.

No resolutions are proposed, no votes taken, and no policy statements issued during or after the meetings.

The meetings will end about noon Sunday. A statement will be released at that time, but the statement will give no clue as to the position of any of the participants.

The Woodstock Inn will be open to the general public again Monday.

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald, Apr. 26, 1971]

VIP'S RUTLAND PROTEST TARGET—BILDERBERG CONFERENCE IN WOODSTOCK ENDS WITH JEERS, CURSES FROM PEACE GROUP

(By Howard Coffin)

WOODSTOCK.—Western European and American VIP's and a future queen were cursed at, argued with, and jeered as the Bilderberg Meetings closed at the Woodstock Inn here Sunday.

About 50 demonstrators, mostly college-age, made their dislike for the Southeast Asian War and the wealthy highly obvious, as the high-level private meetings came to a close.

There was no violence.

Wealth, and its contributions to special unrest, and the American involvement in Indo-China were the prime topics for the meeting, according to a terse statement issued at the close of the session.

Participants at the meetings qualified as experts in both fields.

The demonstrators gathered at the inn at noon Sunday as the meetings' participants were departing.

They grouped around the inn's front door and generally bothered Rockefellers, Rothschilds and others who had attended the Bilderberg Meetings.

The mood of the demonstrators was hostile only at rare times. Except for the frequent shouting of obscenities, nothing that happened gave the legions of police in the Woodstock area cause for worry.

Each year, under the leadership of Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, a three-day private meeting is held somewhere in the western world to discuss international problems.

The site chosen for the 1971 version of the Bilderberg Meetings was Laurance Rockefeller's Woodstock Inn.

The meetings were a masterpiece of privacy. Absolutely no press coverage was allowed.

At the close of the sessions Sunday a one-page statement was issued by directors of the meetings, the only public admission that any meetings were held.

Organizers of the meeting obviously wanted the participants to be left alone and thus they chose the little town of Woodstock. They got their wishes for privacy, until Sunday.

Just before noon a group of students bearing a wide variety of signs protesting war and capitalism marched up to the front steps of the Woodstock Inn.

They intended to let their feelings be known to the Bilderberg participants, and they succeeded.

The prime target of their efforts was President Nixon's foreign affairs adviser, Henry Kissinger, a participant in the conference.

However, Kissinger was spirited out the inn's back door with a heavy guard of security agents.

Only two protestors managed to see Kissinger's departure. One bellowed at Kissinger, "Your days are numbered."

The other yelled: "You're a pig."

Kissinger obviously heard the remarks, but he disappeared into a waiting car and didn't respond.

Kissinger was apparently the only conference participant to choose the back door.

The others made their way generally unhindered through the demonstrators. They were piped aboard waiting busses and cars with mouth harps, shouted slogans, songs and jeers.

Two of the earliest to leave were New York City banker David Rockefeller and his nephew, West Virginia Secretary of State John D. Rockefeller III.

"How do you explain your \$70,000 raise, David, in times of economic crisis?" shouted demonstrators at the two Rockefellers just before they entered a waiting automobile.

David Rockefeller smiled briefly and then was whisked away in a Mercedes.

"You're terrible."

"Don't come back."

"Get out of Vermont."

Those words echoed after the Rockefellers' car as it motored out of the inn grounds.

The Mercedes sported a fresh dent in a rear door, put there by the foot of a demonstrator.

A sign in the crowd read: "The Rockefellers: David gets a \$70,000 raise while (New York Gov.) Nelson (Rockefeller) cuts welfare."

Another demonstrator's sign read: "Kiss off Kissinger."

The following signs were also in evidence at the inn Sunday.

"Victory in Vietnam."

"End the War."

"Free Father Berrigan."

"White Europe Gets \$, Yellow Asia gets napalm."

Vermont Public Safety Commissioner Edward Corcoran and several state and local policemen kept the demonstrators under close scrutiny.

In case they were needed, a sizeable share of the state police force was on standby at the Woodstock Union High School athletic field just outside of town.

The early departers Sunday, such as former Deputy Secretary of State George Ball, left in private cars.

A sturdy woman demonstrator looked an unperplexed Mr. Ball squarely in the eye and growled: "Your days are numbered."

There was a kick for Ball's car as he motored off.

With the private cars dispatched, a Vermont Transit bus pulled up before the inn to carry conference participants to the West Lebanon, N.H., airport.

A Viet Cong flag was promptly attached to the front of the vehicle.

A gray chilly afternoon became almost raw cold as the demonstrators waited nearly an hour before the mass exodus of conference participants began.

At one point publisher William Moyers, former aide to President Lyndon B. Johnson, appeared on the front steps of the inn.

He carried on a brief conversation with one demonstrator. The demonstrator accused Moyers of participating in a meeting of people who are responsible for continuation of the Vietnam War.

"That's not altogether true. You can't put a label on everyone here like that," Moyers responded.

Unlike Moyers, most of the meeting's parti-

cipants refused to talk with the demonstrators.

One exception was Norwegian shipping magnate Lef Hoegh. Said Hoegh to one student: "You should know that half of the people at this meeting agree with you about the war. Half of us are Europeans."

The man most willing of all to talk with the demonstrators was Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs Joseph Luns.

Luns, tall, distinguished, aging, and looking not unlike the late Charles DeGaulle, talked for nearly an hour with the demonstrators.

Luns tried to explain to the young people that at times a nation may find it necessary to kill people in a war for the good of many more people.

The demonstrators didn't buy his reasoning, but they treated the foreign affairs minister with respect.

With most of the protestors gathered around Luns, a handsome, fortyish couple managed to slip down the inn's front stairs and into a waiting car.

The couple attracted only a few jeers, for no other reason than the fact that well-dressed people were generally jeered Sunday at Woodstock.

Few people realized until their car was well away from the inn that the lady was Princess Beatrix of The Netherlands, and her husband, Prince Klaus.

The princess will someday be queen of The Netherlands. That will occur when her mother, Queen Juliana, leaves the throne.

As her car slipped past the band of demonstrators still intent on debating Luns, the princess turned toward the crowd and arched an aristocratic eyebrow at the demonstrators.

Keeping official charge of the goings-on on the inn's front porch was Woodstock Police Chief Elio Paglia.

He talked good-naturedly with the demonstrators. They evidently respected him and partly due to Paglia's handling to his job, there were no incident of any seriousness.

Some of the loudest jeers and strongest obscenities were directed at a three-star American general, John W. Vogt, as he hustled down the inn steps.

Vogt is director of the Joints Chiefs of Staff.

"Two, four, six, eight, organize and smash the state," was a chant repeated often Sunday.

As each dignitary left the inn Sunday he was asked: "What are you doing to end the war?"

Most chose not to reply.

Kissinger chose to take his leave of the meeting about 1:30 p.m.

State police and other security men peopled the inn's rear entrance as the presidential adviser moved quickly into a waiting and inconspicuous blue sedan.

He seemed not to hear the shouts of the two demonstrators who discovered his getaway. He did not respond.

As former West German Foreign Affairs Minister Gerhard Schroder left the inn, someone offered him a button which bore the words "Kidnap Kissinger?" Schroder good naturedly refused the offer.

One individual the crowd looked for, but never did see, was the Bilderberg Meetings' founder and organizer, Prince Bernhard.

It was learned Sunday that Bernhard left the meetings Saturday to fly to the bedside of his critically ill mother in Europe.

As the chill afternoon wore on, the crowd of demonstrators dwindled.

The demonstration ended when the second busload of participants pulled away.

Lin Webster of Goddard College, an organizer of the demonstration, explained the demonstrators' purpose as follows:

"It is disgusting when such people come here to play at peace and really do nothing when they are people who have the power to end the war and racism in the world.

Commenting on the ill weather, Webster said: "It's too bad. The Lord usually gives demonstrations better days."

The 1971 version of the Bilderberg meetings was only officially announced on Thursday as Prince Bernhard arrived at Boston's Logan Airport.

Most of the meetings participants arrived Thursday night. A man who participated described the meetings as "hard work, almost constant meetings."

One break from the proceedings occurred Saturday night when David Rockefeller hosted a cocktail party for participants at the Woodstock home of his brother, Laurance Rockefeller, at the head of Elm Street.

Many of the meetings' guests walked the half-mile from the inn to the Rockefeller home and got a good look at one of the loveliest sections of Woodstock.

Saturday afternoon the meetings saw their first evidence of American discontent.

About 50 persons conducted a silent vigil, organized by Woodstock County School students, across the street from the inn to protest the Southeast Asia war.

The vigil's participants managed to see to it that each member of the Bilderberg meetings found a mimeographed note of war protest at his evening meal place setting.

Tightly guarded secrecy prevailed throughout the three days of the Bilderberg meetings. The meetings were the results of 10 months of planning.

And planning is about to begin on next year's sessions of the meetings.

At the close of the sessions Sunday the following statement was issued:

"About 100 people from the United States, Canada, and Western Europe had a free and frank discussion on the two points on the agenda: The contribution of business in dealing with current problems of social instability, and the possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequences.

"The participants attended the meeting in their personal capacities, not as official representatives of their countries. In accordance with the Bilderberg tradition, no resolution was passed and no report on the discussion is being issued.

"The purpose of the Bilderberg Meetings is to promote understanding of the problems facing democracies on both sides of the Atlantic, and consequently the participants come from all walks of life, irrespective of their political leanings.

"The prince of the Netherlands (Prince Bernhard), who has presided over the Bilderberg Meetings since 1954, had to leave Woodstock Friday evening, as his mother was reported to be seriously ill."

That was all that was officially said.

While in Woodstock, Prince Bernhard occupied a suite of rooms overlooking the village green, the new Woodstock covered bridge, and Mt. Tom beyond.

RESULTS OF 17TH DISTRICT OPINION POLL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, each year that I have served in Congress I

have conducted a poll of opinion in the 17th district. The response has always been very great and 1971 was no exception. More than 20,000 people participated and several thousand of them took the time to attach a letter to their poll and express additional views.

It is impossible to cover every subject on a questionnaire but over the years most subjects are covered in some general way.

This year one change was made. The same questionnaire was submitted to all of the high schools in our district and their responses were compiled separately.

Some schools utilized the poll in their junior and senior government classes. Other schools submitted the questionnaire to the senior class exclusively. Heretofore, all replies had been compiled in one survey result. The 1971 compilation shows some very interesting differences of opinion on the part of our youthful constituents most of whom will be voting for the first time next year.

First of all, I was amazed that every high school questionnaire had been answered in totality by most of the students. Few blank spaces were left on any questionnaire. An average of 5 to 10 per-

cent did not answer most of the questions on the adult questionnaires.

Second, it is easy to see that the high school students seek more government answers to our problems than do their elders. Many questions elicited a relatively similar response but in those areas where the issue of broadened government services is presented, the high school students opted for the most part in favor of more government. This is best indicated in the questions on the national health insurance and the welfare plan.

The results are as follows:

1971 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF 17TH OHIO DISTRICT
[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you believe that balancing the Federal budget to curb inflation is more important than increasing Federal spending on domestic problems?	71.7	24.9	3.4	(c) Continuing to permit strikes in all industries after reasonable cooling-off period and negotiation.	29.1		5.9
2. To combat inflation and strengthen the economy: (Check only 1)				9. Do you believe the busing of school children to obtain racial balance should be: (Check only 1)			
(a) The administration should urge labor and management to voluntarily hold the line on wages and prices.	49.4			(a) Required by the Federal Government.	4.6		
(b) The Government should put wage and price controls into effect.	47.3		3.3	(b) Determined by State and local governments.	13.4		3.2
3. Would you favor the establishment of a new Federal jobs program in the public sector as a means of reducing the unemployment rate?	48.6	46.8	4.6	(c) Eliminated entirely.	78.8		
4. Which approach most closely parallels your thinking? (Check only 1)				10. Should the Federal Government be permitted to use wiretapping and electronic surveillance to fight organized crime?	88.5	8.6	2.9
(a) The Federal Government should return taxing authority not tax money to the States by relinquishing all or part of its taxes in specific areas such as estate taxes, gift taxes, gasoline taxes, etc.	50.1			11. Do you favor keeping a person charged with a serious crime in preventive detention while awaiting trial if the judge decides that his release would pose a danger to the community?	93.7	4.2	2.1
(b) The Federal Government should collect the taxes as it now does but return a portion of the tax revenue to the States in the form of revenue sharing with no strings attached.	44.5		5.4	12. Pollution control, to be effective, may require considerable sacrifice and great expense. Below are several suggestions which have been made. Please indicate whether you favor or oppose these proposals.			
5. A national health program for all citizens: (Check only 1)				(a) To check the rising tide of discarded junk cars (there were 23,000 in Philadelphia alone last year) a \$100 deposit should be placed on all cars at time of purchase, to be returned when sold or legally disposed of.	39.4	49.6	11.2
(a) Should be established and operated solely by the Federal Government.	25.4			(b) To prevent air pollution, unleaded gas should be required for automobiles even if it adds several cents per gallon more to the cost.	54.2	33.8	12.0
(b) Should be established by the Government but operated through private insurance and medical organizations.	32.1			(c) For beverages, all throwaway cans and nonreturnable bottles should be outlawed and deposits on returnable bottles substantially increased to insure their return.	79.2	16.2	4.6
(c) Should not be established.	39.5		3.0	13. Should the development of the supersonic transport (SST): (Check only 1)			
6. Which statement most closely parallels your thinking? (Check only 1)				(a) Be subsidized by the Federal Government.	13.9		
(a) I favor the President's proposal to reorganize the executive branch by reducing the present 12 Cabinet Departments to 8.	47.2			(b) Be subsidized through cooperative effort of private industry.	58.8		9.7
(b) I favor continuing Cabinet level departments that speak for various interest groups like Agriculture, Labor, Education.	47.5		5.3	(c) Be left to development by other nations.	17.6		
7. Do you think the "welfare mess" can be solved by the adoption of the administration's family assistance plan (FAP) which would provide guaranteed annual payments to those on welfare and also extend aid to the "working poor"?	16.7	79.4	3.9	14. Do you believe the administration is being candid in letting the American people know its intentions and the extent of our involvement in the war in Indochina?	44.3	48.8	6.9
8. To settle nationwide labor-management disputes, would you favor? (Check only 1)				15. Do you believe we should maintain a military strength: (Check only 1)			
(a) Compulsory binding arbitration in lieu of right to strike.	40.2			(a) At least equal to the Soviet Union?	52.9		6.0
(b) Compulsory binding arbitration only for industries affecting the public interest such as railroads and public utilities.	24.8			(b) Superior to the Soviet Union?	41.1		
				16. Do you believe the Soviet Union: (Check only 1)			
				(a) Will help maintain world peace?	15.4		5.8
				(b) Continues to have plans of world domination?	78.8		
				17. Would you favor sharply reducing the number of our military personnel stationed in Europe, which now totals 300,000?	59.5	34.9	5.6
				18. Do you believe President Nixon's record after 2 years in office is, in general, faithful to his campaign promises?	51.5	40.0	8.5

1971 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF 17TH OHIO DISTRICT (HIGH SCHOOL)

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you believe that balancing the Federal budget to curb inflation is more important than increasing Federal spending on domestic problems?	72.3	27.7		5. A national health program for all citizens: (Check only 1.)			
2. To combat inflation and strengthen the economy: (Check only 1)				(a) Should be established and operated solely by the Federal Government.	43.7		
(a) The administration should urge labor and management to voluntarily hold the line on wages and prices.	42.7			(b) Should be established by the Government but operated through private insurance and medical organizations.	35.7		0.3
(b) The Government should put wage and price controls into effect.	57.3			(c) Should not be established.	20.3		
3. Would you favor establishment of a new Federal jobs program in the public sector as a means of reducing the unemployment rate?	85.3	14.3	.3	6. Which statement more closely parallels your thinking? (Check only 1.)			
4. Which approach more closely parallels your thinking? (Check only 1)				(a) I favor the President's proposal to reorganize the executive branch by reducing the present 12 Cabinet departments to 8.	33.3		
(a) The Federal Government should return taxing authority not tax money to the States by relinquishing all or part of its taxes in specific areas such as estate taxes, gift taxes, gasoline taxes, etc.	32.7			(b) I favor continuing Cabinet-level departments that speak for various interest groups like Agriculture, Labor, Education.	66.7		
(b) The Federal Government should collect the taxes as it now does but return a portion of the tax revenue to the States in the form of revenue sharing with no strings attached.	63.7			7. Do you think the "welfare mess" can be solved by the adoption of the administration's family assistance plan (FAP) which would provide guaranteed annual payments to those on welfare and also extend aid to the "working poor"?	53.0	47.0	

1971 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF 17TH OHIO DISTRICT (HIGH SCHOOL)—Continued

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
8. To settle nationwide labor-management disputes, would you favor? (Check only 1)				(b) To prevent air pollution, unleaded gas should be required for automobiles even if it adds several cents per gallon more to the cost.....	66.7	33.3
(a) Compulsory binding arbitration in lieu of right to strike.....	27.0			(c) For beverages, all throwaway cans and nonreturnable bottles should be outlawed and deposits on returnable bottles substantially increased to insure their return.....	78.0	21.7	0.7
(b) Compulsory binding arbitration only for industries affecting the public interest such as railroads and public utilities.....	40.3			13. Should the development of the supersonic transport (SST): (Check only 1)			
(c) Continuity to permit strikes in all industries after reasonable cooling-off period and negotiation.....	32.3		0.3	(a) Be subsidized by the Federal Government.....	26.3		
9. Do you believe the busing of school children to obtain racial balance should be: (Check only 1)				(b) Be subsidized through cooperative effort of private industry.....	59.3		
(a) Required by the Federal Government.....	10.3			(c) Be left to development by other nations.....	14.3		
(b) Determined by State and local governments.....	41.0			14. Do you believe the administration is being candid in letting the American people know its intentions and the extent of our involvement in the war in Indochina?.....	40.3	59.7
(c) Eliminated entirely.....	48.3		.3	15. Do you believe we should maintain a military strength? (Check only 1.)			
10. Should the Federal Government be permitted to use wiretapping and electronic surveillance to fight organized crime?.....	75.0	25.0	(a) At least equal to the Soviet Union.....	53.3		
11. Do you favor keeping a person charged with a serious crime in preventive detention while awaiting trial if the judge decides that his release would pose a danger to the community?.....	82.0	18.0	(b) Superior to the Soviet Union.....	44.0		2.7
12. Pollution control, to be effective, may require considerable sacrifice and great expense. Below are several suggestions which have been made. Please indicate whether you favor or oppose these proposals.				16. Do you believe the Soviet Union? (Check only 1.)			
(a) To check the rising tide of discarded junk cars (there were 23,000 in Philadelphia alone last year) a \$100 deposit should be placed on all cars at time of purchase, to be returned when sold or legally disposed of.....	58.7	41.3	(a) Will help maintain world peace.....	36.0		
				(b) Continues to have plans of world domination.....	61.7		2.3
				17. Would you favor sharply reducing the number of our military personnel stationed in Europe, which now totals 300,000?.....	62.3	37.7
				18. Do you believe President Nixon's record after 2 years in office is, in general, faithful to his campaign promises?.....	43.7	49.7	6.7

SOUTH VIETNAMESE OFFSHORE OIL

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, I am today renewing the request I originally made on March 16 of this year for a full congressional investigation into the matter of offshore Vietnamese oil leases.

My action today is prompted by a number of factors which have come to light since the date of my original statement. Among these are the following:

First. Several additional American oil companies have responded to my letter of March 2, 1971, regarding their interests in potential offshore Vietnamese oil leases. Although these responses are generally noncommittal, they do raise to six the number of companies indicating that they either participated in or purchased the results of the seismic survey conducted off the coast of South Vietnam in 1969 by the Ray Geophysical Division of Mandrel Industries, Inc. of Houston, Tex. These six are Continental Oil Co.—Conoco—Getty Oil Co., Marathon Oil Co., Union Oil Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., and Standard Oil of New Jersey—Esso. The results of this survey have never been made public but the indications we have suggest that they were favorable.

I am including the full text of these recent letters at the end of this statement.

Second. The April 1, 1971, issue of the Journal of Commerce contained a story entitled, "Seismic Surveys Said To Indicate Rich Oil Deposits Off South Vietnam." In this article, an oil industry source states that "32 companies in all have bid on the concessions and the Saigon government has promised to award bids before June 15." The spokesman's usage of the past tense here is much more than just an interesting grammatical note—in fact it may indicate that an occurrence of major significance has taken place and that a number of American oil companies have already bid on the South Vietnamese

leases. This possibility should be investigated at once.

Again, I am appending the full text of this article.

Third. A recent letter from a State Department spokesman to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee indicates that the U.S. Government, contrary to prior reports, did, in fact, assist in the gathering of preliminary seismic data off the coast of South Vietnam during the period from 1966 to 1969. Working in conjunction with a United Nations-sponsored investigatory team, the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office provided a ship and technical assistance for the U.N. committee.

The complete text of the State Department disclosure, first inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator AIKEN on April 15, is attached.

Fourth. The Peace Education Division of the American Friends Service Committee has prepared an excellent press digest and chronology on the matter of offshore Vietnamese oil. The Friends have performed a welcome service by bringing together all of the disparate press items on this topic into one useful volume.

I am pleased to have it included at the end of this statement.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to stress again the urgency I attach to the need for an immediate investigation by the House Foreign Affairs Committee into the possibility of massive American investments in South Vietnamese offshore oil. For over 2 months I have waited for a reply from President Thieu of South Vietnam regarding his position on this matter. To date I have not even received an acknowledgement of my letter. The oil companies have responded, but their responses are vague and lacking in detail.

The morning we wake up and read in our newspapers about the agreements reached between the Saigon government and several American companies for offshore oil concessions it will be too late. We need factual information on this terribly important matter now, and a congressional investigation is the only way to get that necessary information.

Material mentioned above follows:

CONTINENTAL OIL Co.,

New York, N.Y., March 25, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ABOUREZK: In connection with your letter of March 2, 1971, inquiring about oil exploration off the coast of South Viet Nam, Continental Oil Company has no operations in the area or in South Viet Nam.

In line with our normal procedure for evaluating unexplored areas, Continental has purchased the results of a group geophysical survey of the area conducted by the Ray Geophysical Division of Mandrel Industries, Inc. At this point, we are evaluating these preliminary findings and do not know what we will do if leases in the area should be offered for bid.

I hope this answers your question, and if you have any further questions, please call upon us.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. MCLEAN.

GETTY OIL Co.,

Los Angeles, Calif., March 16, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: Your recent letter to Mr. J. Paul Getty concerning any involvement of this company in Southeast Asia has been directed to me for reply. I am enclosing, for your information, copies of two quarterly reports to stockholders of Getty Oil Company which relate activities in Indonesia.

As a resource company involved in finding and producing petroleum and other minerals to meet the constantly growing worldwide demands for energy, Getty Oil Company very carefully considers prospective exploration regions on a continuing basis. The company's principal activities in this regard are concentrated on the North American continent. The worldwide exploratory activities, as those in North America, are prudently evaluated in terms of the risk involved in petroleum discovery and economic considerations. As you know, prospective new petroleum provinces are dwindling and competition between nations and companies in the search for these vital energy sources is intense.

As it has with regard to other areas of the world, Getty Oil has obtained offshore South Vietnam seismic data, purchased from an independent geophysical contractor, and our geologists have undertaken a study of this

material. While reviewing this data, which has also been purchased by several other international companies, Getty Oil also has been considering the possibility of registering a subsidiary company with the government of South Vietnam. At this point Getty Oil Company is studying available data to determine whether or not the offshore South Vietnam seismic data supports the probability of a geological formation conducive to the accumulation of petroleum.

Consequently, there has been no decision by Getty Oil at the present time to enter a bid should the government of South Vietnam decide to hold a lease sale.

I trust this information will be helpful to you in your survey. Thank you for writing to Getty Oil Company.

Sincerely,

J. P. McCABE.

MARATHON OIL Co.,

Findley, Ohio, March 19, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: In response to your letter of March 2nd to Mr. J. C. Donnell II, I am pleased to inform you of Marathon's limited exploration, interest, and activities in Southeast Asia.

Late in 1968 we acquired a one-third interest in exploration rights of four blocks offshore Thailand located in the Gulf of Thailand. Since then our activities have been limited to some seismic and geological studies on these blocks to determine their prospectiveness with regards to finding petroleum. No actual drilling has taken place and none is planned at this time. We have generally kept abreast of the literature pertaining to offshore areas of Southeast Asia and have obtained publications containing geological and geophysical data from United Nations agencies.

We have purchased some data obtained in a reconnaissance aeromagnetic survey which included some of the waters claimed by the Government of South Viet Nam. At this time we have no plans for acquiring interests in the waters of South Viet Nam.

Late in 1969 we submitted a competitive bid on one tract located in the East Java Sea but were unsuccessful. Accordingly, we hold no rights in that area.

We hope the foregoing information is helpful.

Sincerely yours,

N. G. DUMBROS.

UNION OIL Co. OF CALIFORNIA,

Los Angeles, Calif., March 15, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: The Union Oil Company has long been interested in the economic development of countries bordering the Pacific Basin. This interest is a natural outgrowth of the fact that we are located on the West Coast and have participated in trade and commerce with the Pacific Basin countries since the early 1900's.

While we have not singled out any particular country or area we have followed developments relevant to our area of activity over the years in this broad area, and through subsidiaries hold interest in several countries.

With respect to South Vietnam, we have acquired some general exploration information by purchase. In the event the government of South Vietnam should offer offshore oil leases we have not determined what our course of action and interest might be.

Sincerely,

FRED L. HARTLEY.

STANDARD OIL Co. OF CALIFORNIA,

San Francisco, Calif., March 29, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: This will respond to your recent letter inquiring about our company's activities in Southeast Asia.

Through an affiliate, we have been engaged in exploration in Southeast Asia for more than 30 years. Our activities have included countries such as Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Australia and Thailand, as well as a number of other areas in that broad region.

In addition, through an affiliate we are a major producer in Indonesia and a major refiner and marketer of petroleum products in a number of countries of Southeast Asia and the Far East.

Inasmuch as we are engaged in major operations in this part of the world, and since indigenous energy resources are vital to continued economic growth in Asia and the Far East, we plan to continue actively our exploration efforts in the Southeast Asia region; however, we have not offered to bid on South Vietnam offshore properties.

Please let me know if we can be of any further assistance to you in this matter.

Sincerely,

H. J. HAYNES.

[From the Journal of Commerce Apr. 1, 1971]
SEISMIC SURVEYS SAID TO INDICATE RICH OIL DEPOSITS OFF SOUTH VIETNAM

SINGAPORE, March 31.—An oil industry source who has seen private seismic surveys of the ocean floor off South Vietnam believes the region may contain the richest petroleum deposits in Southeast Asia.

The source, who asked to remain unidentified, said American concerns are seeking concessions in 18 offshore areas where studies show "very promising results."

He said 32 companies in all have bid on the concessions and the Saigon Government has promised to award bids before June 15.

25 PC OF RESERVES

At stake, the source said, is access to perhaps 25 per cent of the total offshore oil reserves of Southeast Asia.

He said on the basis of seismic surveys of the South China Sea off Vietnam which he has personally studied, "it may be the best area out here."

The source, a petroleum geologist with nearly 20 years experience in Southeast Asia, said the seabeds off South Vietnam. "Figure the same geologically there at the mouth of Mekong as the area off Louisiana at the mouth of the Mississippi"—a large oil producer.

Now the oil potential off Vietnam has become an issue in the United States, the source said. "You won't find anyone here willing to talk about it and be identified. It's become a real hot potato."

Singapore is the base of offshore oil operations, mostly American, in the seas around Indonesia, Borneo and the Malayan Peninsula.

The source said seismic surveys financed by 10 American oil companies were conducted in the seas off Vietnam two years ago. It is these surveys, he said, which he has seen.

UNDERWAY AT ONCE

After the South Vietnamese Government awards the concessions for the offshore oil rights, the source said, it is estimated that work will get underway at once, unhindered by the war.

Seagoing drilling rigs would operate as much as 40 miles from shore. If they strike oil they could store it in floating tanks at sea from which it would be piped into the holds of tankers for shipment abroad.

The most likely base of operations, the source said, is Vung Tau, a city at the mouth of the Mekong River and about 40 miles southeast of Saigon.

LETTER FROM STATE DEPARTMENT TO SENATE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1971.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As Mr. Prentice indicated by telephone to Messrs. Jones and Dockery of the Committee's staff on April 1, we have discovered some additional information that indicates the United States Government did provide some indirect assistance, through a United Nations body, to scientific research on underseas mineral resources on the East Asian continental shelf including the area off the shores of Vietnam. This information was not known to us at the time of my letters to you of February 10 and 27 and has come to our attention only as a result of our continuing inquiries into the matter.

The Agency for International Development, at the request of the United Nations' Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), has provided since November 1966 the occasional services of Dr. K. O. Emery from the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute to serve on a six-member international Technical Advisory Group to ECAFE's Committee for Co-Ordination of Joint Prospecting areas (CCOP). A memorandum describing the work of the CCOP is attached. (Enclosure 1)

Dr. Emery, in his capacity as a member of the Technical Advisory Group, arranged for the U.S. Navy to permit a team of scientists to board Navy aircraft already engaged in magnetic anomaly research (Project Magnet) and a contract civilian research vessel (the R/V HUNT) engaged in hydrographic research. The Navy craft were not searching for underseas mineral deposits, but the visiting scientists were permitted to do so as long as their research did not interfere with the research missions of the craft involved. These missions were conducted widely in East Asian waters, including the continental shelf off Viet-Nam. A memorandum describing the Navy's role in this research is attached. (Enclosure 2)

The results of the CCOP research have either already been published or are soon to be published by ECAFE for public use.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in this matter please call on me.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

SUMMARY OF CCOP PROJECT

In 1966 the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) set up a committee for Coordination of Joint Prospecting for Mineral Resources in Asian Offshore Areas (CCOP). The initial members of the committee were Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines. (Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Viet-Nam have subsequently joined.) One of the first acts of the committee was to invite the participation of representatives of Germany, France, U.K. and the United States as members of a technical advisory group. As a U.S. contribution information obtained through geomagnetic surveys made by the Naval Oceanographic Office's Project MAGNET was made available to CCOP on a continuing basis. (Under Project MAGNET two planes were employed by the Navy to collect data for use in air navigation and anti-submarine warfare based upon changes in isomagnetic lines. The same information also has some preliminary applicability in oil exploration in that data collected can be used to make some judgment on the advisability of moving on to the further step of seismic exploration.) Under Project MAGNET information was collected on the East China and Yellow Seas, as well as the South China Sea and the

Mekong Delta. These data were turned over to West Germany, which had agreed to make geological interpretations of the information as its contribution to CCOP.

After review of these geomagnetic surveys and previous studies carried out by independent geologists in earlier years the CCOP decided that seismic operations were needed to provide more definitive data. After exploring various possibilities, it was decided that the best means was acceptance of an offer for joint participation of CCOP personnel in a study planned by the Pacific Support Group of the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office to collect data on ocean sea bottoms using shipboard reflection seismic and geomagnetic methods. The ship was the *F. V. HUNT*, operated by the Marine Acoustical Services Co. of Miami, Florida, under contract to the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service and directed by the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office. As in Project MAGNET, operations by the *HUNT* were carried out in the East China and Yellow Seas, as well as in the South China Sea and the Gulf of Siam. At all times scientists of CCOP countries were aboard the *HUNT*. Information collected has been published in technical bulletins of CCOP and has been made available to reference libraries in academic and governmental organizations throughout the world. Copies have also been provided, on request, to private industry.

In addition to the projects mentioned above, seismic refraction and sparker surveys were made in the southwestern offshore areas of Viet-Nam in November-December 1968. Equipment and technical personnel for this CCOP project were provided by the UK. Counterpart personnel, ships, and equipment were provided by the Government of Viet-Nam.

THE NAVY'S ROLE

The civilian oceanographic research vessel *R/V HUNT* is owned by a private company and chartered to the Navy Oceanographic Office. It has a civilian crew and embarks civilian scientific personnel for the conduct of a variety of oceanographic research projects routinely pursued by the Navy. Aircraft surveys using specially equipped Navy "PROJECT MAGNET" aircraft are frequently used to conduct a preliminary survey in advance of the work on board ship. When there is scientific space available on board during a scheduled research voyage, the Navy in the past has permitted international scientists to board the *HUNT* and collect data for their projects on a "not-to-interfere" basis with the *HUNT*'s scheduled Navy work. Unclassified portions of the aircraft survey work deemed compatible with the projects of these international scientists have been made available to them.

In mid-1969 the Navy honored such a request from a team of international scientists working under the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE). Four scientists from ECAFE's Committee for Coordination of Joint Prospecting for Mineral Resources in Asian Off-Shore Areas (CCOP—established in 1966) were permitted to ride the *HUNT* during a research voyage in the off-shore areas of the Republic of Viet-Nam, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines and the Borneo coast. Aerial survey work for this particular voyage was deemed noncompatible with CCOP projects, and no aerial data was furnished.

During the voyage, the international scientists collected a variety of data, part of which may be used in oil exploration. This data is unclassified and is expected to be published by CCOP in May of 1971 for open international use. A copy of the data was furnished to the U.S. Navy Oceanographic Office which passed it to the Department of Commerce. It has been available at the National Oceanographic Data Center, an agency of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, for use by interested parties.

The Navy conducts scientific voyages, such as that of *R/V HUNT*, to collect data for support of research and development of Navy equipment and does not make this information available for public release. The Navy does not conduct underwater surveys with the objective of oil exploration. During the 1969 voyage, the Navy provided only facilities for the CCOP scientists and exercised no influence over the type of analysis they conducted after their data had been collected. Whatever information is gathered by CCOP scientists embarked on the *HUNT* concerning mineral and petroleum resources is purely a "spin-off" from the principal effort of that ship's voyage and is collected on a "not-to-interfere" basis.

VIETNAM AND OIL: A PRESS DIGEST AND CHRONOLOGY INTRODUCTION

Public attention has been called, nationally and internationally in recent weeks to the possible relationship between the Vietnam war and U.S. policies relating to it, on the one hand, and, on the other, the possibility of discovering oil in South Vietnam's off-shore areas and the granting of oil exploration leases to foreign, including American, companies. To our knowledge, these developments have come about since the military commitment became massive, but rightly or wrongly, "the smell of oil" in international relations is always a provocative and troubling factor.

The American Friends Service Committee believes that a controversial question needs facing realistically and factually, so that relevant perceptions and actions may be based on a solid foundation and not on either scare propaganda or protective deception.

To that end, AFSC herewith initiates an occasionally-issued digest of facts and observations from public sources, as a contribution to the realistic understanding of the oil issue that has emerged in relation to the war in Vietnam.

The question of oil and the Vietnamese war is both tragically simple and shrouded in obscurity and complexity. Coloring everything that occurs in Indochina is the central fact of the war, and no one in Washington, Saigon, or a corporate office can make a decision outside this all-defining context. But, at the same time, many specific elements in the story are unknown by virtue of the anonymity of some of the actors or their desire to act without publicity. Many have made inconsistent statements; innocent factual errors have appeared in responsible oil journals; the precise importance of certain elements of the larger picture is still not wholly clear.

Nevertheless, a very great deal of reliable information about oil and Vietnam is now available. We make no pretense to have the full details, nor to understand all the motives of every actor in the intricate matter. We believe that Congress may need an official inquiry in order to disclose much important information.

What follows is taken entirely from the public record. Anyone who closely studies the existing information will understand that there are three main forces to consider when assessing the relationship of oil to Vietnam. First, an Administration in Washington seeking to retain a pro-American regime, to avoid a negotiated peace settlement which could reflect the desires of the vast majority of the Vietnamese people for peace, neutrality, and self-determination, and, many think, to achieve a "Korean solution" to the war that would leave a government in Saigon friendly to the U.S. Essential to this end is not merely the military but the economic survival of a dependent Saigon government that has neither an independent agrarian nor urban economy with which to continue, even should the U.S. ever attain its elusive military goals.

The second element is a Saigon regime with an ever-narrowing base of support, wracked by corruption and economic crisis, and aware that its existing urban sector, with its "service" orientation toward the need of U.S. manpower can most certainly collapse even with the partial U.S. troop withdrawals that have already begun to take place. Reliable data concerning the objective situation and motives of both Washington and Saigon are a matter of public record.

The third element in the picture is the role of the major U.S. international oil firms. Here much less is known, save that it is certain that the introduction of any large body of oil—anywhere—is always a potentially destabilizing factor in a tightly organized world oil industry and market. Moreover, access to low sulfur reserves, especially should the Third World oil nations continue their present independent course, would be a potential option for the international firms at some future time. For some, as well, new oil represents potential new profits. But there are many oil companies, and they differ as well as have common interests. Should two or three of the large firms (especially one as large as Standard of Jersey (Esso)) decide on a policy of major investments in Vietnam oil, what the rest do is of little practical consequence. The actions and intentions of the oil industry are the most difficult to fathom from public sources, but in areas such as the Middle East they have undoubtedly been one of the most important determinations of U.S. policy.

In the following chronology each item is headed by a main topic, with the basic point given in the first paragraph. The second paragraph contains additional details and documentation for those who desire fuller data:

November-December 1968: Oil exploration. Under auspices of the UN Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), the U.S. Navy ship *Hunt* takes geophysical survey and results in "highly successful" seismic refraction and other surveys off the southwest Vietnam coast.

UN ECAFE, *Report of the Sixth Session of the Committee for Co-Ordination of Joint Prospecting . . .*, June 26, 1969 (E/CN.11/L.239), p. 8, 66-70.

April 1969: Oil exploration. ". . . 4,000-mile seismic reconnaissance survey on the Continental Shelf off the eastern and southern South Vietnamese coast . . . data obtained will be sold to an unidentified group of U.S. and foreign oil companies."

Mandrel Industries, Houston, performs this research. *Oil and Gas Journal*, April 28, 1969, p. 56.

April 1969: Oil exploration. "Several U.S. petroleum firms are already spending millions in offshore oil exploration along Vietnam's coast . . . Experts rate Vietnam's offshore deposits to be as potentially lucrative as those in the Gulf of Mexico and Indonesia."

The Asia Letter (a businessmen's service), April 29, 1969.

November 1969: Washington. Ambassador Leonard Unger mentions to Senate Committee on Foreign Relations "one very, very large development that may take place" in Thailand and all Southeast Asia. Exploration, with "pretty good hope of finding something there," currently taking place.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *Hearings: United States Security Agreements . . . Kingdom of Thailand*. 91:1 (GPO, 1970), p. 742.

November 1969: Vietnamization. Secretary of Defense Laird informs Committee on Foreign Relations of Washington's deep concern over the economic aspects of "Vietnamization."

"Then you say: 'The economy of South Vietnam is one of the areas which needed to be strengthened.'

"Secretary LAIRD. Senator Symington, this is one of the very difficult problems that we face and one that has not been solved. The

Council of Economic Advisers sent a group out there within the last few months. We also have another group going out there within the next few weeks. And I wish that I could report to you that this problem did not exist, but it does.

"Senator SYMINGTON. I knew you would be frank and wanted to bring it out because it is obviously one of the worries we have to face in any plan for Vietnamization.

"Secretary LAIRD. It is."

U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *Hearings: Briefing on Vietnam*, 91:1 (GPO, 1969), p. 117.

Economic aid to RVN in fiscal 1970 \$614 million as opposed to peak of \$745 million in 1966. *Ibid.*, p. 118.

December 1969: Oil estimates. Industry estimates for all Southeast Asia become more and more optimistic: "... beginning of a boom."

Ocean Industry, December 1969, p. 63.

Spring 1970: Oil estimates. Industry evaluations continue to grow more sanguine and are more widely discussed in business community.

ECAFE and company studies are the basis of assessments, with South Vietnam being mentioned as "equally prospective." *Oil and Gas Journal*, April 27, 1970, p. 123; also *Fortune*, March 1970, pp. 45-46; and *Wall Street Journal*, September 22, 1970, p. 34.

David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan Bank estimates \$35 billion will be invested in Asia and western Pacific over next 12 years, mainly Southeast Asia. *Pacific Basin Reports*, May 1970.

Mid-1970: Oil exploration Mandrel Industries completes "two major contract surveys . . . off the coast of the Republic of Vietnam" for undisclosed sponsors. Later in the year "a group of major oil companies" has it resume offshore Vietnam survey.

Ampex Corp. 1970 Annual Report: *Third Quarter Report*, Ampex Corp.

May 1970: Oil estimates. ECAFE issues reports that feed optimism on East Asia offshore oil promise.

UN Press Release ECAFE/671, May 7, 1970; UN Press Release ECAFE/674, May 22, 1970.

June 1970: Oil estimates. Future of Vietnam oil linked by major industry journal to the political-military outcome of the war.

"The projected work pace for all of Asian Pacific could turn out to be woefully conservative, depending on how long it takes to settle the war against the communists in Vietnam. If and when the U.S. wins its objectives there, oil exploration conceivably could be successful enough to turn that part of the world into another South Louisiana-Texas-type producing area. This would be one of the biggest booms in the industry's history. It all depends on the Vietnam war, how long it takes to get the job done and how well the job is done." *Petroleum Engineer*, June 1970, p. 51.

August 1970: Saigon & Vietnamization. "If the economic situation continues to deteriorate it could seriously undermine both the Vietnamization program and the political stability of the Thieu regime, say worried U.S. and Vietnamese officials."

Wall Street Journal, August 24, 1970.

Summer-Fall 1970: Saigon & Vietnamization. Vietnamese inflation worst in world of 50 countries ranked, 1969-70. The previous year it ranked third. "The economy is Thieu's Achilles' heel." State Department official admits.

Business Week, October 24, 1970; also First National City Bank *Monthly Economic Letter*, September 1970, p. 103.

"Early last year, my colleagues and I were convinced these [economic] problems were becoming more serious than the military threat and if left unsolved might undo everything that had been achieved." Ellsworth Bunker, January 21, 1971 speech in *Department of State Bulletin*, February 15, 1971, p. 209. See also *New York Times*, December 27, 1970.

September 1970: Saigon leases. Saigon soon

expected to parcel our 18 offshore regions for oil exploration, mainly to Americans.

Wall Street Journal, September 22, 1970.

October 1970: Saigon. Semi-official agency, with help of U.S. AID (Agency for International Development) issues a book appealing for foreign investment.

Authored by an American law firm with branches in Thailand, Indonesia, and the Dominican Republic, some of whose members were recently U.S. officials, *Doing Business in Viet Nam* (Vietnam Council on Foreign Relations) is subsequently distributed free by Saigon Embassy in Washington. *The Asia Letter*, October 27, 1970, p. 4.

November 1970: Oil exploration. Esso drilling in its Malaysian concession bordering Vietnamese offshore region results in "significant discovery." Supplements seismic exploration with vital drilling information.

"Most observers agree that these discoveries will focus lots of interest on the South Vietnam offshore tracts when they come up in the near future." Esso had four or five drillings with which to estimate promise of region. One well flows at 3000 barrels a day. *Petroleum Engineer*, November 1970, pp. 46-47.

December 1, 1970: Saigon. Promulgation of petroleum law, 011/70, modeled after Thai law written with assistance of Walter Levy, oil industry's leading consultant.

New York Times, April 2, 1971.

Terms of law very generous to foreign investors by world standards, "competitive enough to attract the much needed capital and know-how of foreign investors." *Vietnam Economic Report* (Saigon), January 1971, p. 2 [also Embassy of Vietnam, Washington, *Viet-Nam Bulletin*, January 25, 1971, p. 2].

December 20, 1970: Saigon leases. Saigon will offer leases on its offshore shelves, and oil firms are expressing interest. Meetings between oil firms and government will begin next February.

New York Times, December 21, 1970.

January 1971: Oil estimates & Saigon leases. "Green Light for Oil Men." "Somewhere in the continental shelf off the South Vietnamese shore lies hidden one of the most spectacular petroleum deposits in the world."

Vietnam Economic Report, January 1971, p. 1. Of all sources, Saigon generates the most optimistic, enticing estimates.

January 8, 1971: General. *Le Monde* scoops the issue of oil in its larger political, diplomatic context.

Leading Southeast Asia authority, Jacques Decornoy, asks what assurances Washington has given oil firms.

January 8, 1971: General. Cambodian Government of Prince Sihanouk issues detailed statement on Indochinese offshore oil.

Peking Review, January 22, 1971, pp. 16-17.

January 18, 1971: General. Another Mother for Peace raises the question of whether oil leases are related to slow American troop withdrawal from South Vietnam and launches national campaign for Public Hearings before Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Associated Press Wire Story, January 18, 1971.

January 21, 1971: Washington & Vietnamization. Ambassador Bunker outlines gravity of economic aspects of U.S. partial withdrawals, outlining need to attract American creates an economic climate foreign investments.

"Therefore, an effective strategy must be designed to further participation in foreign trade and to attract private investment from abroad. All of you here today can help to forge and further this strategy. I think you may also serve your own economic best interest, as well as America's and Viet-Nam's, by convincing other American companies of the merits of doing business here. The recent petroleum law and the new investment law now before the upper House indicate the Government's desire to create a flexible long-term investment policy which will serve Viet-Nam's interests while at the same time it

creates an economic climate foreign investors will find attractive. . . . Everything I have been discussing until now may be put under the heading of Vietnamization." Speech to American Chamber of Commerce in Saigon, *Department of State Bulletin*, February 15, 1971, pp. 209-10.

Late January 1971: Saigon leases. 22 oil companies, mainly American, express interest in offshore concessions. Saigon hopes to have bidding procedures ready by late February or March.

Oil and Gas Journal, January 25, 1971, p. 3; *Los Angeles Times*, February 1, 1971. From this point onward, inconsistent reports on the time for opening bids become more frequent.

January 1971: Vietnamization. Asian Development Bank report, with American direction, outlines need to bring massive private investment into Vietnam to prevent the collapse of Saigon economy during phase of partial American troop withdrawal.

Loss of U.S. direct spending could create serious crisis in economy. Report predicates a "Korean solution" to the war, a military victory for Saigon, and at least 25,000 U.S. troops stationed in Vietnam after 1975. *Le Monde*, February 9, 1971.

February 7, 1971: General. Soviet officials point to large role oil discoveries have played in U.S. policy in Indochina since early 1970. Agence France-Presse February 7, 1971 dispatch from Moscow; *Pravda*, February 23, 1971.

February 11, 1971: Washington and Vietnamization. Administration to send David Kennedy, former Treasury Secretary, to Saigon to discuss "ways to combat inflation and keep the economy on an even keel as American troops continue to withdraw."

New York Times, February 12, 1971. George Shultz had at the end of 1970 already been to Far East to work on same problem. *Business Week*, March 20, 1971, pp. 72-73.

February 10-27, 1971: Washington. State Department denies oil is of any significance whatsoever in U.S. policy in Indochina.

In correspondence with Senator Fulbright and public statements, State Department admits, however, "It is difficult to say when South Viet-Nam's offshore oil prospects were first recognized but it certainly was some years ago." Implies Saigon has no plans for granting leases, and that value of offshore oil is unknown. Concedes Esso has raised issue with State Department. *Congressional Record*, March 11, 1971, 6076-6078; *New York Times*, March 17, 1971.

February 15, 1971: Saigon leases. Saigon will issue invitations to bid about mid-March, and discuss terms with bidders about mid-year.

Oilgram, February 12, 1971, p. 3; also *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly*, February 15, 1971, p. 5.

Senator Jacob Javits, March 9, 1971, in a letter to Another Mother for Peace, released information that oil companies will submit bids from February through May, sign contracts during September and October, and will begin exploration early in 1972.

Late February 1971: Washington. Informal State Department assurances and encouragement to oil companies discussed by Congressman William Anderson and others.

Boston Globe, February 22, 1971; *Congressional Record*, March 10, 1971, 5871-5872, and esp. 5876-5877.

Despite Secretary Rogers' March 16 denial, on April 2, 1971 the *New York Times* wrote that "State Department officials said today that it is 'quite true' that the United States is seeking to encourage investment in South Vietnam to help its economic development."

February 24, 1971: General. The PRG (National Liberation Front) denounces Saigon oil law, declares Saigon future concessions null and non-bidding.

Le Monde, February 27, 1971.

March 6, 1971: Saigon leases. Final bidding to occur by May. Saigon sends delegation to Iran to tap its knowledge of industry.

"... the authorities in Saigon are evidently looking forward to a rush of applications from world oil companies... reflects confidence that oil will start flowing commercially very soon." *Far Eastern Economic Review*, March 6, 1971, p. 38 [also *Congressional Record*, March 15, 1971].

March 6, 1971: Saigon leases. Esso, Gulf, Shell, ERAP "are among those reportedly interested in bidding." U.S. firms have "informally" discussed the matter with State Department.

Business Week, March 6, 1971, p. 36. This is first major national U.S. press discussion of issue. By this time the press in France, Japan, and Sweden had fully discussed political implications and facts regarding oil.

March 10, 1971: Saigon leases. Gulf Oil and semi-governmental Japanese corporation form an agreement jointly to seek and exploit Vietnamese concessions.

Authorized capital \$2.2 million, joint operation might spend \$55 million on exploration its first five years. *Financial Times* (London), March 11, 1971; *Yomiuri*, March 10, 1971.

March 10, 1971: Washington. "Defense Department offers to help foot investment insurance to U.S. companies for any future offshore South Vietnam oil exploration and development."

Issue is not yet resolved whether the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), the new federal agency with a public-private board of directors which is taking over and expanding the private foreign investment assistance and insurance programs of AID, headed by AID's John Hannah, will assume task. "... some companies have approached State and Defense departments on matter." *Platt's Oilgram News Service*, March 10, 1971, p. 5.

OPIC board's March 8 meeting considered insurance for Vietnamese offshore oil investments. *Village Voice*, March 25, 1971.

Mid-March 1971: Oil companies. Congressman James Abourezk surveys oil firms as to their plans regarding concessions, with important favorable responses.

Esso "would be interested in being advised of the specific terms and conditions." Phillips does not preclude investing. Tenneco will "give it serious consideration." Gulf, in principle, will do so if terms are right: "we are obliged to play our cards close to our chests... so far as future plans are concerned." Mobil says it depends on conditions. Marathon admits it is following matter, as does Union. Getty actively interested. *Congressional Record*, March 17, 1971, 6951-6953, and letters in Congressman Abourezk's possession.

Mid-March 1971: Saigon leases. Saigon has set March 20 as bid deadline and will open them in April. Implies bids have already been submitted.

Oil and Gas Journal, March 15, 1971, p. 40.

Forbes, March 15, 1971, corroborates this general timetable, but also raises grave reservations regarding the wisdom of the oil strategy.

March 22, 1971: Vietnamization. "Thieu also has a personal stake in advancing the cause of oil: lucrative deals could solve Saigon's chronic economic crisis, and thus help him get re-elected next October."

Newsweek, March 22, 1971. "... it is no secret that leading American officials would prefer to see another Thieu victory." *New York Times*, December 27, 1970.

March 26, 1971: Saigon leases. Top Saigon oil official states that 28 oil firms, mainly American, have expressed interest in leases.

Le Monde, March 26, 1971.

April 1, 1971: Saigon leases and Vietnamization. While at least 28 firms are busy exploring leases, Saigon must work out some ambiguities in its regulations. Saigon sees oil as a lever by which to ease its "critical economic situation."

Washington Post, April 2, 1971.

April 1, 1971: Saigon leases and oil estimates. Report that 32 firms have already bid for concessions, awards to be made by June 15. Major oil deposits involved.

Seismic data show "very promising results," "it may be the best area out here." 25 percent of Southeast Asia's offshore reserves may be at stake, and work on concessions would begin at once, as much as 40 miles from shore. "You won't find anyone here willing to talk about it and be identified. It's become a real hot potato." *Journal of Commerce*, April 1, 1971.

Story not immediately confirmed, and on April 6 Dispatch News Service International claims Saigon has temporarily suspended bids as a result of anti-war movement's protests over issue. This story also not confirmed.

CONCLUSION

There are some obvious and unavoidable conclusions from the available data.

The Nixon Administration has often expressed the desire and made clear its intention to sustain the Thieu-Ky regime. In addition to military support, it seeks to sustain Saigon's economy. Oil investments would clearly be a means toward that objective. The Administration has clearly and publicly articulated this strategy, for example, as expressed by Ambassador Bunker. To the extent that it succeeds, oil investments help create for the Administration the economic and political prerequisites for a protracted conflict in Indochina, and therefore it is seen that one cannot divorce the oil question from the large issue of the Indochinese war.

The Saigon administration regards oil as one means by which to sustain its economy, as well as a source of private and governmental revenues. From this viewpoint, Saigon must make oil investments as enticing as possible, without hesitating, as public data reveal, to make enormous claims about what indeed seems a promising situation.

Linking Saigon's extravagant estimates of yet unknown oil riches with the fervent hopes of the Nixon Administration's "economic Vietnamization" program, one can reasonably conclude that preservation of the status-quo and the Thieu-Ky regime is a strategy which also insures protracted war in Indochina.

Quite as essential to both Washington's and Saigon's strategy is the oil industry's acceptance of the proposition that massive quantities of oil may be found in Vietnam safely exploited. Since oil firms are, of course, keenly aware of the risks of investing in Vietnam, they must also require formal investment guarantees and informal urgings, encouragement, and even assurances. Existing information leads one to believe such inducements will be forthcoming if the Nixon Administration is free to pursue this course. The result would significantly assist the continuation of the war and a long-range commitment to U.S. military presence as well as the maintenance of a Saigon regime that is one of the major obstacles to the establishment of peace.

As for the oil companies, it is certain that their offshore explorations and nearby drillings have all produced an encouraging mass of data, enough to cause them to prepare to bid—if they have not already done so. The extent of their investment cannot fall to be related intimately to the larger military-economic context, including Washington's actions. Some of the biggest oil companies have already expressed their interest by deeds and words, in obtaining access to offshore Vietnamese oil. Should this pattern continue and expand, a new group of politically and economically powerful firms with a vested interest in protecting the Thieu-Ky (or a similar) regime will also emerge. That would be a major guarantee that the war in Indochina would continue.

If peace is our interest, it would seem the wiser course to discourage the pressures for immediate opening up of the South Viet-

namese area oil reserves, until a time when post-war rearrangements and settlements and the creation of a government which truly expresses the will of the Vietnamese people have made oil exploration a less internationally and militarily volatile proposition.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we Members of the U.S. Congress are moved by an unusual demonstration of patriotism. And, when such a display of loyalty and love for country comes from a member of our younger generation it is all the more meaningful, especially when so many youngsters are flagrantly demonstrating their disrespect for our system of government and for our American flag and its symbol of freedom.

Nella Arnold of Millwood, Ga., has written a paper on freedom. It is titled "Freedom—Our Heritage," and I believe that Nella has written her paper from a deep sense of love of country. I am proud of this young woman and her commitment to her country. Her paper is included at this point:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

(By Nella Arnold)

"The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time," Thomas Jefferson spoke.

Long before the first American colonies were in existence, the people of England were gradually laying the foundations of our liberties, building up those institutions which have made us a free nation. Those who came here were the heirs of great political traditions.

"What sought they thus afar?

Bright jewels of the mine?

The wealth of seas, the spoils of war?

They sought a faith's pure shrine."

They sought to develop, in the new world, a government that would give them freedom such as their ancestors had been struggling for: a government to secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and for those who would dare to follow them.

The interest of the newcomers was not in treasure, but in beginning a new life, a life in which they would be free, among other things, to worship God as they chose.

One writer observes, "At best, men cannot be simply free or simply happy in being free. They must be doing something with their freedom."

The Englishmen who came wanted to build a heritage which would secure a better way of life for their children. They planned to build a land freedom could own. They chose to build a land whose ray of peacefulness could guide others to freedom. They chose to build America.

America meant freedom of religion. Each man brought with him his own beliefs.

And America meant freedom to earn a better living. She served as a refuge for those unfortunate people who were not only jobless but homeless.

Emma Lazarus spoke for America in her poem "The New Colossus":

"Give me your tired, your poor,

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.

Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost

to me.

I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

America. As a fortress, she stood tall in the night, offering everything that her name represented to all who would call her home. America stood for many things.

America meant freedom to share in government, freedom to talk over political matters, freedom to criticize the government, its officers, and laws. America meant freedom to make plans for common action. It can only happen here: free speech, free opinions, even for the youth of the land.

When my forefathers fought for freedom of choice, they fought for individualism—for the ability to speak out and make their opinions known. They fought for “freedom to learn enjoyably, freedom to express learnedly, freedom to share the knowledge they had, wisely, and freedom to lead others to freedom.”

Now. “This is my country, land of my choice . . . What difference if I hail from North or South—from East or West? My heart is filled with love for all of these.” Freedom has been made mine.

Freedom to laugh, to cry, to love—freedom to dream and make dreams come true—to ride my bike down a country trail, and freedom to walk down that same path—freedom to choose from a dozen different religions, and, yet, I can feel truly safe being part of this “one nation under God”—freedom to choose my friends, to plan my life, freedom to explore and discover—freedom to understand—and freedom to ask questions when I don't understand.

I have told of my heritage. I can accept no other. I am a product of Freedom's Heritage.

A LONG-AWAITED, BADLY NEEDED NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is time to review the progress of our transportation policies in this country. In our history we have seen the emergence of the water-carrier, the horse-drawn vehicle, the development of the railroad, and marine carriers; we have seen the invention of the gasoline engine, trucks, and buses, the laying of pipelines, the emergence of air carriers, and the use of electrified lines—on the surface, above the ground, and under the seas. America can be proud of the tremendous progress she has made in the development of our transportation into the highly complex and sophisticated systems we know today.

Mr. Speaker, with each of these individual modes of transportation, however, we have developed an individual policy to govern it. While one scientific breakthrough served as a basis upon which further progress could be made, our policies did not build upon each other, nor often did they even relate to each other. Our transportation policies are like a group of horses before a wagon, with separate reins controlling each horse. It is sometimes inefficient and confusing.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we form a team out of these horses with one driver steering the course. In 1966 we took a great step in this direction by forming the Department of Transportation, collecting all of the various agencies involved with Transportation. We have now hitched

the horses. Now we need to take the reins. On May 21, 1970, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee urged the formulation and statement of a policy by the Secretary of Transportation. The committee pointed out that previous expressions of policy dated back as far as 30 years and varied with the mode of transportation. The Secretary was encouraged to coordinate development and improvement of all modes and to review the relationship of economic regulation to other aspects of transportation policy. For better coordination, the committee suggested that the Secretary recommend incorporation and consolidation of decisions, policies, rules, and regulations of regulatory agencies of transportation. The establishment of a national, unifying, transportation policy was to have been issued within a year. This call was issued on May 21, 1970—nearly a year ago. And we have not yet seen such a statement of policy, so desperately needed in our transportation governance.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the need for coordination and its dependence upon a statement of policy. I now point to the outcome of the two steps: better regulation. With the issuance of a policy statement by the Secretary, we can coordinate our policy planning. We can carry those plans through to the performing elements—the carriers themselves. No longer will each mode of transportation plan independently of the other modes, but as a team which can better serve the transportation needs of this country. This can only be done by consistent and coordinated planning.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we have come a long way in making good use of our transportation system. But we must not be satisfied in our past accomplishments. We must continue to develop systems and policies which will meet our needs. I therefore call upon the Secretary of Transportation to acknowledge the grave need for a policy statement and to complete and issue his findings to that end immediately.

The establishment or announcement of a National Transportation policy is a difficult and complex matter. But a policy should be announced now—even though it may not be the final policy. To delay means we are heaping confusion and disorder on top of a fast changing technology, so the policy must be announced. If it is not soon, then the Congress ought to give serious consideration to stop or delay any further piecemeal legislation until the policy is announced.

Mr. Secretary of Transportation, the Congress is waiting on you—for some 2 years now.

PEOPLE'S PEACE TREATY

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the concept of a peace treaty between peoples, rather than between governments, has a strong idealistic appeal.

Because most Americans hope for an

early peace in Indochina, with the repatriation of our Armed Forces and, particularly, of our men held as prisoners of war by the Hanoi regime and the Vietcong, it is reasonable that some Americans would be attracted to a document which has been circulated under the heading, “A Joint Treaty of Peace Between the People of the United States, South Vietnam and North Vietnam.”

This purported treaty deserves most careful examination by anyone approached to subscribe to it. Scrutiny will make plain that the document contains terms substantially in accord with the demands put forward repeatedly by the Communists at the Paris peace talks.

The principal undertakings would be placed on the United States, and, specifically, there would be no obligation on Hanoi to release our men held prisoner—only to “enter into discussions.”

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include a statement of the Department of State with reference to the treaty, as follows:

“PEOPLE'S PEACE TREATY”

A number of college students and others have requested the views of the Department of State on a “Joint Treaty of Peace between the People of the United States and the People of South Viet-Nam and North Viet-Nam” which is currently being circulated by the National Student Association.

PROVISIONS OF “TREATY”

This document: Demands “immediate and total” withdrawal of United States forces from Viet-Nam, but says nothing about withdrawal of the North Vietnamese forces from South Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia.

Places the communist side under no obligation to release the Americans they hold prisoner, and requires Hanoi only to “enter discussions” on the question.

Obligates the United States to remove the government of South Viet-Nam, a government which was constitutionally elected to office by the people of that country.

Contains no provision for ending the fighting in Laos or Cambodia, other than a reiteration of intention to respect the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962, which have been violated by North Viet-Nam ever since.

Contains no provision for international supervision of the implementation of any of its terms.

The provisions of this paper are in essence the same terms which have been put forward repeatedly over the past two years by the communist delegation in Paris. They have not proved acceptable to any political group in South Vietnam except the Viet Cong.

WHAT'S BLOCKING PROGRESS TOWARD PEACE?

The United States and the Republic of Viet-Nam have proposed a program for peace which includes an immediate cease-fire throughout Indochina under effective international supervision; withdrawal of outside forces; a political settlement in South Viet-Nam which reflects the existing relationship of political forces; an Indochina peace conference; and immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war held by both sides. Our two governments have stated that we are prepared to negotiate seriously on the basis of these proposals. At the same time, we are prepared to discuss the proposals of the communist side as well, without any preconditions.

The communist response has been an adamant refusal to engage in discussions on a peace settlement unless their demands are accepted in advance. It is this position which has blocked any progress toward peace. It is this position which those who want peace should try to change.

LACK OF CONSCIENCE

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I enclose herewith a copy of an excellent editorial entitled "Lack of Conscience" broadcast on several occasions in the recent past by WEEI radio station in Boston. The editorial was written and broadcast by Mr. Donald J. Trageser, vice president, CBS Radio Division and general manager of WEEI radio.

It is my hope that the 3 years of service required of a conscientious objector by a vote of the House of Representatives will be altered in the version of the draft bill which will shortly be before the U.S. Senate.

The editorial follows:

LACK OF CONSCIENCE

The national House of Representatives has voted to extend the draft for two years after June 30. Before sending the measure to the Senate, the House approved sizable pay raises for servicemen. Several efforts by anti-war factions were defeated, but one change backed by the conservative Armed Forces Committee did get through. This was an extension from two to three years a conscientious objector must serve in non-military duty. This won fairly substantial approval; more than 100 votes was the margin. It seems congressmen were swayed by arguments that draft dodgers use CO status to avoid military service. This, of course, is true enough; but it's the reasons the conscientious objectors have for avoiding military service that seem to have escaped the majority in the House. By adding the extra year to non-military service, congressmen will punish men with genuine and long-held religious and non-violent principles. This is immoral, probably unconstitutional, and a direct slap at the selective service system itself.

As any young man with CO status knows, you have to earn it. You have to convince selective service, through the draft board, that you are sincere. This is a long and difficult procedure, and when the draft board does approve a man as a conscientious objector, it certainly must be the board's opinion that it is making a good decision—that the young man cannot serve for highly personal reasons. As a substitute, two years of non-military service is justifiable if we accept the selective service precept that all young men have a two-year military obligation. By adding an extra year of non-military service, the House of Representatives is saying that conscientious objectors should be given extra duty and thus be punished for their views. And to WEEI, this is un-American and unfair in the purest sense. It is unpatriotic to punish men for religious or political views. It is un-American to legislate non-violence into the realm of cowardly unpatriotic sentiment. The extra year of service shows a lack of faith in men with the courage to stand up for principle and personal belief, and lack of faith in a system that determines the depth of a man's convictions.

WEEI in this editorial is not evaluating the concept of military conscription. Rather we say that until the system is changed, it must be operated in good faith. This entails hopes the amendment extending conscientious objector non-military service by a year will be eliminated by the Senate in the interest of fair play.

COMMUNIST-INSPIRED MARCH ON WASHINGTON HAS BEEN A FLOP

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the current convergence on Washington, sponsored by various new left organizations, has proven totally counterproductive. For this the Nation is indebted to the Washington police, the National Guard, and other military units which clamped down on the troublemakers by promptly making several thousand arrests before the criminal-minded element could do very much of the damage they planned.

Of the several marches and demonstrations in recent years, the current one—more than any of the others—is more glaringly revealed as Communist inspired. Although it appears that a good many naive good-intentioned people were sucked into the protest activity, the leadership of the movement has been clearly exposed as pro-Communist and anti-American.

That fact was made crystal clear by Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., when in a recent interview in Prague he was quoted as saying:

We are just now entering a new phase of opposition to the Vietnam War . . . during the coming days there will be massive demonstrations in Washington.

It has become increasingly clear that these extremists are using the war issue as a phony excuse for promoting a revolutionary movement in this country. Let us keep in mind that the grand strategy for these demonstrations has been spearheaded by such characters as David Dellinger, Rennie Davis—both of whom were convicted with the Chicago Seven—and Sidney Peck—the latter a former Communist Party official.

In the May 5 issue of the Review of the News, an authoritative publication, there is an article entitled "Seven Days in May," written prior to current demonstrations by Paul Scott. It contains some revealing information concerning sponsors of the current protests. A copy of the article follows:

SEVEN DAYS IN MAY

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon faces a confrontation here in the streets of the nation's capital and the halls of Congress far more dangerous than that on the battlefields of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

Violent-prone, pro-Hanoi anti-war groups have set up a dozen operational headquarters here for their massive "Seven Days in May" demonstrations to disrupt the federal government and force the President to govern by martial law. The boldness of their operations is clearly indicated by their establishment of an advance command post on Capitol Hill to coordinate legislative anti-war activities with those in the street.

Offices of several antiwar Congressmen, centering around Representative Ronald Dellums (D-California), who traveled to Stockholm, Sweden, late last year to attend

the Soviet-oriented anti-war strategy sessions, are being used by the Far Left activists and those who want to destroy the American form of government.

Activists include David Dellinger and Sidney Peck, pro-Red coordinators of anti-war groups and long-time figures in the street protest movement. The two activists are working closely with key strategists of John Gardner's "Common Cause" lobby to use the May demonstrations to mobilize nationwide opposition to using U.S. military forces in defense of South Vietnam. The secret strategy of the new anti-war alliance calls for the forces of Gardner's "Common Cause" to take the so-called "high road," attacking President Nixon and his Vietnam policy on the political-legislative fronts and through the mass media.

Immediate objective of the Gardner group is to create public support for adoption of a Congressional resolution forcing the withdrawal from Indochina of all military forces—land, sea, and air—no later than June 30, 1972. Significantly, this deadline is four months before the next Presidential election, or just before the two major political parties will hold their conventions to nominate candidates.

In other words, the Gardner group wants Congress to do what the Moscow-Peking supported North Vietnamese have been so far unable to do—force the U.S. to abandon the 50 million residents of Southeast Asia to the Communists.

Dellinger's and Peck's anti-war groups along with the National Welfare Rights Organization led by George Wiley, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference headed by Ralph Abernathy, and the National Student Association led by David Iishin, are taking the so-called "low road." Their mission is to organize and radicalize the street demonstrations and mass protest meetings here so their participants can be used to shut down the federal government with carefully planned acts of civil disobedience and violence.

Information gathered from police departments around the country reveals that upward to twenty hard-core revolutionary groups will take part in the violent demonstrations scheduled to begin early in May and run through the month.

One of these Communist-infiltrated groups will be the bomb-throwing Weatherman faction of Students for a Democratic Society. Others will be Maoist anti-war groups from the West Coast. Advance units of these militant Vietnik operations already are on the scene here. They are preparing the way for 500 buses, thousands of cars, and several trains to bring anti-war demonstrators to the nation's capital for the hit-and-run protests. One objective is to bring about a nationwide strike on college campuses.

Scouting parties from these antiwar groups, most of whom are hardcore Communists, for the past three weeks have been touring government buildings with cameras and picking targets to attack, seize, or set afire on Capitol Hill and in other areas of Washington.

While many of the demonstrators and protesters are against violence, police officials here are deeply concerned that anti-war "sappers" will be brought into the city to try to stir the demonstrators to violence. There are even unconfirmed reports that the "sappers" will try to shoot one or more of the women or black protesters in an effort to cause a massive riot.

The anti-war groups are now distributing a 45-page manual of operations for the May offensive here. It includes details of how the members of the "anti-U.S. Army" can live

off the land while launching guerrilla warfare against the U.S. Government.

Several of the militant groups have been secretly trained in acts of civil disobedience ranging from "sit downs" in government buildings to blocking auto traffic on Washington's main roads and bridges. There are also plans to set parked cars afire in order to tie up traffic. The more violent demonstrations are to take place from May first to May eighth.

THE NEW PHASE

The worldwide significance of the coming "May Day" demonstrations was clearly indicated recently by Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in an interview with Radio Prague (Czecho-Slovakia). On his way to Moscow to attend the Soviet Party Congress, Hall reported:

"We are just now entering a new phase of opposition to the Vietnam War . . . during the coming days, there will be massive demonstrations in Washington. In other words, we are entering a period of truly active resistance to that war, and I believe that we will finally be victorious."

In addition to massive acts of civil disobedience designed to force President Nixon to rule with military troops in the streets, the anti-war demonstrators are planning a number of terrorist activities to try to show the world that our nation's capital is not any safer than Saigon.

Federal security authorities have been put on the alert by the F.B.I. to expect other bombings, like the recent blast at the Capitol, during the May demonstrations. One militant West Coast anti-war group, two of whose members are being sought for questioning in connection with the Capitol bombing, is known to have discussed placing bombs in a number of federal buildings including the Capitol.

A government informant in the anti-war movement has warned that the violent-prone members of anti-war groups are now lining up churches in the Washington area to store guns and fire-bombs for use during the demonstrations. Large numbers of guns stolen in nearby Baltimore may have been slipped into Washington for use by some of the terrorists.

All this adds up to a coming confrontation in the streets of Washington more serious than any faced here since the anti-war protests got underway in the mid-Sixties. The revolutionary movement has made it clear that it hopes to force President Nixon to announce a timetable for withdrawing from Vietnam and then force him from office. The Vietnam issue, defused in the elections of 1968 and 1970, now becomes the paramount issue of the days ahead.

LAW DAY 1971

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, May 1 of every year is, by proclamation of Congress, "Law Day" in the United States. It is a day when every American should stop for a moment, and reflect upon the importance of the laws under which we live. It is a day when each of us should be thankful for the protection under the principles of liberty, justice, and equality that we are all afforded by our laws. Yet, at the same time, each of us must rededicate ourselves, on this day, to an even

greater and more far-reaching attainment of these ideals.

In the last several years, we have become increasingly aware, and continue to become painfully aware, of inequities within America which are preventing the attainment of the goals we seek. These inequities must be eliminated if we are to attain the kind of government our Founding Fathers envisioned, as do we all. In doing so, however, we cannot disregard the rule of law, for in doing so we destroy the very things that we are working to attain. We cannot create laws by breaking them. We cannot allow ourselves to let the turmoil of rapid social change obscure our awareness of the fact that we are, and must continue to be a society ruled by laws.

The theme of Law Day 1971 is "channel change through law and reason." It is essential that we recognize the true import of this message.

The law is not only the statutes and precedents set down in the books, it is equally the mechanisms and institutions. It is the courts—from the smallest municipal magistrate to the Supreme Court of the United States. It is the legislatures—from the smallest town council to the U.S. Congress. These institutions must be responsive to change. Our legal system will falter if sufficient attention is not devoted to the courts. We need administrative reform, more judges, additional paraprofessional help to speed court action. Change cannot be channeled through the law until the mechanisms of the legal system are equipped to handle the change.

Not only must our citizens and courts recognize this, but so should the legislator.

It is up to us, the Congress, to use our finely tooled legal system to effect the changes so necessary in our society.

CINCO DE MAYO

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 109 years ago today, in the Mexican city of Puebla, a small, courageous band of Mexican patriots repelled a well-prepared force of French troops led by Napoleon III.

This victory, in the face of superior odds, led to the creation of "Cinco de Mayo" as a national holiday for Mexico. This day recalls the courage and spirit of that brave group of defenders and symbolizes a victory of the human spirit over all military odds.

Mexico, after gaining independence from Spain in 1822, witnessed many years of violent and bloody changes in government. During this period and until the 1860's foreign powers looked at Mexico as ripe for annexation. In the 1860's, Benito Juarez established a progressive government, but, due to financial crisis, was unable to pay foreign debts contracted by his predecessors.

This action led to intervention by the Spanish, French, and British who established an occupation force in Vera Cruz. In 1862, the British and Spanish withdrew, leaving France—under Napoleon III—and to pursue their schemes alone.

About 6,000 French soldiers left Vera Cruz to seize Mexico City but were met by Mexican patriots at Puebla—a strategic city halfway between Vera Cruz and Mexico City. Here, on May 5, 1862, the outnumbered Mexicans, under the leadership of Ignacio Zaragoza, routed the powerful French forces and drove them back to the sea.

This victory was short lived, however, and the French ultimately captured Mexico City and installed Archduke Maximilian of Austria upon the throne. His rule was completely dependent upon the French troops, and when the United States demanded the withdrawal of the troops, Maximilian was deposed by the Mexicans.

Thus, May 5 commemorates a day of triumph, patriotism, and love of country. On this day, I take pride in joining with our neighbors to the south in recalling the great sacrifice, the burning desire to be free, and the courage of those who fought in Puebla, and in rededicating ourselves to our principles for which they believed so deeply.

FORT WORTH EXCHANGE CLUB HONORS BEEMAN FISHER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 22, the Fort Worth Exchange Club honored my good friend, Mr. Beeman Fisher, by presenting to him their Golden Deeds Award for his civic work and community contributions. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the article which appeared in the Fort Worth Press, which covers more fully than I could the great work Mr. Fisher has performed for his city of Fort Worth. I can think of no one individual who deserved this award than did Mr. Fisher.

The article follows:

[From the Fort Worth Press, Apr. 22, 1971]
WHAT MAKES FISHER RUN?—GENTLENESS,
ALERT MIND, DISCIPLINE, CURIOSITY

(By Ken Milstead)

What makes Beeman Fisher run?

A business associate will tell you his feel for people and his ability to understand what the public wants.

His wife will tell you his gentleness, his alert, keen mind and his self-discipline.

Fisher will tell you: Curiosity.

Each description fits together to sum up a man who started out in life "just looking for a job" and rose to head one of the state's biggest electric companies.

Today, at 72, he's still on the go consistently and is active in a variety of organizations and civic movements.

The retired board chairman of Texas Electric Service Co. has been chosen to receive the Golden Deeds Award from the Exchange Club

tonight for his civic work and contributions to the community.

Although retired, he is still a consultant to TESCO, and his other activities include chairman of the TCU New Century Program, board member of the TCU Research Foundation, vice chairman of the board of the Assn. for Graduate Education and Research.

He's the newly elected president of the Texas Water Conservation Assn., director of the Texas Research League, Texas Historical Foundation, Southwest Exposition and Fat Stock Show and the Fort Worth Art Assn.

His list goes on. He has served as president of the Fort Worth and West Texas Chamber of Commerce, Exchange Club, Fort Worth Progress Inc., and Junior Achievement of Tarrant County.

He's a member of the executive board of the Longhorn Council of the Boy Scouts of America, and holds scouting's Silver Beaver Award.

Born on a farm near DeSoto in Dallas County, Fisher says he had no definite ambitions when he got out of high school—just to find a job.

A friend got him on as a copy boy with the Associated Press in Dallas, and he worked his way up to night wire editor.

Then came along this offer to go to work for Texas Power and Light as editor of their employe magazine.

Fisher was apprehensive about it. Wasn't sure it was what he wanted, so he worked two jobs, moonlighted on the TP&L and kept up his work with AP.

Finally settling for the TP&L job, he went from there to a San Antonio radio station, and returned to the utility business with TESCO in 1938.

He was to blaze an impressive trail with the company, becoming its president and later board chairman, helping mold the corporation into a giant company.

"I was fortunate," Fisher says in reflecting on his career. "I kept pretty busy. I didn't lose any time, and I had the advantage of being around older, more experienced men who taught me a lot."

He started with TESCO as an assistant to the president, then to vice president—and on up the ladder.

He says his newspapering helped him in his later career as a utilities executive in that he developed a keener curiosity about things around him.

In summing up a formula to success, he says, "No man ever got anywhere without being curious."

"You must know what's going on around you. Learn all you can about your responsibilities, those of others and about the entire operation."

One of Fisher's characteristics, pointed out by both his wife and his business associate, Burl Hulsey, now TESCO president, his ability to recognize the talents and potentials of others.

Both describe him as an "organizer" capable of picking key people to carry out a job and keep things running smoothly.

To Hulsey, Fisher is a "great guy, very people-oriented and interested in what's going on around him and in what the company's doing."

This keen interest, coupled with his gentleness and poise, is what attracted Mrs. Fisher when she first met her husband-to-be.

They first met in a horse barn in Colorado during an inspection by a group of people of a lake project TESCO was involved in. Mrs. Fisher was at the time an assistant professor in the English department at TCU.

"He's one of the most disciplined, poised people I've ever met," she says of her husband. "He goes through life pretty unruffled and doesn't get upset or irritated."

"He has a keen mind," she continues, "is a very organized man and knows how to get

things done, and he has a great respect for the skills and abilities of other people."

Mrs. Fisher is also impressed by her husband's sense of humor. She finds his understanding of other people almost uncanny.

"He knows what I'm thinking before I know myself," she chuckles.

Fisher's understanding of other people also impresses Hulsey.

"He has his fingers on the pulse of the public at all time," Hulsey says. "He knows what they expect and what they react to."

Hulsey believes Fisher's background as a newspaperman provided the backbone for his knowledge of successful public relations, which proved an asset to TESCO's growth and public image.

But while Fisher is proud of his days as a newsman and still has many friends in the business, looking back is not one of his characteristics.

"He's the kind of a man who is always looking ahead to the future," Hulsey explains. "He seldom looks back or talks much about the past."

PRESIDENT MUST HAVE FREE HAND

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in one of the more intriguing pastimes in which we can indulge is to review subjects and commentaries long after the furor of the moment. Then we can see clearly whether or not analyses made at the time were at all accurate or possessed of clairvoyance.

This morning, as I checked through some files on Vietnam, I came across an editorial in the May 6, 1970, San Diego California Union. This editorial commentary was written at the height of the debate over the U.S. incursion into Cambodia.

Certainly, a year later this editorial makes interesting and still pertinent reading.

The editorial follows:

DESPITE SENATORS' RHETORIC: PRESIDENT MUST HAVE FREE HAND

An accusation by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the President is "taking over" the war and treaty-making powers constitutionally entrusted to the Congress must be marked down as propaganda in its war on the White House.

The committee knows better.

With the blessing of its chairman, Sen. J. William Fulbright, the committee approved the following resolution on Aug. 7, 1964:

"The Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as commander-in-chief, to take all necessary measures to prevent further aggression (in Vietnam)."

"Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the charter of the United Nations, and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is therefore prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

This is exactly what we are doing in Southeast Asia today as we help South Vietnam resist aggression by Communists.

The question of the fine line dividing congressional and executive authority is not new.

Abraham Lincoln as president had little choice but to respond immediately in May of 1861 when Ft. Sumter was attacked in the first shot of the Civil War. Americans shot back at Pearl Harbor even without waiting for the President to act.

The Truman Doctrine of aid to Turkey and Greece was instituted without prior approval of the Senate. Marines went to the assistance of Lebanon in 1958 at that country's request and again to the Dominican Republic in 1965. President Kennedy did not wait for Congress in the Cuban crisis of 1962.

Treaties commit this nation to the defense of 42 other nations. These include 21 in our own hemisphere under the Treaty of Rio; 14 European Nations under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and seven Asian nations under SEATO. We also have mutual or cooperation treaties with Nationalist China, Japan, the Philippines and Korea. Executive policy statements oblige us to defend a number of countries and we have a commitment to some form of collective defense to 126 others under the United Nations charter.

We simply cannot, as Sen. Mike Mansfield naively suggests, "do away with all these powers . . . clear the table and start from scratch."

To do so would abdicate our responsibilities as a world leader and abandon our essential credibility as a member of the community of nations.

However, this is long-range and academic. In the immediate sense, the President as commander-in-chief of the armed forces has moved to protect the lives of Americans threatened on the battlefield.

Would the Foreign Relations Committee desire the responsibility for the lives of these men? What would they propose to do?

PRIDE OF PUBLIC TELEVISION— WQED, PITTSBURGH

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on November 16 and December 22, 1970 it was my privilege to call to the attention of the Congress WQED's special month-long community effort designed to attack the national problem of drug abuse.

"The Turned-On Crisis" consisted of more than 120 hours of prime-time special programs focusing on drug information, rehabilitation, prevention, and legislation, as well as the convening of town meetings and community-based minimeetings held throughout western Pennsylvania.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which made the series available nationally last winter, has presented its first Community Service Award to WQED-Pittsburgh for this distinguished public service program.

I salute WQED, our country's first community educational television station for mobilizing their creativity, ingenuity, and professionalism to help solve one of our major social problems, and to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for recognizing this outstanding achievement.

A recent article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette is included at this point in

the RECORD for the additional attention of my colleagues:

NATIONAL ACCOLADE FOR WQED

Public television has come of age in Pittsburgh. Last year the staff of WQED-TV conceived an ambitious, multi-pronged attack on the problem of drug abuse in Western Pennsylvania. The impressive result was "The Turned On Crisis"—a month-long series of televised town meetings, documentaries and commercially-produced films dealing with the drug scene.

The imaginative enterprise of WQED staffers has been rewarded. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting has presented its first Community Service Award to WQED for "The Turned On Crisis." In so honoring Pittsburgh's outstanding public television station, John W. Macy Jr., president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, declared that the award was given the provocative series "for the fresh and moving way it dramatizes a very critical problem; for the camera's perceptive illumination of the human face in moments of intense suffering; and for its impact on the community and the young."

Perhaps the most amazing achievement of the WQED team which produced the "Turned On Crisis" was its success in enlisting the services of professional men, narcotics experts, law enforcement officers and private citizens in a creative joint effort.

WQED has proved conclusively that public television programs need not be pallid imitations of commercial network offerings. A fortunate community must needs be grateful that the creativity, resourcefulness and energy of the dedicated WQED staff have been duly recognized.

THE "GOOD WILL" GENERATED BY THE PEACE CORPS AND VISTA SHOULD BE SENSIBLY PRESERVED AND CONTINUED

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the renowned educator and distinguished president of Clark University in Worcester, Mass., Dr. Glenn W. Ferguson, recently testified, in opposition to the administration's proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1, before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization and Government Research of the Senate Government Operations Committee.

I am sure that the authoritative testimony and recommendations of Dr. Ferguson for the prudent preservation and utilization of the good will and valiant spirit embodied in the Peace Corps and VISTA concepts and impacts will be most informative and interesting to the Members of Congress and RECORD readers and I wish to include Dr. Ferguson's statement at this point:

STATEMENT BY GLENN W. FERGUSON, PRESIDENT, CLARK UNIVERSITY, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT RESEARCH, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. SENATE, MAY 4, 1971

For a decade, Peace Corps Volunteers have lived and worked in a growing number of lesser-developed countries. For six years, VISTA Volunteers have lived and worked in the environment of poverty in forty-nine

states. From their inception, both programs have enjoyed unique bipartisan support in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. During the critical growth period, that bipartisan support insured the requisite funds, national leadership, and sustained commitment. Now, both programs, which have been nurtured through three successive national administrations, are being subjected to political controversy which has little relationship to the pressing needs of underprivileged people at home and abroad.

Based on the demonstrated performance of VISTA and the Peace Corps, the proponents of any change in organizational base, objectives, or national image should be assigned the burden of proof. For the following reasons, I believe that Reorganization Plan No. 1, as proposed by President Nixon, falls to discharge that burden and should be vetoed by the United States Senate.

The Peace Corps and VISTA were national responses to viable concepts. They were created to tap the service motivation of young Americans, in age or spirit, who wanted to make a personal contribution. Each program incorporated a unique mystique which induced individual Volunteers to serve with minimal pay and maximum challenge.

When VISTA was created, we experienced great difficulty in telling our story to the American people. In spite of the differentiation between foreign and domestic service, it took more than one year to establish the image of a "domestic peace corps" and to convince interested Americans that service at home could be as stimulating as the romantic appeal of service abroad.

National recruitment for volunteer efforts is an illusive and risky venture. The Peace Corps was launched by a charismatic President. VISTA was launched by overwhelming public support for a "War Against Poverty." In spite of the resulting mystique and the subjective identification of young Americans, both programs suffered acute growing pains.

In contrast to ten years ago, contemporary young Americans have few heroes; however, they still identify with Peace Corps and VISTA objectives. Reorganization and centralization will eliminate symbols which cannot be easily replaced. If VISTA, as an entity disappears, Action, as a new entity, will not automatically replace it as a recruiting device. Reorganization, articulated in economy and efficiency terms; will not motivate the youth of America.

Volunteerism is not an objective *per se*. It merely constitutes one available resource which can be applied to the realization of national goals. President Nixon has stressed the importance of organizing by function; however, Reorganization Plan No. 1 assumes that voluntary service constitutes a common thread which justifies the creation of a new Federal agency. If function or purpose were the rationale for the current reorganization proposal, it would be logical to assign the Peace Corps to the Department of State and VISTA to HEW or HUD.

Peace Corps and VISTA Volunteers are not "volunteers" in the traditional sense of individuals who devote part of their leisure time to community service. Part-time voluntary service, at the local level, has been one of the cornerstones in the development of the American community. It is estimated that more than eighty million Americans are "volunteers," in this context, and they have been responsible for organizing a great range of services from the Volunteer Fire Department to the Thanksgiving basket for the indigent.

In contrast, Peace Corps and VISTA Volunteers are full-time employees who request permission to serve and who receive minimal compensation, but who, in most other respects, cannot be differentiated from regular staff members in a variety of agencies. If volunteerism, as represented by VISTA

and the Peace Corps, justifies the merger, then "volunteers" in the Armed Forces of the United States should also be considered for membership.

The Reorganization Plan suggests that the new agency, Action, would serve the needs of the Volunteers rather than the needs of the people where the Volunteers are assigned. This concept perverts a decade of selfless effort and makes the Volunteer the recipient rather than the conduit of assistance. VISTA and the Peace Corps represent different environments, reflecting different service motivations, and the organizational distinction should be perpetuated.

Under the proposed merger, Action could become a holding company which would incorporate six presidential appointees at senior administrative levels. With four presidential appointees at the associate director level, it is probable that each would be responsible for a major constituency. For example, given the sensitive negotiations with foreign governments which are required in administering the Peace Corps program, it would be essential to assign one associate director to the unique Peace Corps portfolio. As a result, the reorganization would merely superimpose another administrative layer which would increase the expense, the flow of paper, and the potential of failure.

It is being suggested that Action, as a new agency, will facilitate economy and efficiency. Nine existing volunteer-related groups, with a combined budget of \$176 million, which includes a generous increment of \$20 million to discover new ways to use volunteer services, would be merged. Without increasing the total number of volunteers, without creating a new rationale for national service, and without insuring that the recruiting base is solid, the Congress is being asked to authorize an additional \$20 million.

Even if the Peace Corps, VISTA, and the other smaller volunteer programs were not merged under an umbrella agency, current state and local proposals may provide formidable competition for the national agencies. In Ohio, Governor Gilligan has announced the creation of a state-wide volunteer program, and in Massachusetts, Governor Sargent is considering several ideas which would provide state support to local voluntary groups.

In urban America, there is a growing awareness that local problems will only be solved when continuing local commitment is assured. The Volunteer, recruited from outside sources, can serve as a catalytic agent, but his leadership role, which he has discharged in recent years, is in jeopardy. In the early days of VISTA, it was standard procedure for a community to request a contingent of VISTA Volunteers which would establish and administer a local project. Today, those same communities have developed the personnel resources and the pride to limit VISTA involvement to providing a scarce skill or to serving in a training capacity. VISTA Volunteers are still essential, but in many projects in many communities, the nature of their assignments and their relationship to the local staff are changing.

In this evolving scene, the VISTA Volunteer and the VISTA program are recognized and understood. To eliminate VISTA, and to create a new national agency with a new set of objectives, would probably be counterproductive.

President Nixon suggests that new national priorities justify the centralization of all national volunteer efforts. Unfortunately, the new national priorities are not clearly delineated. If one of the priorities is to minimize the volunteer as a resource in assisting needy people at home and abroad, that national objective warrants close scrutiny.

At a time when good will is in short sup-

ply, and when few national programs enjoy extensive support, I hope that the Peace Corps and VISTA will survive

TINICUM ENVIRONMENTAL
CENTER

HON. LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1971, I introduced H.R. 7088, to establish the Tinicum Environmental Center. Under this bill, the Secretary of the Interior would spend up to \$4 million to acquire within the Tinicum Marsh all of the land necessary to preserve, restore, and develop it as a prime habitat for many wildlife species, as a feeding and resting place for migratory wildfowl, and as a place where our people can observe nature and enjoy recreational activities.

My bill was cosponsored by 23 of my Pennsylvania congressional colleagues plus Congressman JOHN HUNT of New Jersey. In response to my request, Senators HUGH SCOTT and RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER are introducing the same bill in the Senate. This will permit simultaneous consideration by both Houses of the Congress and hasten the day when the Tinicum Environmental Center will become a reality. H.R. 7088 had its beginnings last summer when I established the Local Community Representatives Committee to work with the Interior Department's Tinicum Marsh Task Force. The objective was to obtain support of the residents and officials of the municipalities surrounding the marshland in behalf of this most practical preservation of Pennsylvania's last remaining true tidal marshland with its rich ecological and historical values.

"PEACE" LEADERS

April 24, 1971, brought the beginning of another round of professionally left-organized activity in behalf of immediate U.S. unilateral withdrawal from South Vietnam. The prime movers flew under the titles of the National Peace Coalition and the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice. Both operated with Communist support. Among the top leadership of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice were Gilbert Green and Jarvis Tyner, both members of the Communist Party's National Committee. Working with them were such notorious "peace mob" leaders as David Dellinger and Rennie Davis.

The stated objective of these "peace" leaders was to compel the Congress to "ratify" the "Peoples Peace Treaty" which, drafted in Hanoi, is in complete accord with the Communist position in North Vietnam. It is completely obvious that the real objective of this leadership is not peace, but humiliation of the United States, furtherance of Communist seizure of Southeast Asia, and general advancement of communism over human freedom and self-determination.

This is not to suggest that all those who participated in these demonstrations were Communists nor pro-Communists.

Quite the contrary; many of them would not knowingly associate with Communists and truly desire peace, as we all do.

ACCELERATED WITHDRAWAL

On April 7, 1971, President Nixon announced that between May 1, 1971, and December 1, 1971, 100,000 U.S. troops would be withdrawn from South Vietnam. This would decrease to 175,000 the total number of U.S. troops remaining; about one-third of the more than 540,000 troops who were in Vietnam when Mr. Nixon assumed the Presidency on January 21, 1969.

As April 1971, drew to an end, the some-281,000 U.S. troops still in Vietnam were being withdrawn at the Nixon-announced accelerated rate of some 14,000 per month compared to the previous Nixon-assigned rate of 12,500 per month.

All of this certainly continued to justify Mr. Nixon's assurance that the U.S. involvement in Vietnam was coming to an end in a manner commensurate with his goal of a generation of peace. It also continued to justify my support of the Nixon Vietnamization program as a great improvement over the lack of planning which, under President Johnson, brought constant escalation of a "no win" war and its American casualties.

"SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is acquiring some interesting evidence of deceptive editing techniques in the CBS presentation, "The Selling of the Pentagon." For example, correspondent Roger Mudd's filmed interview with Daniel Henkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, was cut from 42 minutes to 2 minutes, 4 seconds. One question, mismatched with an answer to a question not asked in the presentation, made Mr. Henkin appear evasive and bureaucratic, rather than a competent public official with a background as a sophisticated military affairs reporter.

The inquiry into this news distortion problem is being conducted in consideration of H.R. 7346, Representative WILLIAM MINSHALL's "truth in news broadcasting" bill which I cosponsored. This bill would amend the Federal Communications Act in a manner that would address itself to this problem of imposing upon an unsuspecting public slanted statements and opinions which film clippers and producers have imposed upon the public in grave disservice of the public's "right to know." Nothing could be more vital to the interest of honest, uncensored journalism and a properly informed public, both enjoying freedom of the press, as well as the responsibility to that freedom which often seems ignored.

CALLEY PRECEDENT

There are growing indications that, if the U.S. Army wishes to prosecute everyone really responsible for the so-called Mylai massacre, it should prosecute officers right straight up the line through ranks and positions far superior to those of the court-martial-convicted Lt. William Calley. There is a growing feeling that, if the Army wishes to be consistent with its Calley precedent, it should take identical action against others who func-

tioned, and who issued orders, under the Army's top-echelon decision, years ago, to wage the Vietnam conflict as a limited warfare of counterinsurgency.

One of the earliest lessons that our men learned in Vietnam was that an "innocent looking peasant village" could be a Vietcong stronghold and death trap for American troops. Another "earliest lesson" was that a Vietcong guerrilla could be of either sex, of any age, and would appear friendly and helpful by day; but, by night, become a maniacally-driven American-killer. In short, there is abundant cause to view Lieutenant Calley as the ultimate of an American officer who took seriously his training and instructions as to how this unusual war should be fought.

INTEREST RATE CONTROL ACT

On March 10, 1971, the House, with my support, passed H.R. 4246, the Interest Rate Control Act. This was a good bill. It did the following: Continued the ceilings on interest rates, continued the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, and included \$20 million of authorized funds to permit implementation of provisions giving the President the right to freeze wages and prices in event his efforts to gain voluntary controls are ignored by labor or business leaders. I believe that this was a power which the President needed. I would personally urge him to use this power should he find it necessary to help end the inflation which continues to devalue the American dollar, price American products out of world markets, and add to our unfavorable balance of payments and current economic agony.

DEBT LIMIT

On March 3, 1971, the House voted to increase the public debt limit by another \$35 billion; from a ceiling of \$395 billion to a ceiling of \$430 billion. I voted against this action for the same reason that I have voted against every such action that has increased public debt to the point where, by fiscal year 1973, which will begin July 1, 1972, interest, alone, on the public debt will substantially exceed \$30 billion per year. As I have said, repeatedly, our economy simply cannot survive a continuation of deficit spending. Long years of this Democratic-begun technique of Government spending of more money than it takes in have created inflation; threatened the dollar; increased prices, taxes and interest rates, and made it increasingly more difficult for individual citizens and the Government, itself, to resolve problems of housing, and other national problems.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT INCREASE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the 10-percent increase in railroad retirement benefits approved by this body will bring relief from the throes of inflation for the many retirees covered by this pension system.

There is little doubt that the payments made by these retirees over the years have been eroded away by a long period of rising prices and living costs. The dollars poured into the system no longer have the purchasing power they did when first paid. Thus it is only right that a compensatory increase be made to cover this loss benefit.

With the decline in the railroad industry, the railroad retirement fund is losing money. For every three people that receive benefits only two people are paying into the system. The Commission authorized to look into all aspects of the system should seek to complete its work no later than the end of this year.

Additionally, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should investigate the possibilities of permitting retirement under the system at age 60 or after 30 years of service. With the many idle workers in the industry, retirement of the older employees will permit young workers with families to continue on the job.

The 10-percent increase is essential and I sincerely hope that this Congress will bring true reform to the entire railroad retirement system. Too many people depend on these payments to carry them through their elderly years to ignore the problem any longer.

**BILL JONES AND JACK DYKINGA—
CHICAGO'S MOST RECENT PULITZER PRIZE WINNERS**

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Chicago Tribune observes, "Chicago is the Nation's most stimulating newspaper town and best served by its newspapers." Two of Chicago's newspapermen have just won the most coveted award in professional journalism—the Pulitzer Prize.

For his excellent investigative reporting of abuses in ambulance services, William Jones of the Chicago Tribune was awarded his prize. The splendid photos of Jack Dykinga of the Sun Times on the "Mentally Handicapped in Two State Schools" won a Pulitzer for him.

The history of Chicago journalism is a victory of great journalists. The work of Bill Jones and Jack Dykinga are a part of that history and now their own peers have awarded them the supreme accolade—the Pulitzer. I want to congratulate these two fine men and add my praise for their superlative achievement.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune and Chicago Sun Times both ran editorials commending Bill Jones and Jack Dykinga. Those editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 5, 1971]
WINNING A PULITZER

There was a demonstration in the Tribune newsroom Monday afternoon. Nothing really disorderly, somewhat disruptive, quite emotional is the way it could be described. It

erupted when Bill Jones came in from an assignment outside the office.

He was greeted by cheers and whistles and a rush by reporters, editors, photographers, copy boys and girls, artists and secretaries to offer their congratulations. Later the hubbub dissolved into a champagne party in the photo lab and it was joined by the publisher and a collection of vice presidents and fans of the editorial department from all over the Tower.

That's how we reacted when one of our reporters won a Pulitzer Prize—the most sought after award among journalists. The scene didn't exactly follow the script our readers might have expected if they had formed their conception of newspapermen and women by reading fiction and watching movies and TV.

The stereotype of the blase, cynical, hard-boiled newshawk no longer applies—if it ever did.

We are delighted to have won the prize because it carries recognition by members of our craft for distinguished work. It is particularly pleasing that we won in a category where first class investigative reporting was required.

The Tribune takes very seriously its self-imposed assignment as a guardian of the public interest. The assignment has led to campaigns that have curbed abuses in public administration and private management and has given us a reputation for being a tough, crusading newspaper.

In Bill Jones' expose of abuses in ambulance services and the collusion of public officials, however, the approach was disciplined and rational rather than sensational. The facts were carefully and painfully collected, checked and verified. The investigative resources of the Better Government Association were skillfully woven into the project to reinforce the validity of the findings.

The project was a triumph for a crusader's zeal. It was not marred by a crusader's fanaticism.

This is the fifth time a member of The Tribune staff has won a Pulitzer. Will Barber, a foreign correspondent, won the prize for his coverage of the war between Ethiopia and Italy in 1936. John T. McCutcheon and Carey Orr won prizes for cartoons in 1932 and 1961. George Blais, who later joined the B. G. A. staff, won Pulitzer in 1962 for exposing corruption in the Sanitary District.

We have had many other fine entries that have not won—the most exceptional one being the Save Our Lake campaign which started in 1967 and was a major factor in the upsurge of concern about our environment which has swept the nation.

We hope there are many more potential Pulitzer winners waiting for recognition in our splendid news staff and we are confident that there are.

We are also pleased that two of the prizes came to Chicago newspapers, even tho the other one went to our morning rival, the Sun-Times, for Jack Dykinga's photography.

It is testimony to an observation newsmen often make. Chicago is the nation's most stimulating newspaper town—and the best served by its newspapers.

[Editorial in Chicago Sun-Times, May 5, 1971]

Photographer Jack Dykinga now follows cartoonists Jacob Burch and Bill Mauldin and writers Tom Fitzpatrick and Charles L. Bartlett, as members of the Sun-Times who have won the Pulitzer Prize, the highest award of American journalism.

Dykinga, like most winners, is constantly outstanding. We are especially proud of Jack's award. We are especially proud of Jack's award. The subject was "Mentally Retarded in Two State Schools." The stories by Sam Washington and Jerome Watson,

which went with the photos, have already won esteemed awards.

Photos and stories alike told the sorry truth of the miserable inadequacies of State institutions.

As for all other winners of the Pulitzer, we rejoiced, yes, in their good fortune, but most of all, in their good work.

"THIS CHILD IS RATED X"

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, the National Broadcasting Co. presented a moving documentary entitled "This Child Is Rated X" which dealt with the treatment of juveniles by courts, jails, and detention homes.

I am today inserting in the RECORD a transcript of this program, together with articles from the Christian Science Monitor and New York Times. In order that our colleagues might have an opportunity to listen to these children and to learn about conditions in the institutions charged with rehabilitating them, I have arranged with NBC to have a special showing of the program here at the Capitol next week. As soon as the details are completed, I will contact each office regarding time and place. I have also urged the network to schedule another nationwide viewing, since many missed the program Sunday night.

Too often our acquaintance with social problems is limited to what we read in books, committee reports, or the newspapers. This television program provides us a more intimate and human look at one of these problems.

A great percentage of the children at the institutions pictured have committed no crime. They are there because they are "hard to handle," or because their parents did not want them, or "for their own protection." A substantial number of children have not had even minimum procedural protection or due process, but have been signed over to these "homes" under an "agreed judgment"—without a hearing or a consultation with a lawyer.

A few of the problems in the institutions can be attributed to overcrowding or poor staffing, and some problems might be helped by additional money. However, we are already spending \$8,000 to keep one child for a year in a typical institution. This is 3½ times the amount the administration wants to give a welfare family of four. It is obvious that we are not getting much for our money.

What we need more than money is a change of attitude. For too long we have used detention as a way of removing persons with problems from our sight and minds. Judge Horace Holmes spoke directly to this problem in the program:

Everybody we don't like, we can't get rid of—we have to live with them. And this is what the kids are saying too. They say we've got to live with one another. If we listen to them, maybe we'll learn something.

The material follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
May 3, 1971]

JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN

Last night also included a program that demonstrates splendidly how television can serve a cause in a way no other medium can.

NBC News's "This Child Is Rated X" deals with a subject that's been handled in the press before—the victimization of children by courts and jails in the United States. Yet the disbelief, the helplessness, the baffled spirit visible in the startlingly angelic faces of the youthful prisoners added a dramatic poignancy to the familiar prison problems covered by the press over the past few years.

Subtitled "An NBC News White Paper on Juvenile Justice," it was not a shock documentary—despite its appalling facts—but an apparently dispassionate review of how various states handle the young people who become their responsibility. The material was so horrifying that no fancy productions were evident. Just Edwin Newman—who must be the busiest newsman on the air—doing his usual good job describing what happens when a boy or girl is unfortunate enough to be caught out after curfew or—in some states—merely to be signed away by parents.

Not only are most adult legal rights missing from the process, as portrayed here, but the youngster may be flogged on the soles of his barefeet like a prisoner in 18th-century Turkey, or perhaps raped by a gang of homosexuals—as learned from obviously honest interviews with the victims themselves.

And didn't I detect an extra-hard edge to the questioning by the interviewer, a new kind of esprit that just might be emerging through the conflict TV news has been having with the federal government lately? In any case, he didn't let official spokesmen get away with bland nonanswers. He pinned facts on them and demanded an accounting. As director-writer-producer of the program, he deserves acknowledgement: Martin Carr.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1971]

TV: JUVENILE OFFENDERS: "THIS CHILD IS RATED X" GIVES A CHILLING PICTURE OF THE WAY YOUNG ARE TREATED

Unfortunately for viewers who don't pay much attention to program listings, one of the more valuable, and valuably disturbing, of recent news specials slipped almost unheralded last night onto the home screens served by the National Broadcasting Company. "This Child Is Rated X: An N.B.C. News White Paper on Juvenile Justice" was precisely the type of television program that merits advance discussion and recommendation. But for various ornate reasons N.B.C. has a policy against the pre-reviewing of its programs. Go fight N.B.C.

Outstanding credits for producing, writing and directing the program go to Martin Carr, who also produced the much-lauded "Migrant" news special that was shown on N.B.C. last July. With Edwin Newman as narrator, "This Child" faced the horrifying fact that each year almost a million children pass through this country's court system, detention facilities and training schools, and that while many of them go in as relatively harmless juvenile offenders, too many of them emerge as hardened criminals.

"The system," Mr. Carr argues, "does not dispense equal justice to black and white. The system does not dispense equal justice to rich and poor. The system does not distinguish between the neglected child and the delinquent child. The system has not seen fit to give its children the same legal protections it has given its adults."

Traveling to various parts of the country, including Cook County Jail in Chicago and the Indiana Boys School, alma mater of Charles M. Manson, "This Child" let the

children who were in, or had gone through, the system tell their own stories, which were then verified with juvenile authorities. Obviously anyone tackling the subject of brutality and insensitivity in the juvenile detention system is going to run up against the accusation of "coddling." Mr. Carr, carefully included spokesmen for the authoritarian side of the argument. He fully recognized the serious problem of the gully child who has committed a very serious crime.

His main concern, though, was with the child who had done something considered to be a crime only because he is a child. In the Indiana School, for instance, sixth largest in the nation, more than half the offenders are there for offenses such as running away from home, breaking curfews or being hard to handle. A study by two criminologists, the program noted, has found that if present laws were strictly enforced, 99 per cent of all children could legally be locked away.

Mr. Carr's interviews with several children, most of them seemingly rather reticent, revealed the outlines of an almost Dickensian nightmare in some cases. The apparent availability of drugs, from acid to heroin, was casually accepted, along with widespread homosexuality and lesbianism. Poorly qualified custodians were linked to vicious and arbitrary punishments. Due process for the child was shown, could be skirted by obtaining the signatures of naive or ignorant, though perhaps well-meaning, parents.

Only in Boulder, Colo., was there found a rare reason for hope, in the person of Judge Horace B. Holmes, the presiding juvenile court judge. Whenever it is possible, he prefers to keep the child out of detention and within the community. Detention "is a way of getting rid of our problems," the judge maintains. "We've done it in mental health. . . . Everybody we don't like we can't get rid of—we have to live with them."

Throughout the system the program found men aware of the problems but too often tending to fall back on the excuse that this is "part of the problem of large institutions." "This Child Is Rated X" and N.B.C. have forcefully dragged that problem out of the institutions into the public arena.

THIS CHILD IS RATED X: AN NBC WHITE PAPER ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

Boy (OC): Sometimes it's, it's slapped in the, the face. And sometimes it's it's the paddle. Like up in, like up in detention they usually give you the paddle before they slap you.

Boy (OC): When they hit ya, they make sure it hurts. They try their best to knock you cross the table when they hit ya.

Leroy Neu (OC): There's not enough punishment. There are not enough juvenile delinquents being committed.

Girl (OC): When you're in a institution with all girls, and there's no males around, I mean lots of girls have low, high sex.

Girl (OC): It's nothing to see two girls holding hands going down the hall or something like that.

Girl (OC): Well, if they're hipped on the drug scene they can get maybe a couple tabs acid or something.

Moore (OC): You know, the schools have failed. The juvenile authorities have failed. The police have failed. The psychiatrists, the social workers, everybody, the preachers, everybody has failed.

Girl (OC): I landed up in jail. All I did, I cried cuz I was so scared. I stayed back from everybody else.

Dr. Menninger (OC): If people have enough money of course they never go to jail, you know that. Jails are for poor people. Jails are for black people. And jails are for children.

Boy (OC): This place don't help you any, just keeps you away from home, that's it.

Leroy Neu (OC): Beyond any question, the youngsters who are there, deserve to be there.

Boy (OC): I ain't planning on going to prison.

Carr (VO): Think it might happen?

Boy (OC): Yeah, it could.

Newman (OC): More of our children are in trouble today than ever before. Twice as many, in fact, as ten years ago. An estimated one million children will be arrested this year and begin a journey through a system of justice from which many will never emerge. A system run by a special set of rules—special because they apply only to children.

There are whole categories of crimes that are crimes only for children. Crimes like running away from home . . . truancy . . . being out too late at night. Children are not given the benefit of a "trial" to deal with these crimes. They get a "hearing" which can send them away to institutions where they remain until the authorities feel they are ready to leave or until enough time has passed so that they are legally no longer children.

Last year 162,000 of our nation's children were locked in institutions that most of us have heard of, but a few of us have ever seen.

But recent stories are beginning to force the public to pay attention to these places.

In Iowa, a girl is thrown into jail because she runs away to get married: she hangs herself. She is 16-years-old.

In a children's detention center in New York, four children attempt suicide within ten days.

In Missouri, a 17-year-old is homosexually assaulted and kicked to death by jail cellmates.

Another 17-year-old is murdered in a Miami jail.

NBC News spent the last seven months investigating our system of juvenile justice. We visited juvenile courts, detention centers, and reform schools across the nation. We chose to let the children in the system tell you their own stories . . . stories we verified with the juvenile authorities. We would like you to remember two facts as you listen to them: half the children in America who are deprived of their liberty and sent to correctional institutions have done nothing that would have been a crime for an adult. And half the children in those institutions will come back to them—having committed a more serious crime. We choose three areas of the country to examine closely. Tonight we present our results.

Newman (VO): Chicago will soon boast a building a mile high. Its crime rate is also sky high, rising 14 times faster than its population in the last ten years.

Cook County Jail, copied from a 19th century French prison, was built to hold 1300 people. It now holds almost twice that number. Three hundred are juveniles—accused of serious crimes. None of them has been convicted. Some have remained behind these bars as long as two years, getting a glimpse of their parents only on infrequent visiting days. Juveniles in Cook County Jail are certain to be poor and almost certain to be black. They are crowded into prison just as they were crowded in Chicago's crime-ridden ghettos. They have in fact exchanged one ghetto for another.

Producer Martin Carr spoke with a 14-year-old prisoner about life in jail.

Carr: How long have you been here?

First Boy: Four months, going on five.

Carr: Five months.

First Boy: Um.

Carr: That's a long time.

Up in here it is. Time pass slow.

Carr: Time pass slowly.

First boy: Uh huh.

Carr: Did you ever get to meet anybody that's committed serious crime?

First boy: Yes.

Carr: Like what?

First boy: Johnny Villos.
 Carr: Um.
 First boy: I met him.
 Carr: What'd you talk about?
 First boy: Well, why he do it, what he do it for. For a reputation he said.
 Carr: What does it make you think about?
 First boy (OC): Me. Well I figure if I had a big reputation like that I would be mighty important.
 Carr: Do you think he's mighty important?
 First boy: Yes.
 Carr: What did he do?
 First boy: Killed a policeman.
 Carr: Killed a policeman. And that made him important.
 First boy: Yes. I guess so.
 Moore: You know, a lot of people are—and you in particular feel that they see 14 or 15 year olds—in jails, and you say, oh my, what a shame. They shouldn't be in here. Yet the victims—the victims of the crimes they have committed shouldn't be in the graveyard either. This is the one thing that disturbs me. Nobody is concerned about victims—you know, the hardships that these kids have . . . upon people in the community—you know, you are no less dead whether you are killed by a 14-year-old or by a 40-year-old, and this is mostly what they're in here for—murder.
 Carr: Nonetheless, Mr. Moore, I think you're making a pre-judgment. I have found over and over and over again in kids that I've talked to, that they are awaiting trial.
 Moore: For murder.
 Carr: In some instances, for murder.
 Moore: In most instances, you found.
 Carr: Isn't this punishment before conviction?
 Moore: No, the law states that there are some crimes that there are no bail for. Would you let them out to go out and kill again?
 Carr: I was talking to a young man here in the jail yesterday, not incidentally charged with murder, and he said while he was here he had the chance to meet and get to know somebody who was charged, with murder. Don't you think that this young man who was talking to me, has been hurt?
 Moore: If he's a 14-year-old and he's in jail he's in here for charge being of raping a white woman. You don't come to jail at 14 for being charged with raping a black woman.
 Carr: Mr. Moore, how does this make you feel?
 Moore: Well, if he's here for about, you know somebody was raped. They had probable cause. Now I think that what happens in this situation that he should have been—I didn't bring him here, as I said before, I'm just a custodian of men. But had he raped somebody related to me, I would want him here.
 Carr: Nonetheless, he is only charged with rape and you run this institution, Mr. Moore. Are you pleased?
 Moore: I have 1,700 men, out of 2,000 charged with something. I haven't, I don't make the laws. I don't enforce them. I'm just here as a custodian of men.
 Newman (VO): Our investigation of the juvenile justice system led us, surprisingly, to a mental institution, Elgin State Mental Hospital in a suburb of Chicago. About 5 percent of the children handled by Cook County's juvenile courts land in mental institutions.
 Elgin State Hospital has set up a special unit to handle some of these children. They are not described by the Hospital as emotionally disturbed or mentally ill. They are called socially deprived.
 Producer Martin Carr asked the Clinical Director of the Hospital's Adolescent Division, Dr. Enrique Vicoso, what kind of children are assigned to this special unit.
 Vicoso: In the definition of mental illness,

you make a definition. They are not mentally ill. They are social deprived individuals.
 Carr: Socially deprived.
 Vicoso: Socially deprived who can be handled elsewhere.
 Carr: What does socially deprived mean?
 Vicoso: Socially deprived is that individual who doesn't have the opportunity to have a father or a mother or a person that more or less is an authority figure. That he may be able to learn some kind of values, social and moral value.
 Newman (VO): Legal Aid Attorney Patrick Murphy represents some of the children in this hospital.
 Murphy: I can think of two cases for instance involving two children, one from an area called Uptown here in Chicago, which is primarily a white Appalachian area and another from the West Side ghetto . . . black ghetto. They both ended up at the Elgin State Hospital. Recently they were both caught in consenting homosexual conduct, they both being about 13 now. Now it may be wrong to do this, it may not be. I'm just a lawyer, I can't make moral judgments, however, the people at the hospital did and they bound them to their beds for a period of 77½ hours. And they tied their hands and their feet to the bedposts and spreadeagled them to the beds, in such position that the boys could only move their hands about 3 or 4 inches in each direction. They were allowed up only to shower. In 77½ hours.
 Vicoso: We're not using punishment over here. We are using a multiplicity of treatment in order to change the behavior of the person.
 Carr: Nonetheless, tying a child to a bed for 77 hours sounds to me like punishment.
 Vicoso: Okay, well this is a matter of opinion. We are trying to provide here in this institution to some of the kids some kind of therapeutical um uh behavior modification and some kind of disciplinary approach to the patient.
 Carr: In other words, tying a child to a bed for 77 hours does not create any physical pain?
 Vicoso: This kind of kid, no.
 Newman (VO): Dr. Marvin Schwartz, Consultant in Child Psychiatry to the Cook County Court system, disagrees with this kind of treatment. He feels it hurts children.
 Schwartz: When you tie someone to a bed like, like one wouldn't tie a dog, but, you know, like a dog, you see—for 72 hours without any, you know, real reasons—and put that person in the middle of a room to display, this person of limited abilities, this person with terrible difficulties of adjustment who has confused ideas of himself, who has confused self concepts to begin with, ends up feeling more self depreciated, more confused. More lost and more of a nothing in our world.
 Carr: In addition I understand to tying these boys to the bed for 77 hours they received intramuscular injections of some medication. And intramuscular injections is particularly painful. So that added to the punishment.
 Vicoso: Not necessarily. Not necessarily intramuscular injections is painful. You may say for instance when the needle going inside all right, it can create some kind of painful sensation, but our goal when you give medication with a patient, especially intramuscular, is because we want the medication to work as fast as possible so the behavior can be modified.
 Schwartz: The concern of the attorneys in this case and my concern is that we see, don't see any evidence that these drugs were being used to treat an acute situation. It was being used to quiet people down totally. Namely as a means of control.
 Carr: So could there be a reason to give it intramuscularly?

Schwartz: Yes, it hurts.
 Murphy: Once we got involved in the case we found out we were, the 77½ hours was, was child's play. One of, the third plaintiff, a girl, was tied to her bed for 7 consecutive days for slapping a matron. Certainly if the girl had slapped her mother and her mother had tied her to her bed as these people did for 7 consecutive days, we would be prosecuting that mother for criminal neglect and she would be on the front page of every newspaper in the state.
 Vicoso: Well in the case of this girl tying her for 7 day, I repeat again, I don't feel this is a matter of really punishment.
 Everybody tried to really help this girl to modify that behavior, but unfortunately this girl has not been kept enough in a place long enough so she may be able to learn about that. As a matter of fact . . .
 Carr: That's not her fault.
 Vicoso: It's not her fault.
 Schwartz: The community sets up institutions with limited budgets, with poorly trained staff, with inad, with poorly trained supervisor—places upon these institutions the problems which are really the problems of the community which the community does not want to deal with, places into these institutions people who are—in a way are victims because we have made them what they are and then says to this institution not only does it say now hold these people in so that the rest of us can pretend they don't exist and are not here, but it says relieve our guilt and pretend you're treating them.
 The shocking thing is—is not these children and not Elgin State. The shocking thing is that this is how our society deals with these things universally.
 Newman (OC): Many juvenile institutions refused to open their doors to NBC News. They claimed they were protecting the children. But Indiana Corrections Commissioner Robert Heyne allowed us to film in Indiana Boys School and Indiana Girls School, hoping that public awareness of their problems might stimulate change.
 Newman (VO): Indiana Boys School, alma mater of Charles Manson, is the sixth largest in the nation. To send a boy there costs the state and local governments \$8,000 a year, twice as much as it costs to send a boy to Harvard.
 More than half the children in the Indiana Schools have been committed for specifically juvenile crimes. Crimes like running away from home, breaking curfew, or being hard to handle. A major study by two New York criminologists tells us that if present laws were strictly enforced, 99 percent of all children would be locked away.
 The next six children are serving time for juvenile crimes. The accuracy of their statements has been checked with Indiana authorities.
 Carr: Why are you here in Indiana State Boys School?
 Boy: I snuck into a drive-in in the truck of a car and there were X rated movies, you know, for 18 or over—and so they—they, I guess they just kind of got me for that mostly and put me down here. Because when I was at the police station my ma said, you know, she was mad. She said well just, just keep him, do what you want with him. And that's what started it. Then I—and then they just put me down here for that really.
 Carr: How long have you been here, this time?
 Girl: Four months.
 Carr: Four months at Indiana Girls School.
 Girl: Right.
 Carr: How did you get here?
 Girl: I was in the orphanage.
 Carr: Um m.
 Girl: In 68. At first I wasn't too sure of why I was there, because you know, they gave me a couple of reasons, because truancy

and then they said my parents didn't want me. Then later on when I found out that it was because my parents didn't want me, and they just sig, you know, signed me over to the state, I felt terrible. Well, I couldn't stay there and that's why I ran twice.

Carr: After you ran away from the orphanage the second time, you ended up in jail, you were telling me. What was it like in jail?

Girl (OC): There were prostitutes, and then . . .

Carr: Did you know about that?

Girl: Yeah, they had talked about it. And then there were two, I think, that was in there for murder.

And it, it really was a scary feeling to be around such people.

Boy: Well when I was four was when I got taken away from my parents and then some Williamses adopted me. And I lived with them until I was 11. Then I went to some other people and I lived there for five years and then I went to another family and lived with them for awhile and then another family and lived with them for awhile and then I got sent up here.

Carr: Where did you like it the best?

Boy: Where I lived in Greensburg. That was the best place I was in.

Carr: Why did you like it there?

Boy: I could, I could talk to them and they really cared about me. They, they'd get me out of trouble if I'd, if it wasn't my fault. I mean, I was good at getting in trouble. And, when I didn't do something and I told them that I didn't do it—and they'd believe me. They'd do their best to get me out of it. It's—I mean, they just really cared.

Carr: This is a school for . . . what?

Boy: Juveniles.

Carr: What kind of juveniles?

Boy: Delinquents.

Carr: Delinquents.

Boy: Delinquents.

Carr: Do you think you're a juvenile delinquent?

Boy: I guess so or I wouldn't be up here right now.

Carr: Do you know what Indiana Boys School is for—what kind of boys are here?

Boy: It's supposedly for juvenile delinquents.

Carr: For juvenile delinquents.

Boy: Yes sir.

Carr: You were sent up here because you broke curfew?

Boy: Yes.

Carr: What time is curfew where you live?

Boy: 11 o'clock.

Carr: 11 o'clock. And you were out later than that?

Boy: Yes, sir.

Carr: Do you think you'll ever get into trouble again?

Boy: Not after being up here.

Carr: Not after being here?

Boy: No.

Carr: Why?

Boy: When you get out, people's going be knowing that you were sentenced to boys school and they aren't going to be wanting their children around you, figuring that it might be a bad influence on them.

Girl: They can't love you in a place like this. I mean, they're, they're just here what, 8 hours a day, just to tell you what to do, and then they go home. I mean, you know, they may care for you, but not the way a mother and a father would.

Carr: How about your friends your age here. Do you have any?

Girl: Up here when you get too close to a girl they automatically think you're casing.

Carr: Casing?

Girl: That's when two girls go together.

Carr: Is there much of this here?

Girl: There's a lot of it.

Carr: Does it hurt any girls?

Girl: In a way yes. Well, you can get hurt,

I mean not just emotionally or mentally, physically also. I mean they beat up on you and beat you over the head, and slam your head up against the wall, and everything but . . .

Carr: If you resist. Is that it?

Girl: Yes.

Carr: Do the counselors know about this?

Girl: Yes, but there's nothing they can really do.

Carr: So what happens to a girl who comes in here kind of innocent and inexperienced?

Girl: She doesn't go out so innocent and inexperienced. Cuz she learns a lot of things up here.

Carr: What do you think causes a problem like homosexuality in an institution like this?

Burkes: Well, I think for the fact is you've got all girls, or boys, or what have you. And then the fact that we have adolescents, or the period of 13 through 18, where they're naturally curious about these kind of things.

Carr: What happens to a young girl who comes here?

Girl: I think they know a lot more about the bad things when they go out.

Carr: Did you learn things you didn't know before?

Girl: Yes, sir.

Carr: I understand that you ran away a little while ago. What happened?

Girl: I got put in cottage 8 when I came back.

Carr: What's cottage 8?

Girl: It's maximum security.

Carr: What's that like?

Girl (OC): Well, it's, it's a small room and you're locked in there about 23 hours a day. It's real drabby and it's got writings all over the wall and you sleep on a mattress on the floor.

Carr: What does it feel like after you've been there a week?

Girl: Like you sort of withdraw from the rest of the world. Like some of the other girls and I, I didn't even care after I was there a week. It was like you're there and you're never going to get out.

Carr: Why are you in here in a room with a thick door, no bed, no furniture . . .

Girl: Because I ran.

Carr: What does it feel like to be in a room like this?

Girl: I don't know. At times it just seems like the whole place is gonna fall in on me, and the only thing that I can do to protect myself would be get out and take off again.

Carr: How about drugs. Drugs is one of your problems.

Maybe it's a good idea for you to be in a place like this—keep you away from em—do you think it does?

Girl: I had some H here.

Carr: Some heroin?

Girl: Yes, sir.

Carr: Did you shoot it up here?

Girl: Yes.

Carr: Which is easier to get around here? Heroin or acid?

Girl: Well, I don't know with the other girls, but me, I think I could get anything I wanted. And I mean in the drug line.

Carr: Why the paper plates and the paper cups and wooden spoon?

Girl: They could file, maybe their spoons or something down and make a sharp object and kind of hurt the housemothers or hurt themselves by breaking or maybe slashing our wrists or something like this.

Carr: Did you ever hear of that happening?

Girl: Yeah.

Carr: Girls attempting suicide.

Girl: Yeah. There's been only one girl that I know of that has died here in Cottage 8.

Carr: You knew her?

Girl: I didn't know her personally, no.

Carr: You just heard about her?

Girl: Yes. She hung herself.

Newman (VO): Charles Manson ran from

Indiana Boys School five times. At least thirty boys run from here every month. Most of them run home.

Carr: Why did you run away?

Boy: Well, I just didn't like it up here.

Carr: Where did you run to?

Boy: I ran to home.

Carr: To your mother?

Boy: Yes.

Carr: What happened to you when you got back?

Boy: I was sent to the detention.

Carr: What's that?

Boy (VO): It's a small room, about 12 foot long and about 6 foot, or about 8 foot wide, it's got a bed in it, a toilet and a sink, off to the side of it, a little window in the back of the room, with a big metal door.

Carr: Is that what they mean by the cage?

Boy: Yes, sir.

Carr: Why do you think they call it the cage?

Boy: Well it's like one.

Carr: How long were you in the cage?

Boy: For eleven days.

Carr: What's it like being in the cage for eleven days?

Boy: Well, after you get done climbing the walls, you just lay down for the rest of the day.

Carr: What do you mean after you get done climbing the walls?

Boy (OC): Well, I just—trying to get out, I reckon you . . . I get claustrophobia and I can't stand to be put in one of them rooms for too long, but . . .

Carr: But you were there for a long time.

Boy: Yeh.

Bennett: We feel that there is a need for a kid to be placed in a unit like this simply to have control of the institution or control of the situation. It is not ideal. But it's the same old numbers game—too many boys for too short a time.

Carr: Why is it necessary to put shackles on a boy and I refer to a sign saying there is no screen around, do not use without shackles. How should I understand something like that?

Bennett: The only time a, a shackle is used on a boy is that if here is a malfunction in the facility where he could escape. Or if a boy has a claustrophobia problem, and the psychologist recommends that the door to the unit be left open. And so a shackle is used.

Carr: Do you always get enough to eat here?

Boy: Not all the time.

Carr: What happens when you get on the end of the line?

Boy: Well, you get about half of what everyone else gets, sometimes not even half.

Carr: Sometimes not even half. So you walk around hungry.

Boy: That's what you have to do and just hope you can get up towards the middle of the line next meal.

Carr: And if you were at the end?

Boy: Then you didn't get nothing.

Carr: I've heard from several boys I talked to here that there's sometimes an Oliver Twist situation. That they don't get enough to eat or they don't get any food at all. How can you explain that?

Bennett: Well this is a problem that does exist in a, say a cottage that has a large number of boys. If the supervisor does not supervise adequately, it could be that the boy at the end of the line will become—will come up with less food than the one to begin.

Carr: Um. Who might this cottage supervisor be?

Bennett: The cottage supervisors may have worked in industry, may have worked in a factory, may have been truck driver, may have been—people from all forms of life. They may have been former salesmen, people like this. And, of course, their work before they came to us was totally different. So we

are shackled with the problem of training them to handle and remold lives. Young lives.

Carr: A while ago, you were telling me that you ought to be on your knees now.

Boy: Yes, sir.

Carr: What do you mean?

Boy: Well, you get on your hands and knees with a shine rag, a little rag and shine the floor—

Carr: How long?

Boy: Well, sometimes you stay there for a couple of days; it's according to how bad the supervisor thinks it is of what you did.

Carr: What did you do?

Boy: I was sitting right beside a bench that was supposed to be off-limits.

Carr: You were sitting next to an off-limits bench. What happens to your knees when you stay on the floor that long?

Boy: Well, you get big blisters on them.

Carr: You had other kinds of punishment too, haven't you? How about the board?

Boy: No, I never had that, except over at the school, once, and that was for when I spilt some varnish on the floor.

Carr: You got the board once.

Boy: Yes.

Carr: What does getting the board once mean?

Boy: Well, they hit you three times but it's only one time. You get . . .

Carr: Who hit you?

Boy: The principal—Mr. Kramer.

Carr: For spilling varnish. What does it feel like to be hit three times with the board?

Boy: Well, it hurts. It's not real bad, you know, but . . .

Carr: Can you sit down that evening?

Boy: Yeah. That's—Mr. Kramer's sort of an old man. He—can't hit quite as hard as some of the other security men that regularly give it to you in the company.

Carr: That regularly give it to you in the company. What's the worst punishment you've seen, really seen with your own eyes around here?

Boy: Where you get three with the board and if you cry . . .

Carr: You get three with the board. In other words you get whacked three times.

Boy (OC): If you cry or anything you get three more and well, you're doing 75 pushups if you mess up one time . . .

Carr: In addition to being whacked with the board, you have to do 75 pushups?

Boy: 75 pushups. And if you mess up with 75 pushups on any of them then you have to get the board again.

Carr: You have got to get the board again.

Boy: And do your 75 over.

Bennett: The paddle that is used is kept in this office and only approved by me as superintendent.

Carr: Do you think it's possible that cottage supervisors often resort to discipline, may enforce certain disciplinary measures just to make their jobs easier?

Bennett (OC): Yes. And this is part of the problem of a large institution. We find that the supervision of staff is very difficult.

Carr: Uh huh. I understand that in the past flogging was an official disciplinary measure here.

Bennett: I would say that it has been many, many, many years since they've had what most people in the field call flogging. There was a leather strap used to spank boys. We have taken that out of our program.

Carr: How long ago?

Bennett: It's been more than a year ago.

Carr: Why might corporal punishment be necessary at an institution like this?

Bennett: It's necessary here. Simply because we have boys a short time and we have too many boys.

Carr: About how many boys that are here now really don't belong here?

Bennett: I think the number is quite high. 55 to 70 percent could be handled in, in other settings.

Carr: How many boys return here? What's the rate of return?

Our return rate runs between 40 and 50 percent.

Carr: About half the boys that are here now will return here. Doesn't that give you a sense of failure, that you're not accomplishing what you'd like to accomplish?

Bennett: Very much so.

Carr: Do you think you're doing any harm?

BENNETT: We're doing a lot of harm.

NEWMAN: Authorities across the nation agree. Harm is being done. Yet judges across the nation continue to sentence the majority of children to juvenile training schools similar to the ones in Indiana. Judge Horace B. Holmes is one exception. As the presiding juvenile court judge of Boulder, Colorado, he tells us why whenever possible he prefers to keep a child within the community . . .

CARR: You feel it is your duty or mission or object to keep children out of the institutions. Even good institutions are bad.

HOLMES: The best place a youngster can be is at home. There is no place better than home for a youngster.

CARR: Your motto is attention, not detention.

HOLMES: That's right.

CARR: What does that really mean?

HOLMES: Means that we've got to look at kids and try to figure out what's going on and what's bothering them and what we can do to correct their activities, what we can do to correct the situation that has caused them to be this way and—you don't get it by locking them up someplace. Either in jail here or in a state institution because this isn't going to solve it.

CARR: Why not?

HOLMES: Because when they come out of a state institution no matter how good it is, they come, strangely enough, kids come home again.

CARR: Why are walls and bars necessarily bad for a child who may be in trouble?

HOLMES: Maybe for some youngsters it's not bad. Maybe the youngster that can't live except confined, but I think many of them are, don't need this. That this is a way of getting rid of our problems. We've done it in the mental health. We've housed our, our mental health patients in, in sort of dungeons and now we're getting better and getting them out, and back into the community. Where they should be. The mental health patients should be with us. Everybody we don't like we can't get rid of—we have to live with them. And this—this is what the kids are saying too. They say we've got to live with one another. If we listen to them, maybe we'll learn something.

NEWMAN (VO): El Paso, Texas likes to call itself the "All-America" city. The motto is on police cars, hotel doors, phone booths, almost everywhere you look. But where the rights of its children are concerned, El Paso is hardly all-American. Rights guaranteed all Americans by state and federal law have systematically been denied.

After careful investigation, NBC News was able to document many instances of children sent away to state correctional schools without the advice of a lawyer or a hearing before a judge.

We talked to Ira Workman and his son Phillip who had spent 9 months at the Gatesville School for Boys.

Carr: Phillip, you were up at Gatesville, right?

Phillip: Right.

Carr: How come? What'd you do?

Phillip: Problems at home and couldn't get along, ran away from home quite a few times.

Carr: Uh huh. Mr. Workman, why did you

think that Gatesville would be a good idea for Phillip, your son?

Workman: As I understood it, I thought it was like a regular school. That they would have people up there that would put the boy on the right track and that was their sole responsibility. I did not approve of the type of disciplinary action that was given there.

Carr: Phillip, you were there, you tell me about it.

Phillip: They would, uh, maybe wanna get us on our feet, you know, sit us down, take our shoes and socks off—and they'd have leather straps mostly, or sometimes a stick.

Carr: Um huh. And you'd be sitting on the floor with bare feet?

Phillip (OC): Uh huh, with bare feet.

Carr: And then what happened?

Phillip: And he'd hit you on the arch of your foot, cause they say that's the tenderest part.

Carr: How many times would he hit you there?

Phillip: Well, sometimes up to ten times.

Carr: Did it hurt?

Phillip: Yes, it really hurts. It's hard to stand really when you, they get done.

Carr: Did you ever cry?

Phillip: Oh, I cried the first time.

Carr: You didn't have to send him in front of a judge in order to send him to Gatesville, is that it?

Workman (OC): No, all I had to do was sign a paper, that, that I understand that the paper of it I signed, went before a judge. Now that's the best of my knowledge.

CARR: Did you try talking to a lawyer? Did a lawyer come down and discuss this with you?

Workman: No, I didn't talk to any lawyer.

Carr: Nobody suggested that you ought to talk to a lawyer or anything?

Workman: I cannot remember any suggestion as to talking to a lawyer.

Carr: How about you, Phillip, did you talk to a lawyer at that time?

Phillip: No.

Bercu: I was told by a number of the juveniles that I spoke to that they in fact had been sent to the Texas Youth Council facilities without having had a hearing. They were now returned and I had been speaking to them.

CARR: Is that what an agreed judgment means?

Bercu: An agreed judgment is an agreement by the parents with the chief probation officer of El Paso County, the man who runs the detention home, agreeing to the fact that the child is a delinquent, without any sort of consent by the child, and then it is then taken to the judge, and without a hearing the child is sent to one of the Texas Youth Council facilities.

CARR: I take it that this is against the law, both here in Texas and against the law of the nation.

Bercu: I find it completely against the law, I can find no justification in any law in the United States for this procedure.

CARR: About how many cases of agreed judgments have come to your attention directly or indirectly?

Bercu: About 50.

CARR: As a lawyer funded by the OEO, is there anything that you can do to get these children out?

Bercu: For the majority of them, there's nothing I can do.

CARR: Why is this the case?

Bercu: Because, apparently, these agreed judgments are cases where the parents wanted their children sent away to some sort of prison.

CARR: Where is Emily right now?

Garrison: Brownwood.

CARR: Emily's at Brownwood—what is Brownwood, Mrs. Garrison?

Garrison (OC): The state home and school for girls.

Carr: Did anybody explain to you at the time that your daughter was entitled to a hearing and to a lawyer?

Garrison: I don't think it was mentioned. But I at least got the impression that if we did go before a judge she may be put away for a definite and longer time than if I just signed the papers and let her go, and left it open for a while.

Carr: In other words you were frightened that if she had a hearing it would be worse?

Garrison: Yes.

Carr: So you decided against the hearing and you signed an agreed judgment?

Garrison: I don't know what I signed.

Newman (VO): Concerned about agreed judgments, Frank Walker, Assistant County Attorney during our investigation, discussed the matter with the juvenile judge.

Carr: Have you ever discussed this with the judge from this point of view?

Walker: I told him that I didn't know they existed, I didn't believe they existed, and I found that they did exist. And that was being done.

Carr: When, you mean the agreed judgment, you found . . .

Walker: Yes, we discussed it no further than that.

Carr: And the judge admitted to the agreed judgments.

Walker: Yes, he did admit to it.

Newman (VO): NBC News requested an interview with Juvenile Judge Edwin Berliner but Judge Berliner refused to be interviewed. Nor were we permitted to talk to any of the children held in Gatesville or Gainesville on agreed judgments. In fact, the Texas Youth Council refused to let NBC film in any of its facilities. We were however, able to talk with 15-year-old Ricky Reid the night he returned home after spending 8½ months at the Gatesville School for Boys.

Carr: Did you get anything out of your 8½ months at Gatesville?

Reid: Yeah. Talked to a lot of people who'd been up there for armed robbery and burglary and car theft and—all different kinds of things.

Carr: Did you learn very much?

Reid (OC): I learned—yeah, I learned quite a bit.

Carr: Did you like it?

Reid: Naw.

Carr: What bothered you?

Reid: The supervisor. He'd come by, you know, and he'd jump on you if you were looking at him wrong or for—getting up.

Carr: What do you mean he'd jump on you?

Reid: He'd beat the hell out of you. I seen a boy get picked up by a man weighing close to 300 pounds, thrown against a wall and the man just sit there stepping on his stomach, kicking him in the legs and head and everywhere. I seen that happen, I seen a man pull a table leg off a table and beat a boy with it.

Carr: Before you were sent to Gatesville, you were in the detention home for 2 weeks. What was that like?

Reid (OC): It was just—you're locked up. I didn't have nobody to talk to, was in a room by myself. Didn't have—I didn't have anything to do. Sat on my bunk. No mattresses on the bunk, rats running around and spiders and everything else. Place smells. Well, after about 4 or 5 days, I thought I was losing my mind. (Laugh) Nobody to talk to or anything. It was pretty bad.

I cut my wrist and man, he come by the door, he looked down, he saw me, so he walked back down the end the hall and it started bleeding pretty bad, then—and then he walked back in and he said, he said something like, you—he said, you dirty, he said, you dirty gringo and all this stuff. He said I ought to let you bleed to death.

Carr: I've heard complaints from people here in El Paso, you've probably heard them

yourself, they would rather be in Gatesville or Gainesville than in the detention home. They described it as pure hell. What do you have to say about that?

Raley: It isn't intended as a resort hotel.

Carr: What am I to think if a child says to me, "I was in there for about 3 weeks and I was let out only 3 times during the day for meals. I had nobody to talk to in between. I had nothing to do, I had nothing to read. I had to sit on a bunk with no mattress on it." Should I believe him? Is he telling me the truth?

Raley: I'm not going to say. I'm going to say, draw your own conclusions.

Many times a child is booked in for protective custody which is not a legal charge, but is for their protection. Later we find that the child is completely incorrigible, by their own admission and by a statement from the parents. They exhibit that incorrigible behavior here too, believe you me.

Carr: How do they do that, Mr. Raley?

Raley: I might bring this in at this time. That originally was a tee shirt which one of the boys was wearing in a room. In a few hours time this boy removed that shirt, started unraveling and rolling the twine. That is the tee shirt in its present form.

Carr: Why do you think he did that, Mr. Raley?

Raley: More to trying to strike back at anyone, especially his parents.

Carr: Isn't it possible that the child made that ball of twine because he was bored? Because he had nothing better to do?

Raley (OC): Not necessarily. Many of them will take any action to—as they see it—get even with their parents or the guards.

Carr: How would you account for this behavior on the part of the children?

Raley: I would say a lot of it is due to the coddling, permissiveness of parents—permissiveness of law enforcement, of everyone concerned.

Carr: Are you able to overcome this permissiveness?

Raley: Some of it.

Carr: I've heard again and again from different people in town that many times a parent in cooperation with you has sent off children to either Gainesville or Gatesville or one of the other homes in Texas without the benefit of either a hearing or a—lawyer which they are entitled to under the law.

Raley (OC): This isn't true virtually. These children, these well these parents, first—are—cautioned of their rights, of the child's rights and many times there is an attorney in the background that the child is not aware of. Later the parents get guilt feelings, the child is resentful and you get the answer you have had. Many of them through this sense of guilt will change their story to the point where they try to clear themselves.

Carr: Isn't it always an advantage for a child to have a hearing and to have a lawyer?

Raley: Uh—again, I'm not going to go into that.

Carr: Why is your son in Gatesville, Mrs. Brown?

Brown: Because he wanted to get married and he keep on running away from home. And they sent him over there because at the time, you know, we thought that was best for the boy, that he wouldn't get married. They told me that was a very nice school and very good place for the boy.

Carr: Who is this? Who told you that?

Brown: Mr. Raley. I went to talk to him and he told me that the best thing for the boy there would be that school because it's a good school. They have a swimming pool. They have good teachers. They have freedom.

When I first sent him over there, Mr. Raley told me that I could get him out any time I wanted to. And I got very sick and I want to get him furlough and he say not a chance.

Carr: You're sick now, aren't you ma'am?

Brown: Yes. I've been sick for the past 2 years, I think—2 or 3 years.

Carr: What is the matter with you. Do you know?

Brown: I saw the doctor yesterday. He said I got a tumor, and two of them say that I got cancer.

Carr: But they wouldn't let you bring him home?

Brown: They wouldn't let me bring him home, they say no.

You know, when they sent him away I figure well I go see him once or twice a week. And then I find out that it was miles away and then I didn't even know, I didn't even—well, as you can see, people in our position, I didn't figure that I'd ever see him at all til he come home.

Carr: How far away is Gatesville?

Brown: Well, we make 14 hours on a bus. We borrowed some money, you know, from a finance company to go see him on Christmas . . .

Carr: Uh huh.

Brown: . . . But since he was coming . . .

Carr: How much money did it cost you to go and see him?

Brown: Well so far, on back and forth these two times \$250.

Carr: Two hundred and fifty dollars?

Brown: What we spent.

Carr: Do you still owe this money to the finance company?

Brown: Yes.

Carr: You're working too aren't you?

Brown (OC): Yes, I'm working. My husband working and I have, I have to, I have to find another job to help me to pay this money.

Carr: You went over to Gatesville?

Brown: I went to Gatesville and I found him beat up.

Carr: You found your son beat up.

Brown: Beat up. He got a big bruise on his head and he was terrified. He wasn't afraid. He—oh when anybody talk to him or get near him, he just bend his head and stay like that and he don't answer.

Carr: What are you going to say to your son when he comes home?

Brown: I want to tell him I'm sorry. I'm going to—I don't know, I'm going to try to explain to him what did I done, and try to make up for what I done—

Carr: Do you think you can make up?

Brown: He's a good boy—he got a good heart. And we raised them as, you know, as good as we can. We, we got a big family you know, we fight and we made up right away. We never stay mad at each other and we raised the boys that way. I think he'll forgive me, I hope at least. Because it's a lot to forgive you know. Send a boy, a 15-year-old boy to hell like that, I don't think—is if I were him, you know on my side, I think it take me a long time to forgive my family.

Newman (OC): In El Paso, Juvenile Judge Edwin Berliner has stopped the practice of agreed judgments. Since we filmed, several of the children sent to Texas Youth Council facilities in this way have been released. Nonetheless, many of them remain, sent away by a court which clearly feels that children, simply because they are children, are not entitled to full protection under the law.

The Texas Youth Council, when it learned of our investigation, refused NBC News access to any of its institutions with or without a camera. It was therefore impossible to document the many reports of brutality given to us by parents and children. However, State Senator Donald Kennard tells us that physical mistreatment is a fact of life for children in these institutions. State Representative Curtis M. Graves tells us that nearly 200 parents and juveniles have complained to him of brutality at the Gatesville School for Boys. He has personally verified

this brutality, in one case by finding blood on the wall of a cell where a child had recently been beaten.

Brutality of this sort goes on every day in children's institutions across the nation, and will go on unless we as Americans see that it is stopped.

Solitary confinement also must be stopped. No child should be forced to remain days on end in a locked room. It can only be an act of cruel and unnecessary punishment.

But more basic than this, we must stop the practice of sending children away to these institutions, where any child is condemned to be a faceless individual surrounded by a staff unable to help him, however real the desire.

Alternatives to large institutions are succeeding in several communities, such as Boulder, Colorado. Children in trouble now remain within these communities, in foster homes and small residences.

Some children must be locked away because of the seriousness of their crimes. But most children are sent away to the wrong places for the wrong reasons. They have broken laws which do not exist for adults. These laws, as they are now written, should not exist for children either. For under these laws, children are treated as criminals for acts that should not be considered crimes at all.

We can expect children to respect the law only if we show them the respect and care that law and common sense require. This is not the case now. What is the case now cannot be permitted to continue.

END CREDITS

Copyright, National Broadcasting Company, Inc. 1971 All Rights Reserved.
Produced and written by Martin Carr.
Directed by Martin Carr.
Associate producer, Judy Towers.
Unit manager, Joseph Nash.
Program coordinator, Peter Freedberger.
Supervising film editor, Robert Loweree.
Film editors, Louis Castro and David Saul.
Cameraman, Dexter Alley.
Sound, Ernest Chacon.

EDUCATION AND RELIGION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Martin W. Weitz, director of the Center for Inter-Faith Studies at Lincoln University and the rabbi of Temple Adas Shalom at Havre de Grace, Md., in my district, recently wrote an editorial for the spring edition of the Hourglass entitled "Education and Religion."

At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues Rabbi Weitz's views on the issues with which education and religion must deal in the latter part of the 20th century.

The editorial follows:

EDUCATION AND RELIGION

(By Martin M. Weitz)

Education and Religion today are perhaps the two best barometers for values. Their common frontiers in the American setting are a study in values, a challenge in needs, and form a perspective of "that which renders anything useful or estimable."

All of us have heard cleverisms about both *Education and Religion*. We have heard it said that Education is "a process which leads from an infantile vacuum into an adoles-

cent void," that the campus creature known as a co-ed is a "moron"—"more off than on." Likewise Religion has been labeled or libeled, "an insurance policy against hell-fire," "the next man's superstition," or "an eternal bedtime story with which Mother Nature puts the race of man to sleep." All this was before the Radioactive "Fall-out," for since then more people have plumbed the depths, and scanned the heights and to do this even for morale alone, they turn to Religion and Education.

Education and Religion search for and sound out values even though individual professors may be absent-minded and individual ministers, absent-hearted, even though single so-called educational and religious institutions may devote all energy to the full use of the plant rather than the full value of the student.

Education means just what it means in the Latin: "To lead out," "To build up," to draw out of oneself or build up in oneself one's fullest potentialities and finest capacities. The greatest single value in Education is not to flood the mind with facts nor amuse students nor make experts of them in any and all fields. The value in Education is to "lead out" or "build up" the students so that they may find their own values, so that they may think—even think out loud, if that is possible, so they may think for themselves. There should be a few places left where they may still learn to do that! And in times of crises, especially for Democracy, there must be more, not less thinking.

Religion too means what it means in the Latin: "To bind"—to attach oneself to a quest for the highest values men may have. Religion has been variously and too often vicariously interpreted as one's "consciousness of the sacred" or as "what man does with his solitariness"—as personal values in Religion—or as "the enshrinement of man's highest aspirations," "the cooperative quest for the good life," or "dynamics in social ethics"—as social values in Religion. Nevertheless, they explain Religion as a quest for values, often personal in origin and social in goal, to seek the Heartbeat of the Universe called God and also find the pulsebeat of fellowman, as it were. As the poet expressed it: "I looked for God but could not see, I sought my soul and it would not be, until I found fellowman—and found all three!"

Whereas Education "leads out," to think out something, Religion "binds in" to believe in something. Education is a process of the laboratory; Religion is the purpose of the sanctuary. The keyword in Education is "experiment;" in Religion, "Experience." In Education, man validates experiment; man does something. In Religion, man enshrines experience; man becomes something.

From days of the Boston Publick Latin School in 1635, when twenty students studied Virgil, Cato, Ovid, in the great days of Shakespeare and Milton, and from 1654-5 when Columbia was founded to 1971 when almost 15,000,000 undergraduates attended over 4,500 colleges and universities, Education and Religion in America have had four parallel frontiers, some of which overlap even today, in varying degree, in many colleges and churches. A survey of these common frontiers may be indeed a study in values and an answer to new challenges, especially if Peter F. Drucker's article in (March, 1955) *Harper's* is true, that by 1975, we shall have over 12,000,000 youths in all our colleges and universities which we already have!

The *Doctrine of Discipline* is their first common frontier. It lasted nearly a century, and still continues in many places. It was the day when college was half-seminary and when courses were adjudged valuable primarily for their disciplinary value. In that

age, Education as Religion was largely a matter of discipline. The one was discipline of the mind, more discipline than mind and the other was discipline of the soul, more discipline than soul.

The next frontier was *Knowledge for Its Own Sake*. It came into its own about the middle of the last century and still remains a cultural hangover in most of our so-called Liberal Arts Colleges. "It's good to Know" was the keyword of the school and "It's good to go" was the password in the church.

Rapid expansion and enrichment of physical America helped usher in the third frontier, *Preparation for Life*. This slogan in Education was synonymous with the rise of land-grant colleges, agricultural and engineering schools and technical institutes. In the "Seventies," when only 25,000 students were in colleges at the time half-a-continent was being mastered and measured, there was a *Preparation for Life* which often meant a preparation for leadership in that life. Religion too in these expansive decades boomed with revivalism, in a "variety of religious experiences"—as Christian Science in the East and Mormonism in the West. Education, gone technical, took up *Preparation for Life*. Religion, gone revivalist, took to *Preparation for Life—After death!*

With the Twentieth Century appeared a more promising frontier in Education and Religion—*Life and Growth*. This current parallel considers the educative process and the religious experience not as *Preparation of Life, or Life-After-Death*, but as a slice of life in the present. In this modern and fourth frontier, when a student is asked, "What do you want to make of yourself?" his answer will be "A human being!" rather than an accountant or an engineer. Today Education and Religion are on the threshold of *Life and Growth*, but not yet in it. If *Life and Growth* is to have validity today for youth, then Education and Religion must cooperate to make this new frontier a supreme pursuit in matters that count. Education, to be more than an intellectual canning process, and Religion, to be more than a pious praying exercise, must create new values even more than recreate old values. Both Religion and Education, more than ever, must utilize youth's love of distant horizons, rededication to search for truth and the freedom to sustain such search, and youth's quick sympathy for the oppressed. If *Life and Growth*, as a new frontier, is to add new intellectual power to Education and new spiritual purpose to Religion, what then are some of the struggles Education and Religion must face in a common effort for high human values, in the cold-war peace of "coexistence" that has to be waged and won, beyond racial tensions, campus confrontations as well as mini-wars?

1. *The struggle of Individualism and Co-operativism*: How may we prevent "rugged individualism" at the top from becoming "ragged individualism" at the bottom and yet how may we retain personal freedom, and social security with world peace?

2. *The struggle of Ruralism and Urbanism*: Shall the new America continue to stride to the city or stay in the country? Shall we help America become city-or-country conscious? As the world rebuilds shop-worn and war-shorn cities, how may we do so with care for health and welfare and without chaos of previous eras, and with a *theology for ecology*, as it were?

3. *The struggle of Nationalism and Internationalism*: How may America, without loss of political unity and cultural plurality, cherish the Good Neighbor ideal in the family of all nations by such means as practical international peacetime communications, and cooperation not only in democratic slogans, but in living standards? How may we advance the cause of World Peace without loss of creative cultures?

4. *The struggle of the West and the East*:

How may we best supplement the values of a Gandhi and an Edison, a Hu Shih and an Einstein, a Kagawa, and a John XXIII, a Tolstoy and a Martin Luther King? How may we attain a ripeness of spirit in the midst of a wealth of things?

These are some of the social situations which Education and Religion must face together today for new frontiers in "Tomorrow," to find therein new-old values "where each (nation or individual) may dwell under his own vine and fig-tree and none shall make him afraid."

THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY AND THE BUDGET CUTS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the Puerto Rican community of New York City has come to the mainland seeking a better standard of living. In most cases this dream has been turned into a nightmare. The many current hardships that Puerto Ricans must endure will be intensified if the budget cuts proposed by the New York State Legislature and the resulting cutbacks in city employment and essential social services are allowed to stand.

Because the city's financial plight implies certain disaster for this community as well as other poor and disadvantaged residents of the city, the Puerto Rican Coordinating Committee Against City-State Budget Cuts has been established. The following position paper written by the coordinating committee is cogent testimony of just how cuts in city services and personnel in vital agencies will adversely affect the Hispanic community.

For this reason and for the benefit of my colleagues, I insert this "position paper" into the RECORD:

POSITION PAPER

(By Puerto Rican Coordinating Committee Against City-State Budget Cuts)

To the Citizens of the State of New York.
Via Mayor John V. Lindsay, Governor Nelson Rockefeller, The Legislature of the State of New York.

RESOLVED

The Hispanic community of the City of New York is unalterably opposed to the cuts in services affecting the poor as summarized this week by Mayor Lindsay. We cannot countenance this drastic and inconsiderate array of cuts which will severely affect the posture of this volatile metropolis and adversely erode what few gains the Hispanic community has achieved in the last few years.

RESOLVED

The contemplated cuts in personnel and services by the city in response to threatened budget cuts from the State represent a dangerous and unwise decision generating frustration and resentment among those citizens who will be most severely handicapped by the cuts—the poor and displaced in our city.

RESOLVED

The Hispanic community considers this a time of lament and sorrow, for the anticipated cuts represent the death knell for the disenfranchised of our city least able to de-

fend themselves in a disconcerting era of spiraling inflation and governmental indifference. Therefore the Committee, on behalf of the hundreds of Hispanic organizations throughout the city, declare this to be a time of mourning.

RESOLVED

The Hispanic community opposes the wholesale firing of employees from key agencies whose principal services affect the poor. It also opposes any mechanical formula for firing these people which will detrimentally affect the Hispanic employee, who in most cases was the last to be hired, holds a "provisional" status, and makes a modest income, will be unable to apply for unemployment insurance and, collectively, will be the man or woman hurt most by being let go in a time of a business slowdown and depressing job market.

RESOLVED

The State Legislature should provide the City of New York with sufficient funds to insure that the basic and essential services, such as Police, Fire, Sanitation, Housing, Etc., are not compromised in the city. This entails not only restoring budget cuts announced by the State but also providing the city with ample (and equitable) taxing measures to insure that the City of New York can meet its basic operating expenses.

RESOLVED

A cohesive campaign will start now in the City to alert the citizens of Hispanic origin to prepare themselves to vote against those legislators who have evidenced indifference to their plight and serve notice that their conduct will be carefully scrutinized and will be held accountable for their performance on bills and issues affecting the poor in our city.

RESOLVED

The Committee Coordinating Protests Against the Budget Cuts will urge organizations throughout the city to join the large contingent of groups now declared to be going to Albany on Wednesday the 28th to make a vocal presentation of their complaints against these cuts.

RESOLVED

The Hispanic community recognizes the corrosive effect of inflation on urban governments and how it has contributed to the fiscal crisis in this city. It deplors, however, that much of the resources of this city are funneled out of the city and state in tax revenues that are used for purposes which serve no good to the poor of this city. Therefore, we urge the Federal government to come to the aid of not only this city, but all other urban communities similarly threatened with bankruptcy.

DOCUMENTATION

The following is a capsulized version of how cuts in services and personnel in key agencies affects the Puerto Rican community as well as those of Hispanic origin who have recently arrived in this city. In each case it will be noted that these cuts affect the poor in the city far more than other areas.

1. Department of Social Services

(a) The recent welfare grant cuts will be disastrous to the Hispanic community and the Puerto Rican employees in the Department of Social Services.

(b) Since the majority of Puerto Ricans in manufacturing jobs earn modest incomes, they depend at one time or the other during the year on some supplementary assistance. Therefore, in some measure, the New York taxpayers are subsidizing marginal New York City industries.

(c) Approximately 40% of the 350,000 families on welfare are Puerto Ricans with 700,000 children. A cut of 40% would tragically affect all these children.

(d) Those families with incomes of over 100 dollars weekly stand a chance of being jeopardized by Medicaid cuts since the family breadwinner is not eligible for medical coverage. Therefore if a serious illness occurs the family would be better off if the head of the family abandons his job and seeks public assistance in order to be restored to its Medicaid eligibility.

(e) To deprive the Puerto Rican family of the semi-adequate public assistance support given last year will undermine the present ratio of Puerto Rican children getting child welfare services (14.4%). These cuts would mean the city would have to spend more money to provide foster care and other child welfare services to Hispanic children forced to be removed from their home where economic pressures have served to break up the home. (As happens when the man of the family must "abandon" his home in order that his dependents can get adequate public assistance.)

(f) Cuts in the DOSS personnel will have a disastrous effect on Puerto Ricans in the agency since they make up most of the case aides and messenger slots which are always the first to be sliced. Few Puerto Ricans have positions in the clerical or administrative branches of the Department. Cuts will hit the "non-essential jobs" where Puerto Ricans are usually employed.

(g) Most of the semi-skilled assistants who will be let go, being ineligible for unemployment insurance, must fall back on welfare assistance whilst trying to find other employment. This shuffling of people from one public treasury to another is pointless, time consuming, heartbreaking and, in the long run, far more expensive.

2. Hospital Corporation

(a) Under Option 1, the most severe of the threatened cuts, the city plans to lay off 13,890 people and not fill jobs which will become available through attrition (estimated at 7,140). This is over 21,000 people. Who are these people? Mostly the unskilled who work as porters, nurses aides, messengers, clerks, etc. The Black and Puerto Ricans.

(b) Four to eight of the existing 18 city hospitals may be closed. These will be, no doubt, those hospitals in ghetto areas.

(c) There will be a discontinuation of all home care services. (840,000 home care days a year). Who avail themselves of this care? The black and Puerto Ricans.

(d) Discontinuation of all non-emergency ambulatory care. (4,400,000 clinic visits a year).

(e) Discontinuation of all specialty inpatient care, with services limited to medicine, general surgery, gynecology, obstetrics, pediatrics and psychiatry.

(f) Elimination of all training programs in hospitals.

(g) Loss of 800 to 2,000 physicians.

(h) Displacement of 40,000 to 80,000 patients annually from our city hospitals.

The above are the direct causes. But what are the indirect causes to the anticipated medical service cuts? The Puerto Rican man usually considers the hospital clinic as his physician and takes his family to the hospital whenever there is a sickness or injury.

Secondly, a hospital is only the nucleus around which medical services in a poor community rotate. For instance, in the South Bronx, those agencies which depend on Lincoln Hospital, which will be severely affected by budget cuts are: Mott Haven Health Center, Morisiana Health Center, Hunts Point Multi-Service Center, Women's Clinic, Neighborhood Maternity Center, Planned Parenthood Center and two Mental Health Clinics, to name a few. The hospital provides laboratory service, referral service and staff. The anticipated cuts will virtually eliminate all ancillary services the hospitals can give the backup agencies in their community.

Thirdly, cuts in hospital funds affect the poor much more than the affluent areas of our city for the simple proposition that there is a scarcity of general practitioners in ghetto areas forcing the populace to depend on city medical services. This is a captive population with no place else to go—or die.

Fourth, The ghetto areas are those which make the greatest demands on medical services because it is in these areas where you have a higher frequency of T.B., addiction, cancer, venereal diseases, etc.

3. Fire Department

(a) The mayor's decision to cancel the class of 75 firemen, as reported by Fire Commissioner Robert O. Lowry will hurt the Hispanic community because most of these men were to be assigned to slum neighborhoods where there is a higher frequency of fires.

4. Division of Veterans Affairs

(a) Though apparently an insignificant cut, slicing 50% of this office's personnel is harmful to the Puerto Rican community. It is already a fact that many veterans of the Vietnamese conflict are Puerto Rican and black. Many of these men are now finding it difficult to readjust to society, find jobs and begin meaningful careers. This agency could and has served them well in the past and has been a second source of aid to the Federal Veterans Administration. *Rather than cut the agency, it should be doubled in view of the many men now being deactivated as the President attempts to deescalate the Asian conflict.*

5. School Crossin g Guards

(a) The decision to not fill 310 part-time vacancies now available will affect children in ghetto neighborhoods where the majority of these vacancies now exist.

6. Police Department

(a) The decision under option 1 to eliminate over 13,000 police is disastrous since the largest portion of the police assignments are made in the troubled ghetto areas. Cuts would be effected there. It is already recognized that 80 percent of the crime in this city occurs in poor neighborhoods with the addict preying on his neighbors.

7. Environmental Protection Administration (Department of Sanitation)

(a) As Jerome Kretchmer has already stated, the reduction in the workforce of the Sanitation Department, under Option 1 will severely curtail cleaning operations in the slums. This will be especially felt during the summer when the accumulation of garbage is greater, as more and more citizens take to the streets to escape the oppressiveness of their ghetto apartments.

(b) These areas are already underserved by the Department of Sanitation. The mayor has already cancelled the hiring of 150 additional sanitation workers desperately needed this summer. Further cuts are intolerable.

8. Urban Action Task Force

(a) The closing of the 40 local offices of the UATF, laying off 88 people, a fait accompli, was unfortunate since these regional offices afforded an opportunity for the poor to bring their complaints and get referral services where they could get assistance. Too, it was a pipeline to the leaders and city administrators best able to rectify the difficult living conditions in poor areas.

9. Housing Complaint Offices

(a) The cut of 3/4rds of the personnel in this vitally needed city function is deplored by the Puerto Rican community. A large number of the complaints filed at this office were made by the poor, certainly not the affluent, and the personnel cutbacks means there is now no one to act on the complaints. This will be especially irritating come next winter when the volume of complaints escalate, as landlords fail to provide adequate

heat, hot water and other basic and essential services rightfully claimed by tenants.

10. Urban Corps

(a) Outbacks in the Urban Corps (50% of the 1850 available vacancies) will be especially felt by the Puerto Rican community. This summer promises to be one of the most difficult the City has experienced. The recession will affect the young the most during the hot months when they will have no jobs or activities to occupy them. Cancelling the summer intern program will be one more disillusioning nail in an already disheartened generation of young people who feel that society simply doesn't care about them anymore.

(b) Puerto Rican children, in particular the new generation in their teens, feel particularly removed from the main stream of American life and affluence. Programs cutting into their activities and endangering their aspirations will have a lasting effect.

11. Board of Education

(a) Under Option 1 the Board of Education will have to give the pink slip to approximately 16,400 teachers. Many of these teachers will be the recently hired bilingual (Puerto Rican) teachers recruited by the Board, and who, because of their short tenure will be the first to go. These are teachers desperately needed in a school system which already is inadequate to the needs of its Spanish-speaking charges.

(b) Open enrollment programs will be terminated. These programs were especially helpful to the Puerto Rican lad unable to finance a college education on his own. The family resources are far too limited for him to contemplate going to a private institution and because of the severe entrance requirements in most colleges he will be unable to qualify for admission.

(c) The open enrollment program has enabled the Puerto Rican contingent at the City colleges to increase from 5.9% to 7.7%. This percentage was expected to go up in the years ahead, and once the students made up the deficiencies of their secondary schooling, they would continue in school and constitute a larger percentage of the graduate schools than the insignificant number of Puerto Ricans now pursuing graduate studies.

(d) Outbacks in funds will also affect remedial programs in college, such as those in reading and mathematics which service the Puerto Rican student and enable him to compensate for the disgraceful high school preparation he receives in ghetto area schools.

(e) The spectre looms that there will be no Freshman class in the City colleges next year. This would be catastrophic and unthinkable.

(f) On the collegiate level cutbacks will affect the few Puerto Rican professors which have been acquired with such agonizing difficulties. Many are the most recently hired and lack tenure in their professorships.

(g) In the secondary school system, most of the non-professionals employed, who may be dismissed, (18,000), are paraprofessionals, teaching assistants, porters, maintenance men, etc. Like their collegiate confreres the bilingual teacher will be affected. Counseling services will be all but eliminated. Speech clinics, remedial math and reading courses will be abandoned.

(h) Extra-curricula, or activities outside the classroom will be detrimentally slashed. In most instances these activities are essential to a broader, more comprehensive educational package for the disadvantaged Black and Puerto Rican child.

(i) The cost of these cuts in psychological terms as it affects the alienated ghetto youth are immeasurable. The effect on morale on all teachers is sizable.

(j) Staff cuts will adversely affect the UFT's present contract provision that there

be no more than 31 children per class. Fewer teachers means larger classes. Larger classes means less personal attention, a more rudimentary, less satisfactory educational program.

12. Department of Correction

(a) Contemplated cuts of up to 1200 men in the Department are unwise in the extreme. The recent prison riots highlighted the difficulties this Department is facing. Personnel shortages were cited by its Commissioner as detrimental to the good operation of his Department. The anticipated cuts are almost 1/3rd the uniform staff. Obviously, this cannot be because the prisons simply cannot operate with officers.

(b) Puerto Ricans are concerned with this Department because almost 22% of the prison population is Puerto Rican or of hispanic origin. In some detention houses (Bronx and Brooklyn) the percentage is higher.

(c) Presently it is the desire of the Puerto Rican community that this Department make every effort to recruit more bilingual officers to meet demand for services and counseling of non-English speaking Latin inmates.

13. Transportation Administration

(a) It is a self-evident fact that the poor are the biggest users of public transportation in this city, and that personnel cuts, under Option I, would be intolerable, in a transit system which is already antiquated, understaffed, ill staffed, and at times dangerous to use.

(b) Unlike their commuting fellow-workers who drive into the city or come by train or bus from suburbia, the Puerto Rican must rely on the subway to get to and from work and for all his transportation needs. At the present fare, which is most prohibitive, he should expect, and get, better service. With the anticipated cuts, he will get even worse service.

14. Criminal and Supreme Courts

(a) All city agencies involved in the administration of criminal justice are understaffed and overworked. We are fully aware of the horrendous delays in our court system, forcing youths to remain in detention institutions for months on end awaiting trial. To cut funds for our courts would be inexcusable and inhumane.

(b) We concur with Judge David Ross that what we need are more courts, better courts and a faster, more responsive judicial system. We cannot agree to slicing the funds for the city's courts from \$109.7 to \$98.5 million.

15. Recreation and Parks

(a) The city's parks are the St. Moritz and the Palm Beach of the Puerto Ricans. For those unable to escape the city in summers, the parks (and city's beaches) are the only escape. Budget cuts (under option 1) over 1/2rd the operating expenses of this Department will contribute to the further deterioration of these facilities and denying them to those who need them the most—the city's poor.

16. Human Resources Administration

(a) No city agency has experienced the demand for increased services to the extent that the Human Resources Administration has had to respond to in the last few years. The HRA and its sub agencies is severely affected by contemplated budget costs, yet it must provide services and monies to welfare clients in an ever increasing scale.

(b) As WOBS recently editorialized, "one of the reasons most people decry welfare costs is that they blame the ills of our state and local governments on welfare." Despite illusions of how much is spent for welfare the figures show that for the \$1500 per/capita paid in taxes in this country, only \$30.00 of that amount is spent for public assistance programs, yet we pay over twice as much

(§80) for highway construction and maintenance and almost ten times as much (§420) for national defense.

(c) In New York City, 11% of the budget in 1969 went for public assistance. Yet city and state prejudice against welfare has burdened the Human Resources with projected services cuts which cannot be absorbed in these times. For instance, the New York State budget cuts reduced the Youth Services Administration State funds by 50%. That means that this agency lost \$1,779,000 from the \$3,668,000 it expected to receive this year. These cuts affect all YSA programs which help the Hispanic young and were also used to finance the work of many small contract agencies, voluntary, non-profit organizations that provide youths with specialized services, like the Police Athletic League. 650 youths employed in neighborhood beautification will not be retained this summer. Many were Puerto Rican.

More than 20,000 youths in after-school and juvenile delinquency programs will no longer receive these services. And it is unlikely that the YSA's \$9.7 million budget requested from the City of New York will be granted.

The Puerto Rican community concurs with the HRA's announcement recently that by reducing the State budget, the Legislature has decided that the welfare of youths throughout the State is of no great importance. And in a time of increasing social unrest this indifference may be far more costly than anyone comprehends.

(d) Under option 1, the almost \$12.5 million will be siphoned away from the community action programs. This represents a loss of 2400 jobs. Likewise, the budget previously submitted included a long-awaited 7.5% salary increase for employees, who had not been raised in over two years. To the employees not let go the increase will be given, however, the difference will have to come out in funds appropriated for programs.

In other words, in order to raise workers to the level of living wage each small agency supported in this program will lay off workers and attempt to operate the program with fewer people. The portion of the cut, therefore represents an additional reduction in the operating level of the entire anti-poverty program.

Most of the job positions sacrificed are paraprofessional and rely on the community resident for manpower. Thus the loss of the job has a multiplier effect in that the buying power of the community is reduced which, in turn, directly affects non-poverty businesses in the neighborhood and directly threatens the jobs provided by these businesses. Likewise, the income received by these families, while marginal, is in practically all cases the only income the family has. If this income is lost, public assistance must be sought. But if public assistance is also to be reduced, where will the income come from?

The loss of a job to a Puerto Rican family literally means a grave threat to the family's ability to obtain shelter, clothing and food.

(c) In addition to all the cuts in services by the supplementary agencies under HRA the HRA has already announced welfare grants reductions of 10%. This, on top of all the other cuts places an unusually heavy load on the poor of this city.

17. Addiction Services Agency

(a) No problem has been more acute or aggravating to the poor than the unchecked spread of addiction in the city of New York. It tears at the very structure of the Puerto Rican family; contributes immensely to crime in the ghetto; and shows little if any hope in the near future.

(b) The ASA, in addition to suffering the same drawbacks and headaches as the other agencies discussed here, will suffer an addi-

tional blow because of the state legislature on the unacceptability of in-kind contributions as a matching share. What it all means is that the total Youthful Drug Abuse Program (YDAP) in New York City will drop from \$72 to \$12 million.

(b) The poor communities need funds to maintain addict centers and provide the medical and psychiatric help these men require. Reduced treatment in the ghettos mean the addict has no place to go. What assistance he may have gotten will be lost, making him another candidate for welfare.

(c) The result is that youths will keep on taking drugs. Some will die. Others will be caught stealing or selling drugs and incarcerated. Most important; they and their families will feel less secure their son will kill the habit and be restored to a normal life.

(d) The cost of addiction, in terms of a lost life, lifetime as a public ward, crime, and the very essence and nature of our life in the city as each and everyone must adopt to a crime-ridden society, is monumental compared to the sums being asked to provide an adequate curative program.

SOME FURTHER RANDOM COMMENTS

Uniformed Forces

A recent survey by the Grand Council of Hispanic Societies shows that the percentage of Puerto Rican employees in the uniformed services is very small. Most of these men have been recently employed. Many had to study hard, wait long for appointment. Yet because of their tenure they will be among the first to be discharged under Option 1.

In every Department they perform services which are vitally needed since they must deal with the large Hispanic community, much of it non-English speaking.

Wholesale firings of these desperately needed men will result in disillusioning other Hispanic citizens from joining the uniformed services. The Grand Council points out there is only one commissioner in the uniformed services departments and that representation among the higher ranks is practically non-existent.

Puerto Ricans presently comprise an infinitesimal percentage of both City and State civil services. In the state, for instance, out of 202,000 employees, only 2,300 are Hispanic, a 1.45%. Most of these are in lower clerical positions.

It is not easy to sell the Civil Service to Hispanic citizens who cannot adjust to the studying, taking exams, and long waits often accompanying appointment. They want their jobs NOW. With these cuts, they see the doors further shut in their face.

The following Organizations, civic clubs, community corporations, store-front anti-poverty agencies, citizens groups, etc., are signatories to this Position Paper.

Puerto Rican Community Development Project.

Hunts Point Community Corp.

ASPIRA.

Morisiana Community Corp.

Puerto Rican Forum.

Bronx Multi-Service Center.

Grand Council Hispanic Societies Inc.: New York City Department of Correction, New York City Fire Department, New York City Police Department, New York City Transit Police Department, New York City Department of Sanitation, New York City Housing Authority, Hispanic State Employees Society, Hispanic Transit Society, Puerto Rican Civil Service Employees Association, Con Edison.

Department of Social Services, Hispanic Society.

Lower East Side Community Corporation.

South Bronx Community Corporation.

South Bronx Maternity Center.

Hostos Community College.

Action for Progress.

College for Human Services.
Association Femenina Hispana.
Lower West Side Community Corporation.

National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights.

Society of Puerto Rican Writers.

Society of Puerto Rican Journalists.

Citizens Welfare Action Group.

Brigade-in-Action.

Puerto Ricans Tenants Group of Lower East Side.

Association of Community Service Centers.
Negro Action Group.

N.I.N.A. Neighborhood.

United Neighborhood Association.

Movimiento Puertorriqueño Unido.

Puerto Rican Council.

Congress of Municipal Clubs.

Committee of Welfare Families.

United Organizations of Suffolk Street.

Lower East Side Neighborhood Association.

Little Stars of the Bronx.

Nativity Mission.

Eldridge Street Community Center.

University Outpost.

Neighborhood Council to Combat Poverty.

Neighborhood Mothers.

Each Time, Inc.

Welfare Action Group Against Poverty.

Two Bridges Parent Development Program.

Project Able Association.

Chinatown Planning Council.

Chinese Youth Council.

Movimiento Hispano Unido.

Puerto Rican Action Group.

Lower East Manhattan Youth Leadership.

Puerto Rican Teen Canteen.

Association Dominos & Deportes.

Alizana Para Mujeres Social Club.

All Nations Womens Club.

Association of Puerto Rican Organizations.

Bronx Coordinating Regional Council.

Organizations United of the Bronx (OUB).

Westchester Avenue Community Coordinating Council.

Gramery Neighborhood Improvement Association.

Morisiana Urban Action Task Force.

163rd Street Improvement Council.

Project Survival.

Jennings Satellite Group.

Modern Action Committee for the Elderly.

Neighborhood Engaged Workshop.

Opportunities for Equal and Remedial Services.

Trinity Avenue Block Association.

Caribbean Artistic and Cultural Association.

Catholic Charities of South Bronx.

Simpson Street Development Association.

Bronx Committee of Self Improvement.

Concerned Parents Association.

Hunts Point Coordinating Council.

Mott Haven Planning Committee.

South Bronx Citizens Group.

South Bronx Physical Fitness Group.

Urban League Bronx Committee.

Herbert Lehman Community Corporation.

Puerto Rican Community Service Center.

Borinquen Social Club.

National Association of Puerto Rican Volunteers.

Congress of Puerto Rican Veterans.

Consejo General de Mujeres.

National Training Corps.

Hijos de las Piedras.

Parada Tres Reyes Magos.

Circulo Toabajeno.

Sociedad Cultural Puertorriqueña.

Happy Ladies Club.

Allianza Civica Tropical.

Juncos Social Club.

Juventud Hijos de Salina.

Puerto Rican Interracial Development Group.

Ateneo Artistico Hispano.

Choferes Inc.

Spanish American Barbers Association.

Puerto Rican Investors Association.
 Caborrojenos Ausentes.
 Alianza Civica Bayamonesa.
 Boulevard Tenants Association.
 Bello Amanecer, Inc.
 Seven Brothers Social Club.
 Liga Puertorriquena (Baseball).
 Puerto Rican Political Action Group.
 Las Lomas Social Club.
 Association Arecibena.
 Club de Lares.
 South Bronx Community Corporation.
 Concentrated Employment Program.
 Las Flores Social Club.
 Taxistas Hispanos.
 Hijos de Vieques.
 South Bronx Council.
 Federation of Puerto Rican Organization of Lower Manhattan.
 Puerto Rican Federation of South Brooklyn.
 Puerto Rican Council of Brooklyn.
 Spanish American Merchants Association.
 Comerio Social Club.
 Hermandad Puertorriquena Arcoiris.
 Santa Isabela Social Club.
 Association de Fotografos Hispanos.
 Puerto Rican Veterans Association.
 Association Cultural Hispana.
 Club de Volantes de Puerto Rico.
 Sociedad Hispana de Queens.
 Latin American Development Association.
 Assoc. Progresiva Hispana de Queens.
 Brooklyn Hispanic Civic Association.
 Puerto Rican Womens Needlecraft Association.
 Puerto Rican Organizations of Brownsville.
 Federation of Puerto Rican Athletic Leagues.
 Puerto Rican Teachers Association.
 Boulevard Health Clinic.
 Circulo Civico-Cultural Mayaguez.
 Assoc. Hijos de Vieques.
 Narajitenos Unidos.
 Barranquitas Social Club.
 Caguas Criollos Social Club.
 Hermanos de Ponce.
 Movimiento Proporcional.
 Club Social Aguadeno.
 Club Hijos de Humacao.
 Soc. Arecibena Campeche.
 Union Rincoena.
 Agrupacion Femenina Puertorriquena.
 Lus Munoz Rivera Memorial Association.
 South Bronx Orientation Center.
 Centro de Orientation Puertorriquena.
 Fraternidad Guanisa.
 Comite Pro Ninos Liciados.
 Alianza Civica Puertorriquena.
 Capullos de Borinquen.
 Hijos del Eden.
 Yauco Deportivo.
 Yauco Civic and Social Club.
 Lazo Social.
 Association Cutral Fajardena.
 Borinquen Bella.
 Caballeros de San Juan.
 Hijos de Florida.
 Circulo Toalteno.
 Tremont Community Corporation.
 Elsmere Tenants Council.
 Monterrey Community Association.
 NAPRA.
 Wheeler Avenue Block Association.
 United Bronx Parents Association.
 Bronx River Education Action Center.
 Circulo San Germino.
 Sociedad Fraternal Hispana.
 Circulo Social Manatieno.
 Familias Hispanas, Inc.
 Circulo Guayanillense y Amigos, Inc.
 Soc. Maricaoeno.
 Bayamon Civic and Social Club.
 Mallen Social Club.
 Soc. Civica San Germanas Ausentes.
 Hermandad Progresista Cidrena.
 The Family Institute.
 Bethany Community Development Corp.
 Borinquen Buds.
 La Sultana del Oeste Social Club.
 Marvel Civic & Social Club.

Resp. Logia de Lengua Espanola.
 Resp. Logia del Caribe (Luna).
 St. Anthony of Padua Housing Clinic, Inc.
 Asociacion Cultural Hijos de Camuy.
 Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, Inc.
 Bay Ridge Spanish American Social Club.
 Caparra Social & Athletic Club.
 Civilian Protective Association, Inc.
 Comm. Orientation Center of First Presbyterian Church.
 Williamsburg Community Corp.
 Council of Block Association, District #2.
 Cuyler Spanish Orientation Center.
 El Eslabon del Caribe, Inc.
 Fort Greene Caballeros Hispanos, Inc.
 Fort Greene Community Orientation Center.
 Gowanus Youth & Parents Civic Association, Inc.
 Hijos de las Marias, Inc.
 La Casa Penuelas Social Club.
 McKibb Star Social & Athletic Club.
 Ocean Hill Cursillistas Center, Inc.
 Pitkin & Hilford Tenants Association, Inc.
 Bomberitos, Inc.
 Chelsea Puerto Rican Independent Action Group.
 Chelsea Save Our Home & Business Committee.
 Club Civico Social Ponceno.
 East Harlem Jaycee Foundation.
 Faro Puertorriqueno.
 Hijos De Barceloneta.
 Madison Neighbors in Action.
 Manhattan Valley Spanish Civic Organization, Inc.
 Progreso para el Viejo Chelsea.
 Puerto Rican Crusade.
 Fiesta Folklorica Committee.
 Desfile Puertorriqueno.
 Soc. Unida de Aguirrenos Ausentes . . . and others.
 Prepared and edited for the Committee by: Agenor L. Castro.

DOES UNION POWER CAUSE INFLATION?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles M. Brooks, corporate manager of industrial relations of Texaco, Inc., recently made a very thoughtful speech on the subject "Does Union Power Cause Inflation?"

In his remarks, he outlines a very definite relation between the awesome power of labor unions and the inflationary cycle which has caused one of our major domestic problems.

I call this speech to the attention of all of the Members and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

UNION POWER AND INFLATION

(By Charles M. Brooks)

The subject for this Annual National Chamber labor relations luncheon is stated in this question: "Does Union Power Cause Inflation?"

My personal view—and I am only speaking for myself today—is that labor unions possess tremendous economic power, and that their application of this power is a principal cause of the inflationary sufferings being endured by all of us.

Highly respected authorities agree that we are in an inflationary spiral—they say this is a period when prices keep going up because costs keep going up—and that costs keep going up because wages keep going up.

Whatever words are used to define the term "inflation", the fact is that anyone who purchases products or services knows that the cost of living has been rising too fast for comfort. And, anyone who "meets a payroll" or who must interest himself in labor costs knows that wages have been increasing in the past few years faster than productivity increases. The result has been price increases.

Authorities agree that unless greater output from labor and equipment is achieved in the economy, higher wages will inevitably bring higher prices. That is what has been happening.

Wages have been increasing without a corresponding increase in productivity, with the inescapable result that prices have been rising steadily. The figures have been furnished you already. I think it is quite evident that the "dog is chasing its tail".

With the increase in productivity at an unbelievably high figure during the same period when wages were rising at an extraordinarily high rate, the difference was made up by price increases.

That was inflation! It was caused by the unreasonably low wage increases. Those increases were due to excessive settlements dictated by powerful labor unions.

A former union official and now a high government officer said recently that those high wage settlements were self-defeating. He elaborated in this way—the wage increases pushed up prices to such a high level that buying began to slacken off, jobs began to disappear, the value of the dollar fell, and the rise in welfare costs chewed up and devoured more and more tax dollars.

Another high government official, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns, has told Congress recently that our American labor unions have become so powerful, and have so abused that power, that they have pushed wage rates up to the point that they are causing loss of jobs. He said, "The inflation that we are still experiencing . . . rests on the upward push of costs—mainly, sharply rising wage rates".

If I might be permitted to borrow a manner of speaking from a great man of history, I would say that never have so few caused such wage increases that prices have soared so high that it requires so much to buy so little.

If we concede—as I think we must—that the high wage increases are causing the inflationary conditions, the question presented is whether union power is at fault. I think the evidence is overwhelming that union power does cause this cancerous condition of inflation.

Unless you have at some time come face to face with it, the power of labor unions is something that is hard to believe. Gilbert Burck wrote an article in the February issue of *Fortune* on the subject, "Union Power and the New Inflation". This is a quotation of one paragraph from that article:

"The underlying trouble is a phenomenon so much taken for granted that it seldom gets the critical scrutiny it deserves—labor's unique monopoly power. 'When you really examine that power today', says an eminent British economist, 'it is quite fantastic'. Unions were originally established, of course, to protect workers from exploitation and to advance their general welfare. It was partly because of the unions' benign role that the Western world put the interests of people as producers ahead of their interests as consumers. Thus favored, however, labor unions naturally sought to gain higher wages and benefits for their members than they could get in the open market. They became monopolies. They rig the markets for labor by restricting the supply, thereby raising the price. Allowed to organize like armies, they practice coercion and intimidation, and do not hesitate to disrupt a whole economy to gain their ends."

That, Ladies and Gentlemen, is a state-

ment that should stimulate us all to action—it is something to ponder!

What manner of power is this that labor unions can use and abuse, and by which they can upset an economy?

The former dean of Harvard University's Law Faculty, the late Roscoe Pound, once described the union power that I refer to in this way:

"The legal right to commit wrongs to person and property, to interfere with the use of highways, to break contracts, to deprive individuals of the means of earning a livelihood, to control the activities of the individual workers and their local organizations by national organizations centrally and arbitrarily administered beyond the reach of state laws—things which no one else can do with impunity."

This awesome power of unions is the power to shut down railroads, silence telephones, stop firefighting, interfere with police and other essential services—the power to stop mail service—the power to do many things that are not allowed to any other being, organization or institution.

The wisdom of allowing a private organization to have such powers is questionable. But even more questionable is whether people will continue for much longer to tolerate the abuse of that power.

The charge is so often made in gatherings like this that labor unions have monopoly power which they use wrongfully. These charges are not that the power exercised by unions is illegal! The charges are that the possession or use of the power is wrong. Something can be wrong and at the same time legal.

The situation I am talking about is in some ways comparable to the period 80 to 90 years ago. Then the charge was against business—now it is against labor unions. Some 80 years ago, whatever business monopolies and trusts that did exist were not illegal—but they were wrong. Those wrongs were corrected to permit our country to grow.

The same thing is needed today! We should curb the power possessed by unions that is wrong—unions should not be allowed to use their power in ways that are wrong.

What are some of the most notable union powers that aggravate the inflationary condition of our economy; and what are the sources of those powers?

The Power of Compulsion, as possessed and abused by unions, I conceive to be wrong in concept and wrong in its use. Unions may lawfully compel people to join the union, to pay dues to the union, to support political candidates favored by the union and to stay away from their jobs.

Union leaders in some industries, such as construction and maritime, can lawfully withhold work permits that effectively deprive individuals of the right to work when they want and need to work. Union leaders may lawfully impose arbitrary fines, intimidate, threaten, coerce and frighten workers and their families to do the bidding of the union leaders.

The power of compulsion is wrong! It is wrong to compel a person to pay tribute in the form of initiation fees, assessments and dues in order to "earn his bread".

The right to work belongs freely to each man and woman. The right to union activity also is protected, but the right to refrain from union activity is likewise assured by Congressional mandate, even if it is often disregarded by administrative fiat and executive laxity.

This union power of compulsion can and does help cause inflation! For an example, the multibillion dollars construction industry—we all know that some building crafts have recently engaged in successful strikes to get a wage rate of \$12 to \$14 per hour. News Commentator John K. Jessup, in his broadcast of

February 13, 1971, painted this word picture of union power and inflation:

"The way construction workers win their extravagant raises is very simple: they turn one in every three wage negotiations into a strike. In an industry as fragmented as theirs the strike is a pretty definitive one-way weapon. The contractor is tied to his building site and his bank loan, whereas the striking carpenter or plumber can and often does drive to an interim job in the next town until his original employer gives in. This is monopoly power of the most naked kind and it is being chronically abused. We are already indebted to the building trades unions for setting a national example of featherbedding work rules and jurisdictional disputes. They have also shown us how to keep skilled blacks out of work by refusing them local union memberships. Now we can thank them also for setting the pace of our inflation."

The power of compulsion reaches a high point in the 17 building trades unions and the several maritime unions. They have the power to compel contractors and shipping operators, as the case may be, to obtain all workers through their union hiring halls. This gives the construction unions control over hiring and training, by the manipulation of which they can create artificial shortages in building crafts at a time when unemployment rates for the building crafts stand at around 11%. This control that unions have over manpower is a tremendous power unequalled in lawful commercial transactions.

This kind of labor union power has direct effects on inflationary conditions. High construction wage rates stop construction jobs, which causes more unemployment, poor housing, high prices, and tax rises.

The building trades and maritime unions are the kingpins in the use of the hiring halls, but they are not the only culprits in the use of compulsion. The transportation settlement of some months ago—about 40% increase in wage rates—set a pace that automobile and other industries' unions have sought to follow. This excessive settlement was possible because the Teamsters Union has the power to literally stop the flow of goods. This power has gone unchallenged by both public authorities and the private citizenry.

Since most everything we buy must be transported at some time and in some way, and since labor costs represent around half of the operating costs in transportation, these excessive wage increases in transportation have quite naturally raised the prices of most all of the products we use. The manufacturer, the wholesaler, and the retailer, it seems, have added the increased freight rates to the prices, and we all have had to pay.

The "muscle power" and the license to use force and violence is a second specific power of unions that I conceive to be wrong in both concept and use. Strong-arm tactics, threats, beatings, intimidation and the like are traditional weapons used by unions.

It is well known and fully documented in records of Congressional Committees that union leaders rely on fear to a great extent to accomplish their objectives. One union leader, who was questioned about violence on the picket line that had been sanctioned by the union, stated that these violent actions of force and intimidation were designed to serve as an example for the future. He said that by the use of these tactics, the people would learn the lesson they have coming to them and "that it will then no longer be necessary for us to have large picket lines. They will have learned their lesson and will have learned it well".

The public generally has learned its lessons well! Fear of some kind of reprisal serves to intimidate us all. How many times have you heard one say that he or she is afraid

to go through the picket line? More than once, I am sure.

A few years ago, the high school football team of a small city was being feted at a banquet sponsored by the local Chamber of Commerce. The hotel where the dinner was scheduled was being picketed due to a labor dispute. During the day of the banquet, some of the parents of the football players received threatening phone calls that the boys might be bodily harmed if they went through the picket line. The banquet was canceled as a result of this act of intimidation which instilled fear in the people.

It is a sad commentary on our labor laws and law enforcement—both of which are supposed to provide balanced power between business and labor—that union leaders can frighten people to stay away from social events, the marketplace and their jobs.

This imbalance in power, as between business and labor unions, is shaking the foundations of our economy. What do you think would happen to an employer who threatened his employees? You know—as I do—that hot coals of criticism would be heaped upon his head by politicians, Ralph Nader, George Meany and a number of organizations. Many of the more verbose union leaders, some politicians and certain of the self-styled liberal press are still referring to alleged exploitation by employers of their employes by referring to evidence uncovered by the La Follette Committee about 40 years ago.

The same situation prevails as to our labor laws of today. For the most part, they were written in the 1930's, based on conditions that existed then, when fledgling unions needed some protection and support from the government. But the tables have been turned, and it is time for us to look at our labor laws on the basis of conditions of the 1970's, instead of the 1930's.

The power of unions to slow down progress by restricting the use of more efficient equipment, machines and methods is the third power that I believe is wrong—and it is another power that when exercised by the unions causes inflation.

The industrial relations records of modern America are replete with evidence of restrictive work practices that have been written into labor agreements because unions are so powerful that the employers could not resist successfully. Some types of restrictive practices, many of which you are familiar with, are included in the following list:

The Electrical Unions require previously wired equipment to be re-wired before installing them.

The Printing Union demands that prepared ads be reset, with resulting waste and increase in costs.

The Plumbers Union refuses to work on pre-threaded pipes unless it is re-threaded on the job.

The Painter's Union limits the size of a paint brush to stretch out the work.

The Carpenter's Union refuses to install pre-fabricated items.

The Bricklayer's Union has a quota of 400 bricks per day, instead of the normal 800.

The Electrical Union requires that only a skilled craftsman may insert a light bulb.

The Dockworker's Union demands that pre-packed containers must be repacked at the New York City Port docks.

This list could be expanded many fold—some of the restrictions being even more ridiculous and more costly. The work rules imposed by the railroad unions are classical examples and are fairly well known because of the numerous railroad strikes, special laws and various emergencies in the past few years.

Too often an employer will agree to include some of these restrictive practices in a labor

contract in the mistaken belief that these are not cost items. But, more frequently, particularly in certain industries, the practices have become so traditional that a union will never let them be changed. These costly, uneconomical and non-productive practices are the by-products of the power of unions—a power which employers cannot successfully cope with under present laws and attitudes of the public and the government.

Therefore, union power does cause inflationary conditions.

A final point is that labor unions seems to have an inexhaustible supply of power flowing from the public sympathy and government favoritism that they enjoy.

The public generally tends to identify unions as defenders of the "underdog", protectors of the weak, and supporters of the poor. There was some basis for such feelings 40 years ago. But not so today. Nevertheless, I am always surprised by the attitudes of the public about a labor dispute, even though the public is being hurt by the dispute.

Most adults in America are employees instead of in business for themselves. Consequently, most people automatically identify with and place themselves on the side of the union in a labor dispute. School teachers, writers, reporters, broadcasters, police, and many others not identified with unions a few years ago, seem to have joined the cult of "strength in organization and demonstration".

Likewise, a majority of our politicians have a bias in favor of unions. Unions have been most effective—and unencumbered by the Corrupt Practices Act—in their political activities. Courts and law enforcement officials seem to "wink at" the quite obvious trespassing by unions on intended legal restraints.

Just as law enforcement officials so often "look the other way" when the union leaders stir up and participate in violence, in like manner they are most permissive regarding alleged infractions of laws that proscribe political activities.

A business institution is not allowed the same leeway as unions. This aggravates the imbalance of power between unions and business, and sets the stage for unions to use their incomparable power in ways that cause inflation.

Another vivid illustration of the general public and government bias for unions can be found in the public assistance given to strikers.

When an employer and the union fail to agree, our labor laws are such that the parties are permitted to "battle it out" on the picket line. The parties are then engaged in an economic struggle. But, under the administration of our laws, they cannot use equal weapons. Strikers may receive food stamps, welfare payments, and sometimes unemployment compensation.

These public assistance gestures are one-sided—it is tantamount to the employer fighting alone, while his adversary is given help with money that the employer himself has contributed.

No self-respecting person wants another to starve, but neither should we want a group of strikers to be kept whole at the expense of the entire country. Our policies should not guarantee the success of all strikes, but that is just about the case under current circumstances.

The following quote from a recently released special report by the California State Chamber describes some of the harm done by this abuse of the food stamp program:

"The weighted advantage of the strikers, their ability to insulate themselves during long periods with little or no income, jeopardizes fair collective bargaining. It propagates more strikes and strikes of longer duration besides making it easy for unions to ask for

inflationary settlements. Strikes hurt the economy, paralyzing not only the business involved but affecting related industries and the nation as a whole. Government action which results in more and longer strikes is detrimental to the economy and to the people."

If strikers are to be helped by doling out public funds, would it not be fair to give the employer some assistance? We read from time to time about a business being bankrupted as the result of a strike.

If the strikers are to be assured that they will not suffer—even though they or their chosen union leaders started the strike—then Small Business Administration funds or the like should be used to help the other side. As conditions now stand, the government officials and the public act to guarantee the success of every strike.

Moreover, unions have a tremendous power—one not found on the side of business—flowing from the accepted practice whereby about one settlement in every seven is rejected by the members. Following this, the leaders go back for more—and sometimes there is more than one rejection—witness the airline settlement five years ago that shattered the guidelines.

To summarize and conclude, I submit that labor unions possess powers far beyond those of other private organizations;—that labor unions, through the exercise of those powers have caused and are causing inflation;—that those powers are drawn from many sources, including:

1. Compulsory membership in order to work;
2. The traditional use of coercion, intimidation, force and violence;
3. Restrictions on managerial rights and responsibilities;
4. Public sympathy and political bias in favor of unions;
5. Full immunity from monopoly and trade restriction laws;
6. Subsidies for strikers from public funds.

It is to be hoped that we soon will be willing to look at this problem with reason instead of permitting it to remain immersed in politics. Sir William Drummond once wrote:

"He who will not reason is a bigot; he who cannot is a fool; and he who dares not is a slave."

It seems to me that in order to break the shackles that threaten to enslave us in inflation, we must dare to reason our way into legislation and attitudes that will curb the power of unions to coerce, intimidate, threaten, commit acts of violence, control manpower supply, and overpower all who oppose them.

Let us dare to require that the behavior of labor unions be in the public interest. Let us dare to insist that America be for all Americans.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MAY 1971

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the calendar of events for the National Gallery of Art for the month of May 1971.

As always, the National Gallery of Art has planned a month of outstanding events, and I urge those who can to visit the National Gallery during May.

In addition, I want to call the atten-

tion of my colleagues and the American people to the groundbreaking ceremonies for the new east building of the National Gallery of Art, which will take place on Thursday, May 6, 1971. This new building will give an added dimension to the National Gallery, and will also house the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts.

The calendar of events follows:

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

MONDAY, APRIL 26, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 2

*Painting of the week: Boltraffio, *Portrait of a Youth*, (Ralph and Mary Booth Collection) Gallery 23, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the Week: *The Dürer Exhibition: Religious Subjects*. Central Gallery, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday Lecture: *Dürer's Personality*, Guest Speaker: Julius S. Held, Professor of Art History, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, Auditorium 4:00.

"Civillisation"—*Protest and Communication*, concerning Dürer and his contemporaries Tues., Thurs. and Sun., 12:30.

Sunday Concert: *28th American Music Festival*, Feldman String Quartet of Norfolk, Virginia, East Garden Court 7:00.

MONDAY, MAY 3, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 9

*Painting of the Week: Glotto, *Madonna and Child* (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 3, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the Week: *The Dürer Exhibition: Secular Subjects*. Central Gallery, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*, Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday Lecture: *Dürer—The Artist and His Society*, Guest Speaker: Gerald Strauss, Professor of History, Indiana University, Bloomington, Auditorium 4:00.

"Civillisation"—*Protest and Communication*, concerning Dürer and his contemporaries. Tues., Thurs. and Sun., 12:30.

Sunday Concert: *28th American Music Festival*, Madison Madrigal Singers, Robert Shafer, Conductor, East Garden Court 7:00.

Gallery Hours: *The Gallery is open weekdays and Saturdays, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Sundays, 12 noon to 9:00 p.m.*

MONDAY, MAY 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 16

*Painting of the Week: Cuypp, *The Maas at Dordrecht*, (Andrew Mellon Collection) Gallery 47, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the Week: *The Dürer Exhibition: Techniques and Craftsmanship*, Central Gallery, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday Lecture: *Dürer, Master Printmaker*. Guest Speaker: Eleanor A. Sayre, Curator, Department of Prints and Drawings, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Auditorium, 4:00.

"Civillisation"—*Protest and Communication*, concerning Dürer and his contemporaries, Tues., Thurs. and Sun., 12:30.

Sunday Concert: *28th American Music Festival*, Francis Brancalone, Pianist, Emerson Meyers, Tape Recorder, East Garden Court, 7:00.

For reproductions and slides of the collection, books, and other related publications, self-service rooms are open daily near the Constitution Avenue entrance.

* 11" x 14" reproductions with texts for sale this week—15¢ each. If mailed, 25¢ each.

MONDAY, MAY 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 23

*Painting of the Week: Degas. Achille de Gas in the Uniform of a Cadet, (Chester Dale Collection) Gallery 88, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the Week: Dürer and German Painting, Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection, Rotunda Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday Lecture: Treasures of the Wallace Collection. Guest Speaker: Vesey Norman, Assistant to the Director, The Wallace Collection, London, Auditorium 4:00.

"Civilisation"—Protest and Communication, concerning Dürer and his contemporaries, Tues., Thurs. and Sun., 12:30.

Sunday Concert: 28th American Music Festival, National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, Conductor, East Garden Court 7:00.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery Staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MAY 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 30

*Painting of the Week: Neroccio de Landi. Portrait of a Lady, (Widener Collection) Gallery 10, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the Week: Dürer in North Italy, Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: Introduction of the Collection, Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday Lecture: Matisse as a Draftsman Guest Speaker: Victor Carlson, Curator of Prints and Drawings, The Baltimore Museum of Art, Auditorium 4:00.

"Civilisation"—Protest and Communication, concerning Dürer and his contemporaries, Tues., Thurs. and Sun., 12:30.

Sunday Concert: Joseph Fennimore, Pianist, East Garden Court 7:00.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to (202) 737-4215, ext. 272.

GROUND-BREAKING FOR THE EAST BUILDING

After two and a half years of intensive planning, the National Gallery of Art has completed final design plans for an addition to its present building.

The East Building, to be constructed on the site bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue, 3rd Street, Madison Drive and 4th Street, as authorized by Public Law 90-378 approved by the President on July 5, 1968, will be connected to the existing 30 year old National Gallery of Art building by a pedestrian concourse level beneath 4th Street. Architectural plans, renderings, and architectural models are being presented to the public on May 6, concurrent with ground-breaking ceremonies following the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees.

When the site for the National Gallery of Art was appropriated by a Public Resolution of the 75th Congress on March 24, 1937, provisions for expansion were made by reserving the site to the east for future Gallery use. That farsighted action provided the base for planning by the Board of Trustees for the East Building, including a Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. The action was furthered by a gift from Paul Mellon and the late Mrs. Mellon Bruce announced by the President on November 6, 1967.

Congressional authorization in 1968 to construct a building on the site was followed by the Trustees' appointment of the architect, I. M. Pei of New York. The Charles H. Tompkins Company of Washington, D.C. has been chosen as the general contractor. Final completion of the East Building is planned for 1975.

The Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts will include facilities for a major library and photographic archive. The new building will also incorporate exhibition galleries, enlarged restaurant facilities, and housing for the expanding extension, publications and education programs.

CONTINUING ON VIEW

Dürer in America: His Graphic Work, a special exhibition on view through June 6, has been organized by the National Gallery to commemorate the 500th anniversary of Albrecht Dürer's birth. Included are 36 drawings—the first time that all Dürer drawings in America (with two exceptions) have been brought together—and 207 prints which were chosen on the basis of quality from among tens of thousands of Dürer impressions. The prints and drawings on view are on loan from 32 public and private collections in America and Canada. More than 25 percent of the prints and seven books are from the Gallery's Rosenwald Collection.

A section on print connoisseurship, containing 50 comparative impressions with texts and explanatory labels, is part of the exhibition. A definitive, 364-page catalogue is available with extensive treatment of 36 drawings, 80 engravings and 127 woodcuts, all illustrated. Guided tours by the Gallery's Education Department lecturers have been developed to complement the exhibition and aid the visitor. An Acoustiguide tour is available.

BRUTAL SUPPRESSION IN EAST PAKISTAN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked and saddened by recent newspaper reports which describe the treatment of the people of East Pakistan by the Pakistan Army since the recent uprising.

I have received a petition from members of the faculty, staff, and student body of the University of California at Berkeley, protesting this treatment and suggesting a course of action for our Government.

I believe this petition is worthy of the attention of this body.

The petition and signatures follow:

A PETITION OF PROTEST REGARDING THE TREATMENT OF THE PEOPLE OF EAST PAKISTAN

We, the undersigned members of the faculty, staff, and students associated with South and Southeast Asia Studies at the University of California at Berkeley, wish to protest strongly against the massacres which have been carried out against the people of East Bengal by the Pakistan Army since March 25, 1971. Not content with simply reasserting its authority over the region, the regime of Yahya Khan has embarked on a policy of systematically murdering all Bengali military officers, students, and intellectuals and civil servants who might have provided some leadership for Bengal in the future. They appear in particular to have singled out for destruction all the Bengali professors and heads of departments at Dacca and other East Bengal universities. This policy can only have as its result the reduction of East Pakistan to a wasteland inhabited by a cowed and subjugated people. Such a policy, horrible enough when applied

to a small village or remote tribal area, is unspeakably evil when directed to sustaining the rule of a distant military regime over a vast unarmed populace which only three months before had overwhelmingly voiced its desire for a measure of richly deserved regional autonomy.

We therefore urge the Government of the United States to join the Governments of India and the Soviet Union in publicly expressing its outrage at the course of events in East Pakistan; and to carry into effect itself the following measures:

(1) to halt at once all military aid to Pakistan, whether of ammunition, spare parts, or equipment; and to maintain this embargo until a government responsive to the will of the people of East Pakistan has been restored to that province;

(2) to suspend economic aid to Pakistan at least until such time as news reporters and scholars are permitted free entry into the major cities of East Bengal to verify for themselves the truth or falsehood of the stories put out by the Government of Pakistan about the events of March and April 1971; and

(3) when economic aid is resumed, to direct the overwhelming bulk of such assistance to the relief and rehabilitation of the distressed people of East Bengal. The channelling of emergency relief should take first priority, followed by a wide range of programs aimed at encouraging the growth of a self-reliant progressive Bengali economy.

SIGNATURES OF A PETITION OF PROTEST REGARDING THE TREATMENT OF THE PEOPLE OF EAST PAKISTAN

James N. Anderson, Professor of Anthropology.

Gerald D. Berreman, Professor of Anthropology.

J. Das Gupta, Professor of Political Science. Joseph Fischer, Indonesian Social Science Project.

William Geoghegan, Professor of Anthropology.

Ellen M. Gumperz, Lecturer in Social Sciences Integrated.

John J. Gumperz, Professor of Anthropology.

Alice S. Ichman, Lecturer in Education. Warren Iichman, Professor of Political Science.

James Matisoff, Professor of Linguistics. Thomas R. Metcalf, Professor of History.

Leonard Nathan, Chairman, Department of Rhetoric.

Bruce Pray, Professor of South Asian Languages.

Gordon C. Roadarmel, Professor of South Asian Languages and Literature.

Leo Rose, Professor of Political Science. James Schubert, Professor of South Asian Languages.

J. Frits Staal, Professor of Philosophy and South Asian Languages and Literature.

Peter Ananda, Librarian. Dora Austin-Doughty, Staff.

Susan Bradford, Student. Hannah S. Branstetter, Staff.

Kenneth Bryant, Student. Lee Ann Bryant, Student.

John V. Cepelak, Student. Betsy M. Cobb, Student.

Dorothea Gielow, Student. Yvonne Kinns, Staff.

Kenneth Logan, Librarian. Michael Metelits, Student.

William Rosoff, Student. Kenneth Shivers, Student.

Craig Stark, Student. Livia Steln, Student.

S. George Vincentnathan, Student. Mary Patricia Williams, Student.

U.S. SECURITY DEPENDS ON FBI

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly voiced my strong feelings of support and admiration for the FBI and its Director, Mr. Hoover.

Recently an editorial appeared in U.S. News & World Report and was written by that magazine's editor, David Lawrence. I feel this editorial successfully answers the unfounded charges and allegations made against Mr. Hoover and successfully points out that the "Internal Security of the United States Depends Upon the FBI."

I insert this article in the RECORD.

[From U.S. News & World Report,
Apr. 19, 1971]

INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES
DEPENDS UPON THE FBI

(By David Lawrence)

The American people have never known the intimate story about the operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation because public disclosure would impair the usefulness of an important governmental organization in dealing with problems of surveillance involving subversion and crime.

To supervise a group of nearly 19,000 persons who must dedicate themselves to secrecy is not an easy task. J. Edgar Hoover, who has been Director of the FBI for several decades—under both Republican and Democratic Administrations—has given the agency a leadership which has enabled it to participate in investigations throughout the land, especially those related to persons suspected of violating federal laws or crossing State lines to escape punishment.

The FBI does not act alone. It works in cooperation with State and local enforcement agencies and often supplies the critical information which leads to the solution of many a crime and to arrests and prosecution by the proper authorities.

The FBI has been very helpful to the police departments of the nation's cities. It gets no publicity for doing so, and doesn't seek any. But in numerous cases, it has been the FBI which furnished the tip that led to the capture of a much-sought-after criminal. State law-enforcement agencies also benefit from the work of the FBI. In fact, there is a reciprocal arrangement among all these groups in order to help each other.

The policy laid down by Director Hoover is one of concentration on the gathering of facts, leaving it to others to act thereon. The decision to prosecute, for instance, is not made by the FBI. The data it assembles are turned over to the Department of Justice, which then can seek a grand jury indictment.

The FBI doesn't make these requests or furnish attorneys for the court proceedings which may follow.

Many organizations which are emotionally aroused over current issues are inclined to blame the FBI if some of the "extremists" are indicted, arrested and brought to trial. The truth is that the Department of Justice makes the decision as to whether they should even be charged.

But there has been apparent for some time a belief among radical groups that their foremost enemy is the FBI, and they have tried in various ways to discredit the organization.

Recently some members of Congress have been assailing Mr. Hoover for allegedly ordering their telephones to be tapped. Although both he and the Department of Justice have

emphatically denied any such thing, the story has been spread and agitators have picked it up as a means of starting another crusade to drive the present Director out. The purpose, of course, is to disorganize the agency and weaken it.

Actually, Mr. Hoover at the age of 76 is one of the most active men serving in public office. He has developed the FBI, with assistants and associates having specific responsibilities, so as to make it possible for the agency to work harmoniously and effectively with close supervision from the top, including suggestions on important cases. As men who have served in the FBI have gone into business or other professional pursuits, they have usually said to their friends on leaving that the organization is as efficiently directed today as it has been over the years.

The radicals would like nothing better than to tear down the FBI. The removal of J. Edgar Hoover would be a victory for them. But there are no indications that the Nixon Administration will fall for such tactics and surrender to the groups antagonistic to the FBI.

The one thing that the FBI has always sought to avoid was any act which could involve its agents in controversies with members of Congress or government officials unless, of course, in connection with some criminal case. But the maintenance of wire tapping of the telephones of members of Congress, as recently claimed by critics of the FBI, is something that anyone who is familiar with FBI operations would know instantly was never authorized by J. Edgar Hoover and probably never occurred.

The FBI has successfully kept out of politics. It has refrained from interference in any way with campaigns of members of Congress or participation, favorable or unfavorable, in presidential contests.

The FBI operation has been expanding over the years, but the Bureau has stuck to one rule—that it would not make public its findings except with the authorization of the Attorney General of the United States, who is the boss of the agency itself.

The FBI can be relied upon to carry on inside the United States extensive investigations of subversion, espionage and any conspiracy against the Government. For the FBI is the principal safeguard of the internal security of our country.

FRIENDSHIP IS A CHAIN OF GOLD

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter recently from a dear friend and I would like to share its message with my colleagues.

Always remember it is a greater honor to be trusted, respected and liked than to be loved.

So begins the words of an American, concerned for her country, its future, its hopes, and ideals. It is oftentimes difficult to put into writing what one feels in his or her heart. Louise has surmounted this challenge so well, with meaning and clarity, that I would be neglect if I did not share it with my colleagues and those who might cast their eyes upon these pages.

Her expression of what friendship is all about would be well for us to remember for it is a priceless possession not bought, but earned and once earned, not easily discarded.

True friendship is a chain of gold, each link molded with a word of cheer, a kindness, loyalty, respect, admiration, sincerity and trust, and displayed with joy when honor, fame and fortune come to those you know; displayed with gentle concern to lighten the load of adversity. But, never displayed when those it embraces could be troubled or harmed. Beautiful and rich is this golden chain of friendship forever giving new life and animation to those it supports. Wear it with pride, it cannot be purchased, it must be earned.

BEYOND THE COLD WAR

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, there has been wide recognition that the United States now faces a far different situation in terms of military security and international political conditions than in 1945, at the beginning of the cold war.

We are indeed now "Beyond the Cold War." That is the title of a most perceptive article by Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg which I am inserting in the RECORD. Dr. Rodberg raises fundamental questions about our entire military posture, defense systems, and foreign policies. These are questions which must be considered if we are serious about reversing the Nation's priorities.

America's experience in Vietnam has tragically brought home the importance of the manner in which a war is waged, as well as the reasons a country uses to justify its military intervention. Likewise, Dr. Rodberg indicates that we must consider how this Nation defends itself, as well as the reasons given for the needs for that defense.

All too often we have separated the how's and why's of our defense policies. President Nixon has spoken of an "end of an era," and has recognized that the "most prevalent Communist threats now are not massive military invasions."

The President has focused attention on the United States' changing military role abroad. There have been changes in the justifications offered for our military and defense commitments.

However, there have been no fundamental changes in the way the Armed Forces goes about defending the country. The escalating costs, the weapon systems heaped upon weapon systems, and the nature of our armed defenses in Europe, all indicate that our defense policies are still planned by the cold warriors of 1945.

Dr. Rodberg points out:

The military seems to see only weapons facing weapons and has forgotten the functions the weapons are supposed to serve.

There seems to be no correlation between the talk about the changing political situation and the planning of our defense programs.

In Vietnam, this country has waged a war which by its nature, has destroyed that which we had claimed to be protecting. Let us not permit our military expenditures and defense systems to escape all control, for in the process we

forfeit the domestic virtues we seek to defend.

Dr. Rodberg's article follows:

BEYOND THE COLD WAR

(By Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg)

(NOTE.—Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg is a Fellow of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C. He has served as an official of U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and as a professor of physics at the University of Maryland. Dr. Rodberg's article is based on testimony he delivered March 24, 1971, before the House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services on behalf of the Friends Committee on National Legislation.)

A NEW ERA

This year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the beginning of the Cold War. In that period, in order to meet the threat we perceived from Soviet Communism, we built the mightiest military machine the world has ever seen. Our forces are deployed on every continent, our nuclear might can totally destroy any nation on earth, and our military establishment has come to pervade every aspect of our national life.

However, in those same twenty-five years, there have been marked changes in the nature of the Communist countries and in the attitude of the American people regarding the most immediate threats to their security. Instead of one united, centrally-directed bloc of Communist nations, we now see an assortment of diverse countries, each professing to follow the teachings of Marx and Lenin, but often in violent disagreement over which is the true successor to these leaders and which, if any, is pre-eminent in the Communist movement. On our side, there is a growing recognition that the military problem which we face today is very different from what we perceived a generation ago.

President Nixon now asserts, in his recent foreign policy message, that the "most prevalent Communist threats now are not massive military invasions." They are, he argues, "a more subtle mix of military, psychological and political pressures." However, in spite of this changed assessment, this country continues to maintain ground, air and naval forces ready for instant action in any part of the globe, as if there were immediate danger of a major war. And we still continue, year after year, to spend half of all appropriated Federal funds on the defense establishment, including \$20 billion on the most recent "generation" of military hardware.

A nation need not automatically purchase the same quantity of armaments this year as it did last. It may be useful, instead, to take a careful look at the real conditions that obtain today, to see whether our military stance is still the most appropriate and least costly we could purchase.

Many factors point to a new era in world relations. Western Europe is demonstrating renewed self-confidence and vitality, suggesting the ability to determine its own defense needs and to meet them through its own resources, based on its own perception of the threat. Thus, our military might is not so badly needed by our allies as it once might have been. On the other side of the Iron Curtain we see both political disarray and growing military strength. The military power of the Soviet Union has developed to where it is now roughly comparable to our own. We can no longer exercise our military weight with the freedom that we once could without fear of response from the Soviet Union. And, finally, we have learned from the agony of Vietnam that our power, great as it is, cannot achieve the goals which we set for it, that there are other, essentially human, factors in the military equation which can nullify bare military strength.

The Nixon Administration has responded to the new situation a new rhetoric that is intended to describe a new defense policy. However, when the Administration took office, it warned us to watch its deeds, not its words, and its deeds indicate that there has been no change at all from the policies of the past. U.S. military forces will continue to be deployed at bases around the world, ready for instant intervention at the behest of the President, and we will continue to purchase new armaments at a pace at least as great as that of the last two decades. In spite of the President's recognition that "we are at the end of an era", there has not been the fresh thinking that the times demand.

WHAT'S THE THREAT?

Our defense establishment, after twenty-five years of the greatest peacetime defense spending in our history, seems even to have lost sight of the real world which faces it. It builds thousands of missiles, and now equips them with more than ten thousand warheads, in order to threaten retaliation on a Soviet Union which has but eight major urban centers. The military seems to see only weapons facing weapons and has forgotten the function these weapons are supposed to serve.

Admiral Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has admitted that, even if the Soviet Union were to achieve a "clearly evident overall strategic superiority"—a most unlikely possibility in view of our massive MIRV deployment program—this might have "no practical effect" on the outcome of a nuclear exchange. But, he suggests, it would affect the "effectiveness of our diplomacy". If the strategic balance has now, even in his view, reached the point where military judgments give way to political ones, then our political leaders, our representatives, and the American public itself are as able to judge the need for new strategic arms as the military.

In a similar vein, we need to ask regarding conventional arms, what is the nature of the threat—not in terms of the number of Soviet tanks, aircraft and ships, but in terms of the purpose of those forces and the danger they actually pose to the United States and its friends. The mere possession of military forces by any nation, even one whose social system we abhor, does not, by itself, pose a threat to us. Those forces must be directed toward infringing on our rights or the rights of some nation of concern to us before they become a threat.

The fact that the Russians have a large army and a growing navy is not sufficient to prove that they are a threat to the security of this nation. Whether we like it or not, the Soviet Union is a great power, with a large population, the world's second largest industrial capacity, and extensive borders to defend. It has always had, and continues to maintain, a large standing military establishment. But this does not mean that we have to see this as an imminent threat to our security.

When the possession of arms is itself perceived as a threat, the result is an arms race, as each side tries to close any "gaps" and match the capabilities of the other. It is in that arms race, rather than in any intentional decision to attack, that the greatest military danger to the United States lies today. And it is on us, still the strongest military power on earth, that the responsibility for damping down the arms race lies.

President Nixon observed in his foreign policy message that the introduction of air defense weapons into Egypt was "the first time that Soviet combat crews have been moved to a nation outside the Communist orbit." This is a remarkable fact, reflecting the conservatism with which the Soviet Union has used its forces, as contrasted with our own readiness to introduce military

force around the world, from Lebanon to Laos, when we see it in our "interest."

The fact is that there is nothing in Communist doctrine or Russian practice to justify the response we have made to the new power position of the Soviet Union. The theories of Marx and Lenin call for revolution from within the capitalist countries, not armed invasion from without. Russia and, more recently, Communist China have made it abundantly clear that home-grown revolutionaries are going to have to make their own revolutions; they cannot expect much more than moral support—with perhaps a modest supply of small arms—from these two powers. And the Russians have gone beyond this to restrain local Communist parties which wanted to push toward revolution within their own country.

What we do see in the case of the Soviet Union is a major world power acting as great powers (including the United States) have always behaved, attempting to become the dominant power in the territory immediately surrounding them, regardless of their ideology. So long as our direct interests do not clash—and there are few if any such direct conflicts—there is a significant chance for negotiation between us, as the imperatives of the nuclear age demand.

A look at Russian force deployments will disclose no evidence that they have ever constructed the kind of force which would have been needed for the invasion of Western Europe that we have been preparing to meet for a generation. Their land deployments, their tactical air forces, and their transportation networks are all designed, not to support an invasion, but as defensive measures, to protect themselves against the kind of onslaught which has repeatedly been launched upon them from the West during the last thousand years. And today we see the Soviets involved in almost daily hostile contact with their Chinese neighbors to the East.

A RETURN TO SANITY

President Nixon says that "we and our NATO allies do not believe that war is imminent in Europe, but we must face the possibility that it could occur." Of course, war could occur, but the sane man prepares for the most likely and realistic contingencies. And it is time, after twenty-five years, that we have not become the victims of our own irrational fears, wasting our treasure and depleting our domestic society, in preparing for a war which the other side is not and never has been planning.

Have we, in fact, been increasing the chance of such a war through the rising of armaments, and the increasing tension, hostility, and chance of miscalculation which themselves can cause the war which no one wants? Because of the vivid memory of World War II, we have maintained a high level of armaments in order to deter the aggression that might come if we were unprepared. Perhaps we should recall instead the situation which brought on the First World War, when nations faced each other armed to the teeth, none wanting war, but each fearful of attack—and the war came, erupting out of the mutual fears that this arms race created.

This year the U.S. military establishment is requesting the largest budget it has ever had in peacetime, and yet it still cannot carry out the mission assigned to it. This must be seen as an anomaly to the average citizen. Why?

The answer is apparent. The Services have been given the mission of maintaining instant readiness for war and being ready for immediate involvement in one "major" and one "minor" war anywhere in the world. But this country does not believe that such wars are imminent and is—wisely, I believe—unwilling to provide the funds which would be

needed if we were really to prepare for such wars. We have then a contradiction which can only be increasingly destructive to the morale of our armed forces as they become aware of the lack of public support for the missions they believe they have been assigned.

President Nixon has attempted, through the Nixon Doctrine, to avoid this contradiction by calling on our allies to provide the additional forces that would permit instant readiness for war. But our allies do not believe in the imminence of war or in the immediacy of the threat. The Europeans, for instance, have long centuries of experience in coexisting with the Russians: this may be responsible for their more relaxed attitude toward the Russian presence in Europe. If our own attitude remains unchanged, we will find ourselves forced to rely increasingly on nuclear weapons in planning for the major war that no one else expects.

And, with the still extensive forces available to us, we will, as in the past, find ourselves engaging in further interventions outside the periphery of the areas which the Soviet Union and China consider vital. With military bases around the globe and continuing commitments both open and secret to more than 45 nations, we will become involved in the chaos and turbulence which accompanies the awakening of these nations. In spite of our protestations to the contrary, we will continue to behave as the policeman for the world, ready to bring our helicopter gunships, our anti-personnel bombs, and our people-sniffers whenever some regime claims it is being threatened by "communism."

In Vietnam we have seen that it is we who created the threat to our security, through our own actions and the commitments we made. By no stretch of the imagination could the type of government in power in the southern half of Vietnam affect the security of the United States or any of its vital interests. But, by involving ourselves in South Vietnam and permitting commitments to be made in our name, we became militarily involved. We were in short our own worst enemy, and our country is paying dearly for it, not only in loss of faith among our own people in the wisdom and purposes of our own government. This is the ultimate threat to the security of our nation.

Increasing numbers of Americans—including large numbers of our military men—now see this imperial role for the American military as inherently destructive to the ideals we profess and, at root, immoral. Too often "anti-communism" becomes simply a cloak that permits us to support the status quo, no matter how oppressive or unpopular it may be.

At this time in its history, the United States must begin to devote its primary efforts to the reconstruction of its domestic society. We have succeeded in reviving Western Europe, in enabling Japan to become the fastest-growing industrial power on earth, in allowing many smaller countries to begin the process of economic development in freedom. It is now time to confront the needs of our own society, not to withdraw from our involvement with the world, but to shift that involvement to one which stresses peaceful interactions with all nations rather than military enticement of some and confrontation with others.

THE CONTINUING MILITARIZATION OF AMERICAN POLICY

The Nixon Administration has argued that we must remain "involved" in the world and not retreat into what it chooses to call "neoisolationism". By equating "involvement" with the maintenance of an interventionary military force, the Administration has downgraded the other, positive forms of "involvement" which the United States could have in the world—economic, diplomatic, social,

cultural—if it were not burdened with this massive military establishment and were not, as a consequence of the unilateral exercise of that power, seen by the peoples around the world as a threat to their independence.

The Pentagon has announced that its new policy is one of "realistic deterrence", hoping in the words of Secretary Laird, to "further the goal of peace by deterrence of armed conflict at all levels". But, having broadened the application of deterrence to "all levels" of conflict, the Defense Department now has an open-ended excuse to introduce arms and military assistance wherever it perceives a threat of "communism". For deterrence, being a psychological rather than a military concept, provides no means of measuring, or of restraining, the arms that are demanded. It is simply an excuse for a steadily growing, increasingly expensive, interventionist military establishment.

In examining the Administration's proposals for the purchase of new weapons, as contained in the Defense Authorization Bill, one should ask, in every case: Will these purchases increase the security of the United States? Are they included in the budget because of real security needs of this country, or because of the momentum which the defense bureaucracy has established through twenty-five years of spending? I believe that an objective assessment of the state of this nation, and of the threats facing it at home and abroad, will show that there is very little in this bill which will contribute to the real security or well-being of the American people, while there are many other, far more important uses to which these scarce funds could be put.

Having suggested that we need to question sharply the assumptions of our military posture, let me list some of the major procurement programs which such questions would suggest should be eliminated or substantially reduced in this year's budget:

MIRV

The most dangerous and wasteful item in this year's budget is the \$1.4 billion included for the Minuteman III and Poseidon programs. These weapons are dangerous because they will pose a massive new threat to the Soviet Union and force them to expand or upgrade their land-based missile just as fear of MIRV on the Russian SS-9 missile induced our Defense Department to proceed with a host of new programs to upgrade our forces; MIRV deployment will also create dangerous new fears of a first strike on both sides. These weapons are wasteful, because the threat to which they were supposed to respond, a large-scale Russian ABM system, has never materialized.

ABM

The Safeguard ABM program continues consuming another \$1.3 billion in the next fiscal year long after everyone, including the Pentagon, has admitted that it will be totally inadequate if the Russian ICBM force should develop to the point where it poses a genuine threat to our Minuteman missiles. The Russians have cut back the SS-9 program which provided the impetus for the Safeguard program, and we should give the SALT talks a chance to bring a permanent halt to both of these weapons systems.

B-1

Funding for the B-1 bomber is to be multiplied by a factor of five, to \$370 million, in the next fiscal year. Such a project is pure waste, even before it gets into the billions of dollars annually which it will ultimately cost. With thousands of missiles on land and under the sea, a B-52 bomber force which shows no sign of nearing the end of its useful life, and thousands of tactical nuclear bombers on ships and air bases around the world, a new bomber is totally redundant, supported only by those who cannot accept

the obsolescence of the manned bomber in the age of the intercontinental missile.

F-15

This new Air Force fighter, for which \$415 million is budgeted, demonstrates what is seen repeatedly in the Defense Department budgeting process—willingness to provide each Service with the latest in its favorite type of hardware. During the long period of Cold War, we were sold on the idea of the "technology race", that it was essential that we be first in the world in weapons technology. In Vietnam, America has learned not only that modern weapons could not win the war for us, but that they were enormously destructive to the very people we were trying to protect. We should learn from this experience, and from repeated evidence that new, sophisticated weaponry turns out to be unreliable and excessively costly, to look very carefully at new weapons, such as these expensive, overly-complex aircraft, before going ahead with them. Their newness and "sophistication" are not reason enough to spend billions on them.

F-14

The Navy's F-14 fleet defense fighter, at \$1.0 billion, is even worse. It is an expensive, over-sophisticated aircraft which will actually reduce the Navy's air capacity, because of its excessive cost, and which does not even respond to the real threat facing the fleet, the surface-to-surface and air-to-surface missile.

ASW

The FY 1972 budget includes \$2.4 billion in procurement for anti-submarine warfare weaponry, composed of \$881 million for construction of five attack submarines, \$599 million for partial funding of 13 ASW destroyers, \$580 million for the carrier-based S-3A aircraft, and \$328 million for the land-based P-3C aircraft.

The Pentagon itself is not sure of its need for the largest of these items, the attack submarines. It observed that "important changes in submarine technology (presumably the development of quieter engines, making it more difficult to detect submarines) have taken place in both the United States and the Soviet Union in the last ten years, and have compounded the uncertainties inherent in our judgments of our needs for SSNs". This very expensive program demands the closest, most critical scrutiny. So too does the purchase of carrier-based ASW aircraft, when the ASW carriers have been phased out of the fleet and there is a widespread belief that land-based planes could perform the same task far more cheaply. And the destroyer construction program has been attacked as producing ships that are obsolete even before they are built and are unsuitable for the task they are supposed to perform.

The entire question of such massive expenditures on ASW weaponry needs a fresh examination. One of the new factors affecting our military posture is the growing technological obsolescence of the surface navy, not because of anything we have done or failed to do, but simply through the development of inexpensive, accurate surface-to-surface and air-to-surface missiles, which can enable a tiny patrol boat or an airplane to destroy the largest naval vessel at distances up to hundreds of miles. Taken together with the advent of nuclear weapons, this has rendered the surface navy vulnerable to early destruction in any sea battle and has made the concept of a World War II-style war at sea a hopelessly outdated notion.

The next major war, should it ever come, will hardly be a replay of World War II. With nuclear weapons deployed throughout Europe, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, it would not be the protracted conflict which we witnessed twenty-five years ago. It is

understandable that the Navy would want to prepare for the major, and glamorous, role which it played in that war; it is less understandable that the political leadership of this country should support such preparations and why our people should have to pay for them.

Beyond this, there is a major—and apparently unnoticed—risk which such ASW measures pose in an era of nuclear deterrence. Just as the installation of an ABM system (such as the one the Russians began to install around Moscow) causes the other side to respond by expanding his offensive forces (as we did with our MIRV), so the development and deployment of significant anti-submarine capabilities, which might threaten the survival of a missile submarine fleet would cause that fleet to be expanded and upgraded, increasing the danger to the side which installed the "defensive" ASW systems. Thus, expenditures on ASW weapons are self-defeating. They are either so small as to be inconsequential, or they become so large as to cause a dangerous reaction from the other side.

C-5A

The new budget includes another installment of \$383 million to pay for the C-5A transport aircraft. This plane, besides being excessively costly, provides a dangerous capability to deploy forces around the globe at the sole discretion of the President. Similarly, the Administration's plan, using funds in the Maritime Administration's budget to construct specially-designed cargo ships for charter to the Defense Department to preposition military supplies around the world, will provide the President with additional capabilities for instant, unilateral intervention upon his own decision. These are manifestly inconsistent with efforts to re-establish the role of the Congress in decisions to commit U.S. forces in further overseas interventions.

MANPOWER

U.S. military manpower, now planned to number more than 2.5 million in FY 1972, can and should be cut substantially. A re-assessment of the policy of maintaining a readiness for instant warfare, a withdrawal from an overextended base structure, and a reduction in the enormous amount of fat and waste that has developed in the armed forces since World War II (now requiring, for instance, seven men behind the lines to support one fighting man, as compared with the two or three men the Russians require) will all permit a substantial reduction in this total, perhaps to 2.0 million this year and further in succeeding years.

ANOTHER BOY HERO DIES

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Betty Owens has just recently received notice that her brother, Pfc. Michael E. Ball, had been killed in Vietnam.

Private first class Ball thus becomes the 119th northern Kentuckian to lose his life in Vietnam.

The sympathy of thousands of other families who have paid this sacrifice goes out to Mrs. Owens. To her also goes the sincere gratitude of those of us whom her brother died protecting.

The recent Kentucky Post article, which reports the loss of Pfc. Michael E. Ball, follows:

ANOTHER BOY HERO DIES

Once again, death on a faraway battlefield in Vietnam has taken the life of young northern Kentuckian, Pfc. Michael Ball of Newport is the latest casualty in our area.

A booby trap claimed the life of the 18-year-old soldier, according to the information given his family. It is one more supreme sacrifice in a seemingly interminable war.

Pfc. Ball is the 31st young man from Campbell County to die in Vietnam, the 119th in Kentucky Post Country. That is a heavy toll of life for any area. And consider, in addition, the hundreds of wounded, many maimed for life.

We sincerely hope that tragedies such as Pfc. Ball's death may come to an end soon, that a just and lasting peace may come quickly.

CBS WRONGLY SUBPENAED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. Speaker, the Columbia Broadcasting System has recently been issued a subpoena by the Special Committee on Investigations, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It demands that CBS provide all material related to the production of the CBS documentary "The Selling of the Pentagon" regardless whether they were broadcast or not.

The implications of this type of procedure should be brought to the attention of everyone concerned with maintaining our basic freedoms. We should be cognizant of all the salient factors involved with an investigation of this nature.

The free expression and exchange of ideas has long been an intrinsic part of our traditional American democracy. From the beginning of our national history journalism, and more recently broadcast journalism has developed in degree and importance with the growth of our Nation. Journalism as a means of disseminating information and ideas is not a subsidiary aspect of democracy, it is an imperative-necessary part of democracy. Those responsible for providing this Nation with the knowledge and information that free men must have to uphold a free society have functioned with a high degree of independence and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, the broadcasting media should be duly entitled to the same guarantees provided for print media. The action now undertaken by the Special Committee on Investigations poses an ominous threat to true free speech in this country. I would hope that the Special Committee on Investigation, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would reconsider their position in this matter.

GREATER BOSTON CHAPTER OF BUSINESS EXECUTIVES MOVE FOR VIETNAM PEACE

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith a resolution which was unanimously endorsed by 75 members and supporters of the Greater Boston Chapter of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace. The statement, adopted at a meeting in Boston on April 13, 1971, reflects the strong opinions against the Vietnam war of business executives all throughout this country.

We business executives of Greater Boston, meeting tonight on the shores of historic Boston Harbor, have endorsed the following resolution:

We insist that the President and Congress of the United States act immediately to end the tragic waste of lives and resources by setting a final date of December 31, 1971 when American air, ground and support forces of all kinds shall be totally withdrawn from Indochina.

We are appalled by the senseless slaughter of human beings, military and civilian, American and Vietnamese; by the ravaging of hundreds of thousands of land acres in Vietnam; by the shattering of the fabric of Cambodian, Vietnamese and Laotian economies and societies; and by the billions of dollars wasted in this unbelievable destruction which should be spent on life-supporting needs, both in our nation and abroad.

As businessmen, we are alarmed at the difficulty the government is experiencing in bringing our war-eroded economy back into balance. We are concerned with the weakness of the dollar in foreign markets, with the persistent high level of unemployment, and with the larger and larger deficits which are looming in the nation's budget.

We miss our children who, instead of joining us in our business lives, are alienated by the madness of this war from the institutions and ways of life we have established. They have, in greater numbers, become estranged from society, and in some ways from us, and we yearn for the return of their confidence. We pray for our soldier-sons who are brutalized and demoralized as they are urged to kill indiscriminately, while others in abject despair are held in prison camps. We want them all freed, and freed now, by ending the war.

"Vietnamization" is hopeless, if it depends for strength on the corrupt and unpopular government of South Vietnam. Fighting a war by proxy where we try to save American lives by encouraging Asians to kill Asians is unworthy of the United States of America. The people of America are crying out with impatience and indignation, and we are with them. The country will not be placated by occasional withdrawals of relatively inactive troops while the war in the air rages on savagely over wider and wider areas.

Our policy must be to set the date, withdraw the troops, and stop the killing. Then, and only then, can we turn our efforts to healing the wounds this war has inflicted on our people, and on the people of Southeast Asia.

THIRTY UNITS OF GUARD AND RESERVES RECEIVE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AWARDS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, as we move in the direction of the zero draft, the role of the National Guard and the Reserves becomes increasingly important. More and more, the Nation will depend upon these sources for much of its military strength, as well as other highly essential functions.

Only recently—April 28—the Department of Defense granted awards for the first time in recognition of continuing efforts by these various units for their support of community projects and domestic actions. This is most appropriate and such awards deserve public acclamation.

I include a copy of the news release which announced the awards I have referred. The release follows:

THIRTY UNITS OF GUARD AND RESERVES RECEIVE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AWARDS

Thirty units of the National Guard and Reserves will receive Department of Defense awards for the first time today in recognition of their continuing efforts in support of community projects and domestic actions.

Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) Roger T. Kelley and Deputy Assistant Secretary (Reserve Affairs) Theodore C. Marrs will present the awards in a Pentagon ceremony at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room Seven, 1E801.

A plaque will be presented to the outstanding unit of each component with certificates to other units whose activities were considered exceptionally noteworthy.

Special awards will be given to Major General William J. Sutton, Chief of Army Reserve, for his leadership in support of the Department of Defense Domestic Action Program and to Camp Bonneville, Washington, for its successful effort to make military facilities available for community support.

Units receiving awards follow:

AWARDS

Army National Guard

Utah National Guard

For establishing, organizing and managing the Utah National Guard Bantam Basketball program, a state-wide non-profit endeavor which has filled a void in physical fitness for Utah boys of 11 to 13 years of age. Juvenile delinquency has been significantly reduced in those communities where the program was conducted.

U.S. Army Reserve

369th Station Hospital, Fort Brooke, Puerto Rico

For their efforts toward improving public health in an area of high unemployment and large numbers of poor; for their emergency action in response to a major flood and for support of a drug rehabilitation center operated solely from donations of goods and services.

Naval Reserve

Navy Marine Corps Training Center, Greenville, S.C.

For assistance in clearing and rehabilitating public recreation facilities, making repairs to youth camps and cooperating with the Greenville County Neighborhood Youth

Corps to provide technical training to young people.

Marine Corps Reserve

Company D, 10th Engineer Battalion, Phoenix, Ariz.

For using training by-products in the construction of civic projects in the local community with emphasis on recreational facilities and ecological improvements as well as participating actively in the Toys for Tots program of the Marine Corps Reserve.

Air National Guard

193d Tactical Electronic Warfare Group, Middletown, Pa.

For expressed compassion to the mentally retarded, knowledgeable assistance to Boy Scout Units, and aid in the adjustment to school life of pre-school, underprivileged children in the Steelton and Middletown, Pennsylvania areas.

Air Force Reserve

302d Special Operations Wing, Clinton County AFB, Ohio

For construction of a city park in Sabina, Ohio, a project which involved not only some 50 volunteer members of the unit but also the young people in whose interest the project was begun.

CITATIONS

Army National Guard

Rhode Island ARNG

For planning, organizing, and operating a summer camp program for disadvantaged youths at Camp Varnum, Narragansett, Rhode Island.

50th Armored Division Support Command, Newark, N.J.

For their efforts and assistance to the city of Newark, New Jersey in removing more than 1,000 abandoned cars from the streets, a community improvement project which enhanced the safety and ecology of the entire city.

District of Columbia National Guard

For their operation of the D.C. National Guard's Third Annual Youth Leaders Camp, a program which annually provides 170 youths, representing a cross-section of the community, with the opportunity to learn and practice basic principles of leadership in a wholesome multi-racial, outdoor atmosphere.

West Virginia National Guard

For their operation of the West Virginia National Guard Annual Youth Leaders Camp. This domestic Action provided 106 youths from 54 high schools with an opportunity to participate in leadership and character building programs.

Army Reserve

405th Military Intelligence Detachment, Denver, Colo.

For their efforts in a long range program in conjunction with the city of Denver, the Denver University, Colorado State University, and state agencies to halt the spread of Dutch Elm disease. This project represents an ideal pooling of resources toward solution of a major environmental problem.

328th General Hospital, Ft. Douglas, Utah

For extensive use of their Medical skills in numerous year-round programs of service to the community, and their work with the Governor's joint planning committee concerning matters of medical support during disasters.

939th Transportation Co., Philadelphia, Pa. and 851st Transportation Co., Pedricktown, N.J.

For their joint accomplishments in completing a municipal improvement project

involving transformation of a dangerous and unsightly tract of land into a recreational area for Morristown, Pa.

489th Engineer Battalion, Hot Springs, Ark.

For their total involvement in community projects in three Arkansas cities. These projects covered the entire field of community improvement and involved close coordination with citizens groups, youth groups, and local officials, and required imaginative but sound and constructive management of resources.

Naval Reserve

Mobile Construction Battalion 2, Alameda, Calif.

For improving and rehabilitating a wide variety of recreational facilities for youth groups, not only in its local area but in other geographic locations, as a by-product of training for its mobilization mission.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Stockton, Calif.

For assistance in improving racial harmony in its local community and in supporting programs for youth recreation and remedial education.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill.

For a concerted domestic action program which included conduct of aviation workshops and seminars on drug abuse for the youth of the greater Chicago area.

Naval Air Reserve Training Unit, Alameda, Calif.

For assistance in youth programs, job assistance to veterans, and racial harmony in the local community.

Marine Corps Reserve

Headquarters Company, 6th Engineer Battalion, South Bend, Ind.

For using construction skills and heavy equipment in a variety of ecological improvement and general civic support projects in the local community.

Company A (Rein), 6th Engineer Battalion, Gary, Ind.

For assistance to local schools, Youth Clubs and charity drives as well as support of civic improvement projects using unit skills and equipment for snow removal, clean-up campaigns, local beautification projects and recreational facility improvement.

Company C, 6th Engineer Battalion, Knoxville, Tenn.

For assistance to the local community and regional youth programs in clearing and improving recreational areas and summer camps and for active programs to enhance civic consciousness and pride among young people.

10th Engineer Battalion (—), Portland, Oreg.

For assistance to the local community through construction of recreational facilities, involvement in civic beautification, and support of charity drives, youth organizations, and historic and civic associations.

Air National Guard

Oregon National Guard

For its participation in the successful operation of the Housing Authority of Portland and Oregon National Guard HAP-CAMP and its contribution to the mental and physical well-being of youths residing in public housing projects in the city of Portland.

Utah National Guard

For providing through the Utah National Guard Freedom Academy a balanced program of academic subjects and practical exercises on "Americanism" to select high

school students from throughout the State of Utah.

134th Air Refueling Group, McGhee-Tyson Air Base, Knoxville, Tenn.

For the sponsorship of and determined involvement in the successful "Toys for Tots" Christmas program benefiting underprivileged children in Blount County, Tennessee.

108th Tactical Fighter Wing, McGuire AFB, N.J.

For the successful organization and conduct of a Day Camp program for underprivileged boys in the Trenton, New Jersey area.

Air Force Reserve

928th Tactical Airlift Group, Chicago-O'Hare IAP, Ind.

For a continuing program over the past seven years to provide Christmas parties and gifts to every child in the pediatric wards of Cook County Hospital.

452d Military Airlift Wing and 81st Maintenance Squadron (Mobile), Hamilton AFB, Calif.

For a continuing program to improve community conditions in Riverside, California, including restoration of a building for the local Boy's Club and an extensive clean-up campaign at local parks.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a land of progress and prosperity, it is often easy to assume an "out of sight,

out of mind" attitude about matters which are not consistently brought to our attention. The fact exists that today more than 1,550 American servicemen are listed as prisoners or missing in Southeast Asia. The wives, children, and parents of these men have not forgotten, and I would hope that my colleagues in Congress and our countrymen across America will not neglect the fact that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved.

Lt. James E. Teague, U.S. Navy, 708549, Harrisburg, Ark. Single, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Erlan Teague, Harrisburg, Ark., attended Arkansas State University, was officially listed as missing November 19, 1967, and officially listed as prisoner in February 1968. As of today, Lieutenant Teague has been missing or held prisoner in Southeast Asia for 1,262 days.