



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 24, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Great is the Lord and greatly to be praised: and His greatness is unsearchable.—Psalms 145: 3.

Almighty God, source of our strength and sustainer of our souls, as we wait upon Thee may there come to us anew something of the greatness of Thy power and the goodness of Thy love.

Give us to see that beyond the clouds that hover over us there still shines the splendor of Thy spirit and in back of our disturbing human affairs Thy divine purposes are still being fulfilled. Help us to realize Thy presence in all the experiences of our daily lives.

Bless these Representatives who daily come together in this Chamber, those who work with them and all who sit in the gallery. May they know that all things work together for good if they love Thee, obey Thy commandments, and walk in Thy ways.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4209. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 5765. An act to extend for 6 months the time for filing the comprehensive report of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia; and

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution designating the last full week in July of 1971 as "National Star Route Mail Carriers Week."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1399. An act to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CXVII—1039—Part 13

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 7. An act to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Leonora Lopez;

S. 306. An act for the relief of Eddie Troy Jaynes, Jr., and Rosa Elena Jaynes;

S. 441. An act for the relief of Blandina Salvador;

S. 442. An act for the relief of Cristina Bangcawayan;

S. 559. An act for the relief of Albina Lucio Z. Manlucuc;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Siu-Kel-Fong;

S. 708. An act for the relief of the village of Orleans, Vt.;

S. 898. An act for the relief of Angelo DiStefano;

S. 997. An act for the relief of Dr. Dionisio Teng Libi and Dr. Bernadette Libi.

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Luana Gaja;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Miriam Lazarowitz;

S. 1271. An act for the relief of Wong Wah Sin;

S. 1538. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended;

S. 1810. An act for the relief of Dorothy G. McCarty;

S. 1811. An act for the relief of Erma P. Curry and Margaret Hamilton;

S. 1905. An act to clarify and extend the authority of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week," and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1971, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 316) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 316

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, May 27, 1971, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Tuesday, June 1, 1971.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, June 1, 1971, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE HOLIFIELD AS "FATHER OF GSA"

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, next month will mark the 22d anniversary of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, which created the General Services Administration. President Truman signed the measure on June 30, 1949, and it became Public Law 152 of the 81st Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act was a historic milestone in Government procurement and property management. It is the foundation statute for procurement by the civil agencies of the Federal Government, for construction and management of Federal buildings, for utilization and disposal of Federal property, and for other essential Government services. Through the years GSA operations have saved the Government many millions of dollars.

It is fitting, on this 22d anniversary of the statute, to recall that our colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, on which I serve, sponsored this legislation in the House of Representatives and managed the bill on the floor. Mr. HOLIFIELD has been the successful author and sponsor of many important legislative enactments in atomic energy, Government reorganization, and other fields. Certainly the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act is one of his outstanding legislative achievements.

On May 17, 1971, Mr. HOLIFIELD'S

16523

legislative role was applauded at a dinner meeting of the Commission on Government Procurement. Mr. HOLIFIELD and I are members of the Commission, as is Robert L. Kunzig, Administrator of General Services. Mr. Kunzig took the occasion to present a plaque to Mr. HOLIFIELD for his public service and referred to him as "Father of GSA." It was a generous gesture for an Administrator who took office long after the GSA was established, and it bespoke the appreciation that so many persons in public life have for the legislative work of our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD). It is a tribute well deserved.

NATIONAL PEACE CORPS WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have stated before and I reaffirm that statement that some of these "whereas" are presumptions which this resolution embraces and refers to the past, rather than the future.

May I ask the gentleman from Indiana if it is his intention to change or amend the joint resolution as submitted, before granting the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I have an amendment at the desk to eliminate the whereas clauses.

Mr. HALL. To eliminate all whereas clauses and simply leave the resolving clause?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object should another joint resolution passed by the other body be considered or called from the Speaker's desk without regard to any of our procedures, in the interest of haste, is it the intent to make them similar as to any "whereas" in the other body in the joint resolution?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. It has been our custom to always remove by amendment the whereas clauses.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object I take this time to ask the gentleman, since this is the first time I have seen of these resolutions, if I may assume that none of

the three resolutions contemplate the spending of Federal funds?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And, with respect to the resolution presently before the House it states in part that the Peace Corps has been notably successful—notably successful—in promoting world peace and friendship, and so on and so forth.

I could not disagree more with that statement.

I am not going to oppose the resolution, but is that statement to be stricken or just the "whereas" that leads to the statement?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. That statement will also be removed as a part of the "whereas" clauses.

Mr. GROSS. That would be removed? Mr. EDWARDS of California. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate that and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 29

Whereas the year 1971 marks the tenth anniversary of the Peace Corps; and

Whereas the Peace Corps has been notably successful in promoting world peace and friendship by making available to interested countries and areas Americans willing to help meet the need for trained manpower by serving overseas; and

Whereas the Peace Corps presently has programs in over sixty countries; and

Whereas more than forty-five thousand volunteers have served overseas in the Peace Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) designating the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; and (2) inviting the Governors and mayors of States and local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: on pages 1 and 2, strike out all "whereas" clauses.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, It is a privilege to support Senate Joint Resolution 29, which designates next week as National Peace Corps Week.

This 10th anniversary recognition culminates a difficult period, and also provides an opportunity to reflect on the many successful events which have occurred since establishment of the Peace Corps in 1961.

It has been my privilege to meet with many Peace Corps volunteers overseas. I have observed them working with local citizens, and helping to promote peaceful

relations, and offering constructive assistance in behalf of the education, social, and economic development of the communities where they served.

Mr. Speaker, also, I have followed closely the work of the school partnership program, which is administered by the Peace Corps. I have direct information of the close relationships which this program establishes between the citizens of our country who contribute private funds and the schoolchildren and their families in the host countries where small educational buildings are constructed.

I believe that there have been some 3,000 of these projects to date, with the Peace Corps serving as the conduit through which this private effort is accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Peace Corps plans to include volunteers covering a wider range of age groups—and that increased efforts will be made to enlist volunteers who have demonstrated the maturity essential to represent our Nation on a day-to-day basis with peoples of other lands. Notwithstanding this change in direction, it seems appropriate to recall that with very few exceptions, those who have served as Peace Corps volunteers have reflected accurately the sentiment of our Nation and have promoted our best interests among those with whom they have worked and lived.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting Senate Joint Resolution 29, it is my expectation that the work of the Peace Corps will become an even greater force for international understanding and peace, and that the Peace Corps volunteers will assume and recognize their full responsibilities as missionaries for world cooperation, friendly understanding and lasting peace.

Clothed with such an ideal, the Peace Corps can help President Nixon achieve his goal of a full generation of peace.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING ANNUAL YOUTH APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 556) providing for the establishment of an Annual Youth Appreciation Week.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 556

Whereas a vast majority of the youth of our Nation are constructive, responsive citizens, vitally concerned with the present and the future, willing and desirous to act in service and to the benefit of all mankind; and

Whereas these actions and achievements of our youth, too often, are overlooked by the

adult community in the hurried pace of today; and

Whereas greater understanding between our generations will require acknowledgement of the constructive actions and responsible characteristics of our young people; Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seven-day period beginning on the second Monday in November in each year is hereby designated as Youth Appreciation Week, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer three amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On page 1, strike all "whereas" clauses.

On page 2, line 3, strike the phrase "in each year" and insert in lieu thereof "of 1971".

On page 2, line 5, strike the word "annually".

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Providing for the observance of 'Youth Appreciation Week' during the seven-day period beginning the second Monday in November of 1971."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF JUNE 3 AS "NATIONAL NAVY WIVES CLUBS OF AMERICA DAY"

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 34) to provide for the designation of June 3 as "National Navy Wives Clubs of America Day."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 34

Whereas the Navy Wives Clubs of America were founded out of necessity and a spirit of good fellowship among Navy wives; and

Whereas on June 3, 1936, the Navy Wives of America, Incorporation, gained official recognition and was granted a charter by the State of California; and

Whereas the Navy Wives Clubs of America provide a congenial social program for the wives and families of enlisted personnel, welcome newly reporting families and assist them in getting settled in new locations, provide volunteer work for Navy Relief, Red Cross, and other numerous community projects, provide assistance to needy service and

veteran families, and foster a spirit of fellowship among its members, their neighbors, and the Navy friends; and

Whereas there are one hundred and fifteen chartered clubs of the Navy Wives Clubs of America which represent Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard wives throughout the world; and

Whereas the Navy Wives Clubs of America support their own scholarship foundation which provides college scholarships for children of enlisted men of all the Sea Services; and

Whereas the partners of the men serving the flag of our country make a vital contribution towards the happiness, morale, and well-being of the Armed Forces of this Nation; and

Whereas June 3 provides an opportunity for due recognition of the foregoing purposes, accomplishments and needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the day of June 3 of each year as "National Navy Wives Clubs of America Day", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On pages 1 and 2, strike the "whereas" clauses.

On page 2, lines 4 and 5, after the phrase "June 3 of", strike the phrase "each year" and insert in lieu thereof "1971".

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide for the designation of June 3, 1971, as 'National Navy Wives Club of America Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the three resolutions just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BIG BUS BILL

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the major themes used by the bus lobby

in their efforts to obtain permission for wider buses is that the wider buses would be safer. Now, highway safety is a problem in which I am very interested, and about which I am concerned. If I were convinced that the widening of buses would truly make them safer, I would be a good deal more sympathetic to their efforts.

A recent publication of the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety makes me very skeptical of these claims relative to the safety of wider buses.

In the summer of 1970, a number of severe accidents involving interstate buses caused the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety to sharply increase its bus inspection program. The report of the results contains some shocking statistics. For example, of the 5,902 buses inspected under the stepped-up program, the Bureau inspectors ordered 688, or 11.6 percent of the buses "out of service." As defined by the Bureau, this means that the buses contained a "defect of such type and degree as to render a vehicle imminently hazardous to operate until repaired." The report further indicates that the bus ordered "out of service" was not defective by chance, but rather because "it clearly is a vehicle which has been less adequately maintained over a period of time, and has developed a multiplicity of defects in addition to that which rendered it unfit to be operated beyond the checkpoint."

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable for the big bus lobby to plead for wider buses on the basis of safety when they have such a deplorable record with respect to existing equipment. It will be of little comfort to motorists to know that the wider buses are designed to higher safety standards, but maintained at the old, deplorably low, standards. The full text of the report will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 415 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 415

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of House Resolution 217, Ninety-second Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction regarding postal services; pay, fringe benefits, position classification, and manpower utilization policies for Federal employees overseas; and census and statistical programs and procedures in the following countries: the United Kingdom, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Australia.

For the purposes of carrying out such investigations and studies, the committee is authorized to send not more than fifteen

members of the committee and not more than six staff assistants (at least two of the staff assistants to be selected by the minority) to the countries named above.

Sec. 2. (a) Local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

(b) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

With the following committee amendment:

After the word "Resolved," strike all the language through line 4 on page 2 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of House Resolution 217, Ninety-second Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction regarding:

(1) the operation of military postal services overseas, the need for additional mail privileges for military personnel overseas, and the thefts from military mail, in the following countries: Japan, Taiwan, and Vietnam;

(2) the operation of foreign postal services, including matters relating to rate structures, budgeting, advertising, personnel recruiting programs, operations under quasi-public corporations, the experiences in handling strikes by postal employees, and the operation of the United States military postal services in the following countries: United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy; and

(3) statistical agencies, international organizations with statistical responsibilities, and the census programs in the following countries: Italy, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Australia.

For the purposes of carrying out each of the investigations, studies, and inquiries

enumerated above, the committee is authorized to send not more than five members (three majority and two minority) and two staff assistants (one majority and one minority) to those countries within which such investigation, study, or inquiry is authorized to be conducted.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 415 authorizes the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make certain investigations and studies overseas.

As amended, the resolution authorizes three specific trips, for each of which the committee would be authorized to send five members—three majority and two minority—and two staff assistants—one majority and one minority.

One investigation would involve travel to Japan, Taiwan, and Vietnam regarding the operation of military postal services overseas, the need for additional mail privileges for military personnel overseas, and the thefts from military mail.

One would involve travel to the United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy to investigate the operation of foreign postal services.

One would involve travel to Italy, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Australia to investigate statistical agencies, international organizations with statistical responsibilities, and the census programs.

The use of counterpart funds is authorized and the so-called Hall amendment is incorporated in section 2(b).

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, a member of the Committee on Rules, heard in testimony before his committee, or is knowledgeable from the chairman of the committee; as to whether or not this legislation would change the jurisdiction, oversight, and surveillance on the part of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. MADDEN. To my knowledge, no testimony was presented to the Rules Committee on that subject.

Mr. HALL. I am aware of the fact that changes in the so-called Armed Services Postal Service were brought about by this committee. I am not completely clear in my mind as to whether ordinarily supervision and surveillance by the legislative branch is by the Committee on Armed Services of the so-called Army-Air Force Postal Service, or whether it is by this committee. Presuming the basic legislation is from this committee, I assume they would take surveillance and oversight and would commend them therefore, because as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have received many letters rightly or wrongly—on investigation—complaining about the postal service within the armed services.

If one would now hypothetically take that out, and assuming that the census, vital as it may be to this committee, is actually managed by the Department of Commerce, in the United States, I really wonder, Mr. Speaker, what remains for these "traveling inspectors" or these three groups of five, three and two, whatever one might call them, to do. Certainly the U.S. Postal Service has been effectually bobtailed, at least from supervision, oversight, and so forth, of the Congress, and I cannot imagine why we would need representatives of the Congress to study such things as the Census, or ordinary mail service or delivery, in these other countries. I just wonder if anything came up in the discussion of the rule with regard to that, since we have a Postal Service Commission outside of Government—politics—and since rates are now fixed by a separate committee.

Mr. MADDEN. As to testimony before the Rules Committee, there was none on that subject. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), a member of the committee, could possibly give some information on that question.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like to point out to my friend from Missouri, who, by the way, is one of the properly inquisitive Members of this body, that our committee does have jurisdiction over the mailing privileges of servicemen. Members may recall that we extended free delivery and the other factors involving servicemen, and this has been a continuous concern of ours for some time. We have on the floor the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WILSON), who I am sure are prepared to explain to the House in detail the interest that our committee rightfully has in the census and the legislation pending in relation to the Postal Service, which includes such subjects as the strike in Britain under circumstances very similar to the new Postal Service that we are entering into. So I am sure that in all three of these areas there was clear legislative control by our committee. However, we will elaborate on that in more detail as we get time.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate that. If the gentleman will yield further, not only being an inquisitor, as the gentleman implies, but also vitally interested in the taxpayer, I would just like to repeat my inquiry as to whether or not we have written for information concerning the census in these other countries prior to dispatching this rather expensive crew for three different trips into these areas? I am about to be weaned and convinced by the dulcet tones of the gentleman from Illinois, but I believe that first we should have tried to make a simple inquiry. I believe this could be done in letter form and the information obtained for the asking. Does the gentleman have any information on that point?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I do not know whether I have any information on that, but for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), I happened to be over in Britain about the time of the strike. Most Englishmen thought it was the greatest thing that had happened to them, because they did not get any complaining mail, especially Members of Parliament, and nobody got any bills. Therefore, they did not have to pay any. The mail service went from bad to nonexistent, which is about the situation we have here.

I probably will vote for this resolution on the theory that if they can see anything at all they can advise the Postal Service about it would have to be an improvement, because the Postal Service is so bad in this country that any change would be an improvement; it cannot get any worse.

As a matter of fact, when I send mail to my district, since I go home every week, I carry it back and forth, because by doing that I can get it there. If I put it in the post office sometimes it never gets there at all.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I could not agree more with the observations of the gentleman from Ohio, having just returned from the district, after spending 4 days there. The one complaint I hear is about the Postal Service and what is to come as a result of their most recent reduction in force, because they have rifed out everyone who knew how to deliver the mail, and if the extant postmasters cannot deliver it without the help of this many-headed Hydra of the regional post offices that they have amputated, we are in bad trouble. I presume we'll "muddle through," as they are generally skilled although ingrained with adverse politics.

Be that as it may, I wonder if there is an answer about whether there has been any application to these countries—Italy, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Australia—so far as the census program is concerned?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Insofar as the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics is concerned, the gentleman should realize that even though the Department of Commerce does conduct the census the House of Representatives still maintains its oversight, hopefully pointed toward the type of questions that will be asked and the type of questionnaire that will go out, not only for the decennial census but also, as we are anticipating, with respect to presenting a mid-decade census to the House in the near future.

There is considerable to be gained by an exchange of information between the countries that we have included here and the United States, for they all conduct various types of statistical programs and census programs.

True, we could write to each of these countries and obtain information. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, like the gentleman from Missouri, I believe he recognizes while we could get briefings on all our military bases here from the Department of Defense it is much more valuable to us if we are able to see them firsthand and to visit the various military bases and talk to the people on hand. I believe the same applies here. If we can send people not just from the Department of Commerce but also from the committee which has jurisdiction over this matter, and give them the opportunity and privilege of visiting with the actual people involved, to see how they operate, we can get a much different picture from what we would get if we just received a letter from them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I believe that sounds like the "old refrain"; me thinks we have heard that self-same argument many times before; but at least the distinguished gentleman from California admitted—first we could have written.

Be that as it may, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from the Committee on Rules if there is any limitation on expenditure in this authorizing resolution, as amended? I see absolutely no limitations for the wanderings or for the source of information gathering of this committee. Usually we have an amount or ceiling, do we not?

I appreciate the "Hall amendment" being in here, and other limitations on the use of counterpart funds, and so forth, but is there no definite upper limit as to how much funds not otherwise obligated can be provided by the House for this committee and its subcommittees?

Mr. MADDEN. In answer to the gentleman, let me state that the bill specifies the limited number of five Members who will go on the investigation, it provides for just one staff member from each party. Then the Hall amendment should take care of what the gentleman outlined in his question.

Mr. HALL. The Hall amendment just prevents drawing per diem in two different countries if they are there within the same 24-hour period, Mr. Speaker.

It does not apply to the length of tenure of the committees. As this is drawn, as I understand it, they could work through both the first and second sessions with no upper limitation at all to expenditures, in this Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think I recollect any such limitation on other committees that have been authorized to travel. You seem to be referring to a limitation as to days and weeks.

Mr. HALL. And the amount of expenditure. As a matter of fact, we recently defeated a travel motion and a committee expenditure bill on the floor of this House for another one of our distinguished committees of the House, which had definitely been reduced before being brought to the floor. However, per-

haps that is handled in the actual funding resolution by the Committee on House Administration. Knowing their propensity in this regard, if that is true, I am willing to let it go.

I have one additional question that I would like to ask, although I do not mean to be overly investigative. I just wonder how this came out of its parent committee. Was it unanimous? Am I to believe that the distinguished ranking minority member favors this bill which he would, I am sure, characterize as "junk-eetering"?

Mr. MADDEN. I was not present at the hearings of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, but possibly Congressman HENDERSON might be able to give that information.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The action of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee was by a voice vote. The ranking minority member voted against it and asked to be recorded as being opposed to the action of the committee.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman and thank him for yielding.

That reaffirms my position against this resolution as submitted by the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have tried to do about as fair a job as we possibly can from the standpoint of a travel resolution.

The original resolution came to us with authorization for 15 members and six staff personnel. We worked it out with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service so that there would be three separate trips not to exceed five members on each one, three of the majority and two of the minority, and one majority and one minority staff member.

If we are not going to let some of these committees travel to this extent, with the size of the committee involved, we might as well stop all travel of all kinds, including the Committee on Appropriations. If that is going to be the intent, that is the way we should proceed. But I do not see how we can come in and cut down anything like this any further.

From the comments made here on the post office's activities, we can always take back the post office situation if the Congress decides that they wish to pass a law to that effect. I do not think, however, that we should relinquish all possibility of obtaining knowledge of the Post Office Department.

So far as the money is concerned, there is language in here relating to per diem, and I believe \$50 a day is the limit.

As to the additional expenses of travel, they all are reported. They go to the Committee on House Administration and they are put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dollar for dollar and member for member per trip.

I do not see how we can write any more language into a resolution than that. I do not know of any other case where we have done any more.

The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) is in this resolution as it is in all of the rest of them.

I see no objection to the resolution unless we are going to cut all travel. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from California for yielding.

I do not suppose that any representation was made to the Committee on Rules as to what contribution these expenditures on foreign travel will make to the huge deficit in the balance of international payments. Was any information at all given with respect to that?

Mr. SMITH of California. As a matter of fact, we have not propounded that question this year before the committees. Last year and the year before there was a review of the countries where there were counterpart currencies and how they were used. I explained it, I think, on the floor as to just how it was to be used. However, we do not have too much in counterpart funds in too many countries. I guess in India we have enough rupees for all of us to take a complete August trip through the use of those rupees.

It is my recollection that we did not have the advice and counsel of the gentleman from Iowa at the time this resolution was considered. I do not think the gentleman appeared before the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, I manage to keep busy and I cannot attend all sessions of all committees.

Mr. SMITH of California. We did not have your sound advice and testimony when we heard this report.

Mr. GROSS. A country where we have the greatest amount of counterpart funds, India, as the gentleman from California mentioned, is not included in this tour.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. But I do note with interest that a group is going overseas to study the taking of the census, and I certainly concur with my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) that the same information could be accumulated by mail about as readily as spending several thousands of dollars by traveling over there.

I do notice that the United Kingdom, Germany, and Switzerland have been dropped, but Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Australia are continued as countries to which the committee will travel. Further, they will get a foot in the door in Europe by being empowered to go to Italy. So, they will get to the European Continent which will open that door for touring as I understand the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of California. I would think that would be correct.

Mr. GROSS. Had Italy been left out, they would have been limited to the four

countries in the Pacific, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Australia.

I wonder if it is less important to have information on the census in Britain, Germany, and Switzerland than it is in the five countries specified in the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of California. I could not answer the gentleman's question. I am not on the standing committee.

I assume much information that is obtained could be obtained by mail or through questionnaires or such, but that is not the purpose of the resolution. There are certain benefits which the individual gets by actually going over and seeing the operations carried on in these countries. I think the committee has been pretty fair with reference to its trips. They have turned in some very fine reports, and I do not think they have ever tried to overdo their travel as some committees may do.

Mr. GROSS. I think I can concur with the gentleman that other committees of Congress do spend more money, wastefully, on trips than does the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, but that does not make this resolution acceptable as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time and I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 201, nays 88, not voting 143, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—201

Abbott	Burton	Dorn
Abernethy	Byrne, Pa.	Dow
A'ams	Byrnes, Wis.	Dowdy
Alexander	Byron	Downing
Anderson,	Caffery	Drinan
Calif.	Carney	du Pont
Anderson, Ill.	Carter	Edwards, Ala.
Andrews,	Casey, Tex.	Edwards, Calif.
N. Dak.	Cederberg	Ellberg
Annunzio	Chamberlain	Erlenborn
Ashbrook	Clancy	Esch
Aspinall	Clausen,	Evans, Colo.
Begich	Don H.	Evins, Tenn.
Bell	Collins, Ill.	Fisher
Bergland	Colmer	Flood
Bevill	Conable	Foley
Blanton	Daniel, Va.	Forsythe
Blatnik	Danielson	Fraser
Boggs	Davis, S.C.	Frelinghuysen
Brademas	de la Garza	Frenzel
Bray	Dolaney	Fulton, Tenn.
Brinkley	Dellenback	Fuqua
Brooks	Dellums	Galifianakis
Brown, Mich.	Denholm	Garmatz
Brown, Ohio	Derwinski	Gaydos
Broyhill, Va.	Devine	Gettys
Burke, Mass.	Dickinson	Gonzalez
Burlison, Mo.	Dingell	Griffin

Griffiths	McMillan	St Germain
Hanley	Macdonald,	Sarbanes
Hanna	Mass.	Satterfield
Hansen, Idaho	Madden	Saylor
Harsha	Mahon	Scheuer
Harvey	Matsunaga	Seiberling
Hathaway	Melcher	Shipley
Hawkins	Miller, Calif.	Shoup
Hays	Mills	Sikes
Hébert	Minish	Sisk
Hechler, W. Va.	Mollohan	Smith, Calif.
Henderson	Monagan	Smith, N.Y.
Hicks, Wash.	Montgomery	Staggers
Hogan	Moorhead	Stanton,
Holifield	Morgan	James V.
Horton	Moss	Steed
Hosmer	Natcher	Stephens
Hungate	Nedzi	Stokes
Jarman	Nichols	Symington
Johnson, Calif.	Obey	Thompson, Ga.
Johnson, Pa.	O'Hara	Thompson, N.J.
Jonas	O'Neill	Tieman
Jones, Ala.	Patten	Udall
Jones, Tenn.	Perkins	Van Deerlin
Kastenmeier	Poage	Vanik
Kazen	Preyer, N.C.	Veysey
Kee	Price, Ill.	Waggonner
Keith	Pucinski	Waldie
Koch	Purcell	Whalen
Kyros	Randall	White
Leggett	Riegle	Whitten
Lennon	Roberts	Widnall
Link	Robison, N.Y.	Williams
Long, Md.	Rodino	Wilson, Bob
McClary	Roncalio	Wilson,
McCormack	Rooney, N.Y.	Charles H.
McDade	Rooney, Pa.	Wyatt
McDonald,	Rosenthal	Yates
Mich.	Rostenkowski	Young, Tex.
McEwen	Roush	Zablocki
McFall	Ruth	
McKay	Ryan	

NAYS—88

Andrews, Ala.	Gude	Pike
Archer	Haley	Poff
Arends	Hall	Powell
Aspin	Hammer-	Quile
Baker	schmidt	Rallsback
Belcher	Heckler, Mass.	Rarick
Bennett	Hillis	Reid, N.Y.
Biester	Hull	Robinson, Va.
Blackburn	Hunt	Rogers
Boland	Hutchinson	Schmitz
Bow	Jacobs	Schneebell
Broomfield	Jones, N.C.	Schwengel
Brozman	Keating	Scott
Broyhill, N.C.	King	Sebelius
Burleson, Tex.	Kyl	Springer
Clawson, Del.	Landgrebe	Stafford
Cleveland	Lent	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	Lloyd	Talcott
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Taylor
Conte	McCollister	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	Mayne	Terry
Dennis	Michel	Thomson, Wis.
Duncan	Miller, Ohio	Thone
Eshleman	Mizell	Vander Jagt
Fountain	Mosher	Vigorito
Goldwater	Nelsen	Whitehurst
Goodling	O'Konski	Wyllie
Green, Oreg.	Pelly	Zion
Gross	Pettis	Zwach
Gubser	Peyster	

NOT VOTING—143

Abourezk	Coughlin	Gray
Abzug	Crane	Green, Pa.
Addabbo	Culver	Grover
Anderson,	Daniels, N.J.	Hagan
Tenn.	Davis, Ga.	Halpern
Ashley	Dent	Hamilton
Badillo	Diggs	Hansen, Wash.
Baring	Donohue	Harrington
Barrett	Dulski	Hastings
Betts	Dwyer	Helstoski
Biaggi	Eckhardt	Hicks, Mass.
Bingham	Edmondson	Howard
Bolling	Edwards, La.	Ichord
Brasco	Fascell	Karth
Buchanan	Findley	Kemp
Burke, Fla.	Fish	Kluczynski
Cabell	Flowers	Kuykendall
Camp	Flynt	Landrum
Carey, N.Y.	Ford, Gerald R.	Latta
Celler	Ford,	Long, La.
Chappell	William D.	McCloskey
Chisholm	Frey	McClure
Clark	Fulton, Pa.	McCulloch
Clay	Gallagher	McKevitt
Conyers	Gialmo	McKinney
Corman	Gibbons	Mailliard
Cotter	Grasso	Mann

Martin	Pryor, Ark.	Stanton,
Mathias, Calif.	Quillen	J. William
Mathis, Ga.	Rangel	Steele
Mazzoli	Rees	Steiger, Wis.
Meeds	Reid, Ill.	Stratton
Metcalf	Reuss	Stubblefield
Mikva	Rhodes	Stuckey
Mink	Roe	Sullivan
Minshall	Rousselot	Teague, Tex.
Mitchell	Roy	Ullman
Morse	Roybal	Wampler
Murphy, Ill.	Runnels	Ware
Murphy, N.Y.	Ruppe	Watts
Myers	Sandman	Whalley
Nix	Scherle	Wiggins
Passman	Shriver	Winn
Patman	Skubitz	Wolff
Pepper	Slack	Wright
Pickle	Smith, Iowa	Wylder
Pirnie	Snyder	Wyman
Podell	Spence	Yatron
Price, Tex.		Young, Fla.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. McCloskey.	Mr. Stanton with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Wright with Mr. McKinney.	Mr. Clark with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Ruppe.	Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Conyers.	Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Rangel.	Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Diggs.	Mr. Clay with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Findley.	Mr. Abzug with Mr. Gray.
Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts with Mr. Fish.	Mr. Flowers with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Steele.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Rousselot.	Mr. Gibbons with Mr. William J. Stanton.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Ware.	Mr. Roy with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Mailliard.	Mr. Pepper with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Long of Louisiana.	Mr. Landrum with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Reuss.	Mr. Yatron with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Mann.	Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Abourezk.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Davis of Georgia.	Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Metcalfe.	Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.	Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Young of Florida.	Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Kemp.	Mr. Carey with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Pirnie.	Mr. Karth with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Kuykendall.	Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Burke of Florida.	Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. McKevitt.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Spence.	Mr. Wolff with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Minshall.	Mr. Howard with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Wiggins.	Mr. Cotter with Mr. Crane.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Coughlin.	Mr. Giamio with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Price of Texas.	Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Wylder.	Mr. Pickle with Mr. Shiver.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Scherle.	Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Martin.	Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Camp.	Mr. Brasco with Mr. Hastings.

CXVII—1040—Part 13

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Wyman.

Messrs. ANDREWS of Alabama, JACOBS, BIESTER, McCOLLISTER, KEATING, and ARENDS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"DON'T HOLD YOUR BREATH"

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, last week the President and the Secretary of the Interior journeyed to the New York harbor area, there to proclaim the intention of establishing a Gateway National Recreation Area. I am delighted at the addition of such a proposed parkland, for I have long advocated additional recreational areas throughout the Nation, especially in highly populated areas.

In remarks for the press the President noted at that same time that this was "one of the most significant steps that the Federal Government has taken, in cooperation with the State governments, on recreation perhaps in this century." For, he said, this step "moves in the direction that all people who have evaluated our parks and recreation areas believe we should move; and that is, to move to bring parks to the people."

Thus the President once again reaffirmed his promise of a legacy of parks. In his earlier Environment Message to Congress in February he noted "merely acquiring land for open space and recreation is not enough" and had urged that "We must bring parks to where the people are so that everyone has access to nearby recreational areas."

All of this sounds good and I thoroughly agree. However, I must admit to some incredulity. Just this spring I conducted lengthy correspondence with the National Park Service over the fact that the budget for 1972 does not provide 1 penny for the development of another park that is now 5 years old, that has been described by the Interior Department as "ideally suited to fulfillment of the recreational and open space needs of the people of this region," and that would serve another 10 million people.

I refer, of course, to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore which I was proud to author some 5 years ago. The House Interior Committee at that time described and recommended this great national lakeshore thus:

Located at the Southern end of Lake Michigan—less than 50 miles from the Chicago-Gary Industrial complex—the proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore fits the national need like a glove. . . . Nowhere in the Great Lakes is there a greater need for shoreline recreation areas.

That seems to me a resounding endorsement. Yet, like an empty house that

great potential park area awaits recreational facilities, parking lots, roads, trails to become fully useful.

So while I rejoice in the creation of new parks and fully recognize the need for recreation areas in the East, I must ask the question as to where this money will come from? The National Park Service has an 11-point development program criteria for programing projects and planning funds. Where will this project fit? And if we can afford another recreation area, why not develop some of the many parks that are awaiting funds? Do not the people of Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois who would use the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore deserve equal treatment?

Or perhaps this project will suffer the same fate as the Indiana Dunes? The Congress proposes but the administration disposes and refuses funds for projects that do not suit political needs.

Last week I discussed the President's massive cancer research program. Obviously my purpose was not to object to cancer research, but to point out once again, as here in the case of parks, the sharp contrast between what the administration does with what it says. The President proposes a vast attack on cancer while he is holding in reserve \$34.5 million in funds for the Regional Medical programs, aimed at attacking not only cancer but the other killer diseases of heart attack and kidney disease.

I fear the park situation may be a repeat situation. I hope the people of New Jersey and New York do not plan on visiting that recreation area anytime in the near future.

WHY JUST CIA RADIO FUNDS?

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the Nixon administration for coming to the Congress this morning to seek congressional approval of legislation which would vest the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in a nonprofit corporation chartered by the Federal Government.

At the same time, however, I would like to suggest that the day for piecemeal adjustment is over—and that much more fundamental surgery is required if the Congress is to play its proper role in assuring that the U.S. Government does not speak with a forked tongue to the world beyond our borders.

I have great respect for the work which Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have performed over the years in carrying the message of truth and freedom to millions of people in Eastern Europe and Asia. To many of those peoples, those two radio stations were the only source of factual information about developments in their own countries and in the world at large.

I am not adverse, therefore, to this kind of dialog. As a matter of fact, in this age of public diplomacy, I believe that it is imperative for the United States to maintain and enlarge commu-

nication with the coinhabitants of our planet.

The question is, how do we do it—and with how many governmental or government-supported voices should we attempt to project our message to the world?

At present, that message is frequently garbled by a cacophony of strange and conflicting sounds—with each separate outlet pushing its own version of the American dream and its own interpretation of the American prescription for the world's ills.

There is Voice of America, with its sonorous tones proclaiming to be the essence of orthodoxy—though sometimes belatedly—on matters of Government policy.

Then there are Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—now to be admitted to the official family entitled to open Federal support—which bring to this new role a tradition of unorthodoxy in the pursuit of their own specialized ends.

Then there is RIAS—Radio in the American Sector—which tries to scale the Berlin Wall and give the residents of both Germanies, as well as those few Americans within earshot, a liberal dose of American jazz and rock interspersed with news keyed to the particular preoccupations of its listeners.

In addition, there is the American megawatt transmitter in Munich, with the long wave frequency potential of becoming one of the foremost communicators of Europe, whose sporadic, lovely function appears to be the jamming of Soviet messages to its own people and its neighbors.

The Armed Forces network in Europe is also a part of the American voice which reaches millions of foreign nationals—as are our military broadcasting activities in the Far East.

All of these activities are supported by the American taxpayer, operate with the sanction of the U.S. Government and whether rightly or wrongly, are deemed to carry our Nation's message to the world.

Unfortunately, each one of them is pretty much its own boss—and neither the Congress nor the American people have any clear idea of how they carry out their public mandate or whether they contribute to the advancement of our national objectives.

As I said at the outset, I am not opposed to the setting up of a Government-subsidized corporation to manage our overseas broadcasting activities. It seems to me, however, that a corporation in this field, whether modeled on Comsat or some other model, would be turning its back on reality if it were to concern itself solely and exclusively with Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

As nearly a decade of studies conducted by the International Organizations and Movements Subcommittee which I chaired during the 1960's showed, we need a drastic, fundamental reorganization of all U.S. Government-supported broadcasting activities, abroad. And the time is long passed when we could patch up things by resorting not even to half measures but to quarter measures.

There are two more points I would like to make:

First, it seems to me that by attempting to perpetuate existing arrangements, we are skating on very thin ice. The cold war thaw has robbed some of our overseas broadcasting operations of their political viability. I do not know, for example, how long the West Germans will indulge us to run our several, disparate operations on their soil—but I have a feeling that it will not be very long.

Second, I am not convinced that the American taxpayer should continue to shoulder the full burden of these rather expensive undertakings. There is, it seems to me, a pretty good possibility that under more realistic and practical arrangements, including joint ventures, some of these broadcasting facilities could become self-sustaining or even return part of the investment to the U.S. Government. I have not seen this possibility mentioned in the administration's proposals.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an age whose very character is shaped by electronic communications. We ought to recognize that fact in our external operations. And we ought to employ the instruments of communication available to us in sensible and imaginative ways so as to advance our national goals and the cause of peace.

I am delighted that after years of persistent prodding by my subcommittee, the executive branch has finally turned its attention to these matters. And I commend the President for coming to the Congress with his proposals. But I doubt that either the Congress or I as one of its Members will be interested in any partial solution which would place new burdens on the American public without attempting to go to the heart of the problem which confronts us—and try to remedy it.

WILLY BRANDT'S MISTAKES IN EASTERN POLICIES

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is now clear that the West German coalition government is becoming increasingly uneasy about its Ostpolitik. The original euphoria about the "new opening to the East" has disintegrated gradually in the usual slowdown of Communist bargaining practices, deliberate delays, additional conditions and in particular because of the issue of Berlin. The optimistic expectations of the first months of Willy Brandt's new West German approach and forecasts of a sudden breakthrough in the East-West relations have proven to be completely unrealistic and unfounded.

There are many great political figures of yesteryear who ended in the bitter and disappointed political dead ends. Willy Brandt may also be heading for a dead end by trying his own instant method for a rapprochement with the Soviet Union and its satellites. Many politicians thought, as Brandt does, that being

known as Socialists or peasant party leaders they had a special means to enter the Moscow door without falling into the trap maintained by the Reds.

I well recall how good intentions were crushed in the very first East European detente effort of Polish Prime Minister Mikolajczyk in 1945 and 1946. Mikolajczyk provided the air of legitimacy to the Communist takeover in Poland by joining the first postwar Communist-controlled government in Warsaw. But his attempt to work with the Communists did not last very long and he escaped to West Germany via West Berlin. He was fortunate that the Berlin wall was not yet in existence at that time. Today Mikolajczyk would probably be shot like many Germans have been during similar attempts.

In the years in which he worked in the free world for the restoration of freedom in Poland and other lands behind the Iron Curtain, Mr. Mikolajczyk spent many years in Washington as head of the Peasant Union and on numerous occasions told me of the treachery, hypocrisy, and brutality of the Communists which he witnessed first hand while working in postwar Poland.

But apparently lessons of history have not impressed Willy Brandt and his government very much. He plunged into his new version of detente just as naively or even more so than all his predecessors starting with Mikolajczyk.

The problem is that Brandt takes himself very seriously but the Soviets do not. They consider his type of government only a transition government toward their goal of a permanent Soviet style "socialist society" in which the Communist Party, no matter how small and insignificant, plays the dominant role. Toward this end they have already activated a small Communist party of Germany under Kurt Bachmann. This party is waiting its turn, once Willy Brandt will be in real political bind, to edge itself into a key political position in no way commensurate with the number of its members or the support it can generate at the voting booth.

In the meantime, Brandt has completely concerned himself on the Berlin issue. There is no German in his right mind who would support the one-sided Soviet and Polish treaties signed by Brandt without a "satisfactory" settlement of the Berlin problem. Chancellor Brandt some months ago was forced by circumstances to accept the linkage of the Berlin issue with ratification of the Warsaw and Moscow treaties. He expected that the Soviet Union would be demonstratively cooperative concerning Berlin after the 24th CPSU Congress of March-April 1971. But the Congress produced nothing to alleviate the tension, nothing really new in the search for detente.

Now the Soviets are pressing Brandt into ratification of the treaties without an agreement on Berlin. And what is worse, there are some disturbing signs that Willy Brandt is softening toward another compromise.

Fortunately, Brandt cannot bargain the Berlin issue alone because this is an

international problem in the hands of the four powers. The United States and other two Western powers will not permit Berlin to become politically isolated from West Germany. This should be clear to all concerned. The United States must continue to honor its commitments in Western Europe of which West Berlin is an integral part. The U.S. Senate's clear-cut vote to reject any changes in this commitment in the form of Senator MANSFIELD's proposal to cut the U.S. presence, or any other similar "accommodations," must be read for what it means.

There is nothing new in the Communist proposals on Berlin which have taken the form of statements during the Congress as well as the official Abrasimov paper delivered to the State Department just before the Congress. These proposals were completely unacceptable to the West in the past and will continue to be just that.

The Soviets, however, have Willy Brandt's signature under the treaties of Moscow and Warsaw and they will continue to press for more concessions from Brandt inasmuch as they realize that the entire future of the Brandt coalition government depends on his ability to deliver practical results from his Ostpolitik.

An additional Soviet push is being exerted on Brandt in connection with the forthcoming international conference of Socialist parties in Helsinki. In his speech in Tbilisi, General Secretary of CPSU Leonid Brezhnev warned the Socialist leadership of the world that they must be able to demonstrate what can be expected from them in the way of "spirit of cooperation" with the Communist world.

Another point to keep in mind is that the shift of leadership in Poland from Gomulka to Gierk in December 1970 and in East Germany from Ulbricht to Honecker in May 1971 contributed further to the gloomy prospects for Brandt's detente. The West German voters seemed to have caught up with the mistakes of their Chancellor and rejected his policies very soundly in their recent local election in Schleswig-Holstein, giving an absolute majority to the opposition party of Christian Democrats.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the United States must be on guard for further moves by the Brandt government which could compromise Berlin and which, in the long run, could endanger the entire Western Alliance.

It is quite evident that the Soviets are of a mind to pressure Brandt and it is even more evident that Brandt does not possess the capacity to handle the situation.

Therefore it is even doubly important for the United States to insist on the political integration of West Berlin with West Germany and to discourage the fruits of "Ostpolitik" which in reality will mean concessions to Warsaw and Moscow.

AMERICA THE VULNERABLE— CIVIL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for and am very grateful that I have been given 60 minutes in which to address the House today. I asked for this special order last week because it is not a thing that I wish to develop here by way of discussion in an idle or a flighty fashion. Yet, at the same time I want to assure those present that I will not speak for 60 minutes. I have obtained unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and that will permit me to put into the RECORD the gist of the facts that will back up what I consider to be the main thrust of today's special order.

For some time since 1963 the question of civil defense has been not only in disarray but has been totally abandoned in our country. To those who inquire about the need for civil defense or who try to make a case for civil defense, we have the ready cliché answer that this somehow or other smacks of warmongering—a belief that peace is not achievable—or that it is simply folly to think in terms of a national program of civil defense.

In 1963 this Congress and the then administration as much as scrapped the then priority importance that civil defense had by placing it in a minor bureau with little or no money under the Department of the Army. In the meanwhile it is my mature conclusion that we have greater need for a sensible, logical and a minimal approach to civil defense than we had ever had in the history of our country since World War II.

America is vulnerable—it is highly vulnerable. First, because from the logistical standpoint the world has not only contracted—but the potentially hostile elements in and out of the Western Hemisphere have increased by geometric progression and the ability in a case of out and out hostility has soared to inflict crippling blows on our country.

At the very moment I rise this afternoon, it is entirely possible for a properly equipped submarine in the warm water ports of Cuba to not even have to surface in order to eject a nuclear guided missile that can strike at will clear to the Midwest section of the United States with mathematical accuracy. I think it would be alarming to say that this is going to happen today, but I think it is folly to overlook the startling fact that this is potentially something that can happen today. There is no question but that the capability of what is potentially considered an enemy has increased not tenfold but a hundredfold right in our own front and back yards.

Vietnam is agitating the minds of our country and this, in turn, has divided the country. I have not spoken out in any loud fashion concerning this great issue because I feel the time to speak is when one has the facts and has enough knowledge that by speaking one can add to the clarification of a dilemma and not to compound a knotty and nettlesome problem.

For this reason I have suspended insofar as any outspoken public utterance is concerned. I share all of the misgivings that my fellow Americans share, but I also think the time has come when we

ought to dwell on the sobering need to acquaint our citizens with the basic and minimal need for civil defense.

We do not really have civil defense—we do not even have emergency precautions. Recently in the month of February, for the first time since this system was instituted, there was a national emergency alert. This alert, according to all of the media people in the country, is the ultimatum—it is the last resort—right on the threshold of a national emergency.

So the local television stations when they received this emergency alert scrambled around—they did not know what to do—whether they were to go off the air or whether they were to wait for instructions.

So they hastened to the emergency box. This, according to them, is a system of communication that exists whereby this box is to be opened only in case of emergencies. So they rushed to the box, opened the box, and looked at the instructions. They read, "Open envelope so and so." They opened envelope so and so. The instructions contained therein said, "Wait for further instructions." Later it was clarified that this alert had been a mistake. The emergency alert had been a big error. Somebody had either misread or misunderstood and had sent out under these national emergency conditions a false alarm.

I do not think we ought to overlook this, because if, indeed, it had not been a false alarm, we would have seen this Nation of ours, which has been pictured as a strong giant and fortress, completely paralyzed, immobilized, and unable to lead its citizenry in case of an emergency along an intelligent and a preplanned route for even basic survival.

It is true that the world has shrunk, but it is also true that our responsibility in this respect has, of course, also increased tenfold and a hundredfold. To those who say, "Why, we would be a frightened giant. We would be living in an atmosphere of fear, trepidation and apprehension," let me point out to them that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had and continue to have a compulsory systematic system of civil defense for every citizen and schoolchild in each one of the Soviet Socialist Republics. Are they by these critics labeled as being frightened, in trepidation, and living in daily apprehension? I have not read such criticism. There must be some good reason why this vast country feels that it is legitimate for its population to have security instructions on a compulsory basis throughout the land, in and out of school, and not only for the schoolchildren but for the general population, also.

I am not advocating that we imitate that practice necessarily, but I am saying that even if the danger of hostile action were remote and inconceivable for us to accept it, we still have the question of regional and almost quasi-national emergencies, based upon acts of God, or great upheavals, such as hurricanes, such as earthquakes, and the reports received from each one of these areas have been consistent in the last 10 years. There has been a near paralysis in those areas so far as having a corporate achievement

of basic self-defense for the people involved in such emergencies, even if it is localized and on a regional basis.

I think the need is clear, and I think the implication of this need has been clear for some years.

I regret that the Congress, in deciding the great issue in 1963, which had to do with the great debatable program of underground shelters—and how strong their case was made that underground shelters were futile, that in this age of megatonnage and the destruction caused by these awesome powers of destruction, underground shelters are futile. But I think that we, in bringing about this reform, threw the baby out with the bathwater and have neglected the basic requirements of a nation such as ours, highly mobile as it is, without a coordinated, intelligent and planned system of basic and minimal self-defense. I am not exaggerating to you that outside of the confines of our national press and our own atmosphere and environment of smugness that this prevails even in the Western Hemisphere.

Everything that comes across the desk published in other countries that share the destinies of this continent indicates that they are not that complacent and that they are concerned because they, too, are aware of some of the late developments, such as those that I and others have reported, among which was the fact that early in the autumn last year, there was a report, which was first denied and then confirmed in December by the administration, to the effect that for the first time the Soviet Fleet had a warm water base and right in our front yard. We should not minimize the fact that there are today, as I am speaking, 30,000 highly trained and fully equipped Russian troops on the Cuban Island.

There is no question in my mind, and certainly the fact has not been challenged by any responsible authority, that they have capabilities today with respect to submarine bases with submarines equipped to eject nuclear-propelled rockets and other types of armaments right now near us.

I believe it is more than a coincidence that the Ambassador from Russia to Cuba happens to be the outstanding scientific chief of Russia on the question of nuclear-equipped rocket sites. I believe it is more than just a mere coincidence. Some of my more sceptical friends seem to think it is just one of those things that do happen and we should not attach any particular significance to it.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, I will present in the subsequent paragraphs I am sure Members will read, if they are interested, in the RECORD tomorrow some of the factual presentation that over the course of months has led me to the conclusions I have generally discussed here this afternoon. I do not believe it warrants my standing on the floor a whole hour, though I could present the material and do so. I do ask that this matter of high importance and priority should be given exactly that by the Congress: high importance and high priority.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Can the gentleman tell us briefly what he would advocate in the civil defense field?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes. I believe we ought to restore a high priority to this. If it is not a top priority it should have at least basic importance for a nationally coordinated system not only of instruction but also of site locations, escape routes, and the like, so that each community, and particularly those in the urban areas of our country, would have a viable, feasible, practical plan, at least on paper. We do not have even that now. Some communities do and some do not.

For example, the area with which I am best acquainted is my own district and the surrounding county. At one time, up to 1967, I had the responsibility of representing the entire county.

Today I really represent the heart of the city of San Antonio, which is now a city of more than 700,000 population. The city of San Antonio, according to the civil defense people, has a fairly good program. It looks good on paper. It compares favorably with the programs of cities of comparable size. But the county has next to nothing in the way of a program.

That is to say, even if there were no question and we had no danger or fear from an enemy, so far as military action or physical violence is concerned, we still do not have basic plans in case of a hurricane or flood or some other natural disaster.

I think the time has long passed when this should be done. Even now the funds appropriated have been diverted, so that their main thrust has not been expended along profitable, constructive, and creative routes.

I would say, first, let us restore civil defense back to some area of direct concern to the Congress, instead of having it a minor bureau within the Department of the Army. The Department of the Army has been cut more than any other department in the last 3 years, generally, as funds go, and this is just a minor little agency within the Department of the Army and yet reflects those cuts.

I also believe, on a grander scale, this would help us to revise our approach to things. There seems to be a great deal of hesitancy with respect to talking about plans, about schemes, and about projects, because of regionalism and because we have had a tendency toward fear and secrecy for the past 10 years. The fact that we have had this advent of a power such as Soviet Russia in a very practical presence on the Cuban Island is something which apparently the officials in and out of our Government either do not want to discuss publicly or feel they cannot discuss publicly, or else they will not admit to it.

I see no sense in saying, well, if we do not talk about it, it will not be a problem. In my book we have a real, a pressing, and a practical problem as well as a continuing threat.

Anti-Americanism exists today and has rushed into a vacuum that has been created in the last few years in the Western Hemisphere. This is true not only to the south of us but it is true also

of our northern neighbors as well. It is something that from a geopolitician's standpoint or from the standpoint of any official charged with the defense of our country in a military sense should be a matter of grave concern. Just one skip to the south of us we have had our American Ambassador assassinated in cold blood. Just a few weeks ago we had a very disturbing development, in the view of us who live near the border, in the Mexican Government. For years they have been accustomed to having an embassy detailed from Soviet Russia about eight times the size of the American Embassy. I guess this is coincidental just like the Russian Ambassador presently rendering his service in Cuba is coincidental, but the fact remains that the Mexican Government was completely shook up when it discovered that some of the young there were being trained very well not in Russia but in Communist China. They had been bragging down there that the Soviet Government was so interested in educating and training their people. For what purpose? For the purpose of returning with the direct intention of overthrowing the established Mexican Government through all of the tactics that are employed in this day and time by Communists in the overthrow of governments.

This is what has happened in the case of our next door neighbor. In the next country to that our American Ambassador was assassinated. Throughout the entire South American continent and all to the south of us a vacuum has been caused. Into vacuums there always rushes something else. Just as surely as we are standing here today this happens. What I fear is the irrational and completely hostile American forces have had an edge in rushing into this particular vacuum. It should be a source of deep concern.

But in the meanwhile I believe first things must come first. We should be fully aware in our country of the need for an intelligent, coordinated, and well planned system of self-protection, civil defense if that is what we want to call it.

We can expect in the event of nuclear attack to lose about 100 million lives—a figure that is so staggering that it taxes the imagination. But that is not all. We could expect that another 33 million would die from the effects of the attack, simply because we do not have adequate civil defense. I believe that any nation that accepts such risks is inviting attack; I believe that it is a risk that we cannot afford, and certainly need not incur.

We spend in this country less than 35 cents a person a year on civil defense. That is only a 10th what Sweden spends. It is hardly one-twentieth of what Switzerland spends—and all of us know how long it has been since Switzerland had to endure attack.

The Soviet Union requires every citizen to have a thorough course in civil defense, lasting about 21 hours. In this country there is no requirement at all. We do not so much as assign people to definite shelter spaces. There are very few Americans who would even know so much as where to go in the event of at-

tack, let alone what to do after finding shelter.

For a time about 10 years ago, Americans were concerned about civil defense. People built shelters at home, supplied them, and learned what to do. But a few years after the great Cuban missile crisis after the excitement had passed, we slashed civil defense expenditures to the bone, to a point where now we spend less than half what is required to establish a minimal program.

People found that home shelters were expensive, and sometimes hard to keep up. Even when the Census surveyed homes and recommended minimal fallout shelter construction, it is doubtful that one homeowner in a thousand responded. After all, there is no emergency, there was none then, and nobody in the Government seemed to care. Besides, there is a tendency to be fatalistic when you start thinking in terms of half the people being dead—if so many are dead, people seem to think, what would there be left to live for?

But the truth is that preparedness is not just for Armageddon. Civil defense can save lives in any kind of emergency. An evacuation plan can move people effectively out of the way of natural disasters. A shelter plan can provide help to people who have lost their homes in any kind of disaster. Trained civil defense leaders, or wardens, or whatever you call them, can help in any type of emergency.

Preparedness takes effort, and it takes expense. It is asking a great deal of any people that they take time and effort beforehand to be prepared against some eventuality that we all hope and pray will never arise. Even so, making that investment in time and energy and resources is what will make the difference between survival and death for countless numbers of people, in the event of nuclear war.

Countries that have known the scourge of war prepare for it. Sweden knows the price of not being prepared. The Soviet Union knows the price, and neither country is willing to repeat past mistakes.

Civil defense is not merely a matter of placing signs in buildings. A shelter is no good if it contains no food, no medical supplies, no sanitary facilities. Yet, even here in the Capitol itself we find precious little in the ways of stocks, though we have sufficient space here for many thousands of people. Nor do we bother to train our employees in survival procedure. The most we do is listen to the horns and bells once a month, to see if the warning system is working.

But to know how well prepared we are, we need only ask ourselves: what would I do, if the warning sounded for real? Most of us do not know. The price of not knowing is panic, and the price of panic is needless injury and death.

The sour truth is that by and large, this country cannot bring its civil defense into workable order without several weeks' warning time. Nuclear disaster takes less than a half hour. Planners say that even if we did have some kind of crisis over a period of several weeks, they would fear any effort to put civil defense in order, because any

such overt action to protect our people might well convince a potential enemy that we intend to strike first, thus bringing about a surprise assault on ourselves. We remain locked in a cycle of being unready, and with the prospect that even if we did have time to prepare for war, the government would fear to make use of that time.

The fact that time is needed is made plain by the situation in my own district. The city of San Antonio has a pretty good system, and there is some reason to believe that it would work well in an emergency. There is adequate communication available, there is a good shelter plan, and so on. But in the county, where an additional couple of hundred thousand people live, there are probably less than 5,000 shelter spaces available that are stocked and for which there are trained managers. The communications system is inadequate and has no good plan. It would take the county several days, possibly weeks, to get ready for a crisis. Even as far as the city is concerned, chances are that the system works best between the hours of 9 and 5—a disaster suddenly striking during some weekend, or during the evening or night hours, would just have to wait.

I believe that if we can afford to have a waiting nuclear deterrent, which we do, available on a constant basis, we could at least afford to protect our metropolitan areas with a minimal force of trained emergency personnel on duty at all times, just in case the deterrent failed to work.

Our cities, for the most part, do not even know how they would bury their dead. Yet, that is one of the first problems that will confront any city that has experienced a major disaster. Failure to cope with that invites a compound disaster of epidemic disease. We are faced with a situation that would cost our cities immense numbers of needless fatalities, and we do not even know how we would dispose of the bodies.

We have a situation in which we have shelters that are stocked with water barrels—but the barrels are empty.

Those empty water barrels are a symbol of the failure and present futility of civil defense in America today. It is a failure that we cannot afford to let continue; it makes this country America the vulnerable.

Thinking the unthinkable is not easy. But we cannot withdraw from reality. The ocean is no barrier to protect our country from assault; even the existence of our large numbers of protected nuclear rockets is no guarantee of safety against attack from a well prepared, determined, fanatical enemy. We cannot assure our total safety—no nation can. Nevertheless that is no reason for criminal negligence.

There is not a truthful man in the country today, who knows what he is talking about, who would tell us that the present civil defense effort is adequate; it is not even a good joke.

Among the wise, there is a saying that the time to fix the roof is while the sun is shining. There was never a more truthful utterance. If we fail to fix the

civil defense roof, when the emergency arises—as we all pray it will not—even if time allowed, chances are that Government policy would not permit us to make use of it. Laxity and failure in defense is not something we are accustomed to. But in civil defense, it has become the norm.

That is why, even behind our ocean, even behind our elaborate barriers of radars and missiles, even if we did have a workable anti-ballistic-missile system, we would still be America the vulnerable, unless we at once realize the magnitude of our need for civil defense, and make realistic commitments to meet that need.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD two articles in line with what I am saying:

IS THE SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM REALLY BETTER THAN OURS?

(By Joanne Levey Gailar)

SOVIET PROGRAM GROWING; AMERICAN PROGRAM SHRINKING

When I speak to various groups on Soviet civil defense, a question that repeatedly comes up is this one: If someone so desired, could he not make just as good a case for the extensiveness of the U.S. civil defense effort as you have made for the Soviet one? This question is asked invariably by reflective, intelligent members of the audience, those who want to be sure that I have not been oversold on the earnestness of the Soviet civil defense effort by the Soviet material I have read.

I freely acknowledge that in the event of nuclear war, no one can give an ironclad guarantee that the Soviet program to protect their essential industrial workers in urban blast shelters and to evacuate everybody else to the surrounding countryside and provide fallout protection for them will work.¹⁰ I can attest, however, both to the earnestness and the intensity of the Soviet effort to instruct their entire population in the means and methods of defense against nuclear weapons, compared with a very low-key American program. The Soviet program appears to be growing in strength and effectiveness, while the American program is shrinking.

INSTRUCTION OF SOVIET POPULATION—NATION-WIDE, COMPULSORY, DIRECTED

Numerous articles,¹¹⁻¹³ for example, on the civil defense instruction of school children in grades five, six, seven and nine leave no doubt that the Soviet school children in all fifteen republics of the Soviet Union are being taught to protect themselves. Details about the 1968-1969 curriculum which include important changes in method and content of courses taught in the previous year, letters of suggestion and criticism from parents and teachers, and descriptions of equipment (gas masks, first-aid kits) and teaching materials (manuals, handbooks, posters, film strips) supplied to the schools, all point to the fact that Russian school children indeed receive a thorough training in civil defense.¹²

Nor is it school children alone who are instructed in civil defense. Marshal V. I. Chuikov, U.S.S.R. Chief of Civil Defense, when outlining the 1969 civil defense program in an interview, stated, "It is pertinent that this year the task of training the population in the 21-hour program is to be completed."¹³ And as Joseph Romm, the then Director of Civil Defense, testified at a recent hearing, "They (the Soviets) have a tremendous civil defense training program. Their society is different. They can direct people to be trained. There is no question that over 100 million people have taken their intensive

Footnotes at end of article.

civil defense training course. They are now, I think, in their sixth mandatory training cycle."¹⁴

INSTRUCTION OF U.S. SCHOOL CHILDREN— SPOTTY, VOLUNTARY, UNDIRECTED

On the other hand, I know of no similar nationwide program in the U.S. for instructing our own population. While the national Office of Civil Defense has provided training for instructors of adult education courses and has developed with the Public Health Service a medical self-help training course, these courses have been adopted in what Mr. Romm describes as "spotty fashion" at the junior high school and high school levels. Under a training program like ours, which in Mr. Romm's words is "voluntary . . . not directed,"¹⁵ only a very small fraction of our populace, either in school or out of school, is learning about civil defense. In fact, few of us know of any children who have received any civil defense training.

DIRECTION OF SOVIET PUBLIC ATTENTION TOWARD CIVIL DEFENSE

Similarly, the attention of the Soviet public is continuously directed toward civil defense through all the press media—newspapers, magazines, movies, radio and television, while the attention of the U.S. citizens is rarely called to civil defense matters through any press medium whatsoever. A Soviet article informs us, for example, "It is very pleasant to note that in recent times materials on this subject (civil defense) have been published in all the central newspapers, and also in the magazines 'Kommunist,' 'Sovety deputatov trudnyashchikhsya,' 'Sovetskiye profsoyuzy,' 'Ogonek,' 'Nauka i Zhizn,' and others."¹⁶ Another Soviet source indicates that "more than a thousand persons have participated and are participating in (providing) television broadcasts in all studios."¹⁷ But skeptics need not take the word of the Russian sources. U.S. resident reporters in Moscow from two of our most distinguished newspapers verify the outflow of articles on civil defense in the Russian press. Bernard Gwertzman of the New York Times reports: "The article (on large-scale civil defense preparations in the Soviet republic of Kazakhstan) in *Pravda*, the Communist party newspaper, was the latest of a series in recent years stressing the importance of civil defense."¹⁸ And Charlotte Salkowski of the *Christian Science Monitor* attests, "A drive to bolster public awareness of civil defense is under way here. The Soviet press recently has carried a number of articles about air-raid drills in factories, training exercises on farms, and other measures designed to prepare Russians in the event of nuclear war. . . . Movie houses show special films and veterans of World War II give lectures on the subject (of civil defense)." According to Miss Salkowski, "Justification for this heightened attention to civil defense is the allegedly growing threat of the 'forces of imperialism' and attempts of the West to undermine the Communist camp."¹⁹

ATTENTION OF U.S. POPULACE DIRECTED AWAY FROM CIVIL DEFENSE

On the other hand, when Dr. Eugene Wigner, U.S. Nobel laureate, submitted an article on civil defense to the New York Times, it was politely received but never printed. A similar effort to interest the *Reader's Digest* in reprinting an article on Soviet civil defense was turned down with comments implying that the subject of civil defense was of little interest. That these are not isolated cases is substantiated by a review of the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* for the past three years. *Readers' Guide* of March 1966 to February 1967 contained seven articles on "Civil Defense"; *Readers' Guide*, March 1967 to February 1968, but two articles, one of which was on Russian civil defense;

and *Readers' Guide*, March 1968 to February 1969, not a single article on civil defense, U.S. or otherwise. Thus, in the same years that Soviet periodicals and newspapers stepped up the number of articles on civil defense, American articles in periodicals and newspapers have decreased to zero. I recently questioned ten people at random; like me, none had seen a program or even a spot announcement having to do with American civil defense on television for several years.

PARTY AND GOVERNMENT MANDATE STRENGTHENS SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE; EVACUATION PLANS CONSOLIDATED

The increase in articles on civil defense in the Soviet Union can be viewed legitimately as a reflection of government and party concern. Soviet civil defense was given a major boost in 1966 at the Twenty-third Party Congress when the Central Committee of the Communist Party called for strengthening civil defense.²⁰⁻²² The Soviet government gave legislative teeth to this mandate with the Law on Universal Military Obligation, article seventeen of which calls for compulsory civil defense training in the grade schools, high schools, and technical schools throughout the Soviet Union.²³⁻²⁴

Another result of the party and government mandate was to substantially consolidate and strengthen existing plans for pre-attack evacuation and dispersal of large segments of the civilian population during periods of crisis escalation. V. I. Chuykov, Soviet Chief of Civil Defense; O. V. Tolstikov, former Soviet Chief of Civil Defense; and Lt. Gen. D. Shuyrin, First Deputy Chief of Soviet Civil Defense, have all recently emphasized that urban pre-attack evacuation is an extremely effective measure in saving lives. Shuyrin, in describing evacuation as "the most radical means of defense," indicates that through evacuation, "it is possible to achieve a reduction in the population density by scores of times in the large cities." In addition, he points out that the feasibility of evacuation is enhanced in the Soviet Union (1) by the socialist system and the planned economy, which enables the S.U. to organize and carry out evacuation on a nationwide scale; (2) by the vast expanse of the motherland, the great capacity of the suburban area, which permits the settling of an enormous quantity of individuals in rural localities, and (3) by a well-controlled transport, which can move people out of cities in a short period of time.²⁵ Marshal Chuykov, in an article appearing in *Science and Life*, a widely distributed and highly regarded Soviet magazine, makes the same claims for the feasibility of evacuation²⁶ as Shuyrin, stressing that in the light of its effectiveness, supplying people with food and water—not defending them from nuclear weapons—is the really knotty problem.²⁷

That the Soviets take evacuation seriously is also evident in the comprehensiveness and detail of their program. Every town, for example, has an evacuation transport commission, which is headed by the deputy chairman of the local Council of Workers' Deputies, whose responsibility is to coordinate the evacuation of the population by rail, motor and water.²⁸

Elaborate evacuation plans include the designation of collecting points at which the evacuees would assemble; evacuation passes for every man, woman and child;²⁹ the presence of a doctor or nurse with every evacuation train or convoy of trucks; explicit instructions on what every family should take³⁰ (depending on climate and season) and the maximum weight of luggage and contents.³¹ There are also plans for receiving the evacuees in the country³²—providing them with food, water, and jobs, and even for having their mail delivered to them at their new addresses.³³ Thus, the seriousness with which the Soviets take evacuation is evident in

(1) the declarations of their military strategists of its effectiveness, (2) the existence of civil defense evacuation commissions in every towns and village, and (3) the comprehensive and detailed plans for carrying it out.

DECREASING BUDGET ALLOCATIONS WEAKEN U.S. CIVIL DEFENSE

I have suggested that the increase in articles on civil defense in the Soviet press is a reflection of government and party concern. By the same token, it is likely that press apathy toward civil defense in the U.S. is a reflection of government apathy, which is evident in decreasing budget outlays for civil defense. While the U.S. government authorized \$238.9 million for civil defense in 1962, only \$105.1 million,³⁴ less than half the 1962 allocation, was authorized for 1966, the year that the Communist party in the Soviet Union issued its mandate to strengthen civil defense. And the allocation for civil defense for 1969 was \$68.1 million,³⁵ the lowest authorized federal expenditure for civil defense in the past eight years.³⁶

Present policy of attempting to provide fallout protection for people near their homes and places of work has prevailed since 1958 when the Federal Civil Defense Administration (FCDA) declared that national civil defense policy "which now includes planning for the movement of people from target areas if time permits, will now also include the use of shelter to provide protection from radioactive fallout."³⁷ In the same release the FCDA cast serious doubt on the effectiveness of blast shelters when they stated, "There is no assurance that even the deepest shelter would give protection to a sufficient number of people to justify the cost."³⁸ While the wording of the 1958 FCDA release seems to give equal billing to evacuation and fallout protection, in practice national policy since that time has placed almost exclusive emphasis on fallout protection with virtually no consideration of evacuation. Nor has any effort been made to provide blast protection for the population.

In citing the absence of a workable evacuation plan in the U.S., I am not suggesting that we should inaugurate such a plan ourselves. On the contrary, a federal order to evacuate our population during a period of crisis could very well serve to escalate the crisis rather than diminish it. Also, as the Soviets themselves recognize, an evacuation policy has a greater chance of success in the U.S.S.R. where there is a well established tradition of public obedience to the directives of a strong central government and a distinct separation of cities (in contrast to the megalopolises of the U.S.). And, finally, as the Soviets again correctly surmise, they could evacuate their population with reasonable confidence that we would not attack them unless we were ourselves attacked. Thus, I am not criticizing the U.S. for de-emphasizing evacuation as a civil defense policy. I simply want to point out that successful evacuation of Soviet cities during a period of escalating international crisis could give the U.S.S.R. a decided strategic advantage over us. It would degrade our deterrence capability, take the teeth out of McNamara's policy of assured destruction, and offset the strategic balance by substantially reducing the number of Soviet urban casualties in a countervalue attack. However, the only answer today to a successful Soviet evacuation might be a return to our pre-1958 evacuation policy, even with all the inefficiency and confusion an actual evacuation would entail.

ROUGH ESTIMATES OF CERTAIN, SPECIFIC SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE COSTS

While figures on the cost of the Soviet civil defense program are not available, it is possible to make some very rough estimates of annual expenditures for certain specific civil defense activities, which we know exist, and to extrapolate the cost from that of the

Footnotes at end of article.

same civil defense activity were we to inaugurate it in the U.S. Let us take, for example, the cost of civil defense instruction of the population. As we have already noted from Mr. Romm's testimony, over 100 million Russians have received intensive civil defense training. We also know that the present civil defense training course for adults in the Soviet Union is twenty-one hours, while school children receive eighty hours of civil defense instruction by the time they complete the ninth grade.

Keeping these figures in mind, let us consider the cost of training 85 million Americans—the equivalent of 100 million Russians—in civil defense. If we allow \$1 per hour per person for a 21-hour program of instruction, the cost to our national economy would be about \$1.7 billion (to the Soviet economy, over \$2 billion), a figure which is more than our total national allocations for civil defense for the past eight years. And this does not include the cost of training the instructors, who, in the Soviet Union receive 35 hours of special instruction for civil defense teachers.⁴⁵ Nor does it include teaching materials, such as slides, posters, and textbooks; nor equipment, such as gas masks and first-aid kits. Also, we must keep in mind that instructing the population is but one aspect of civil defense.

Again we know from Mr. Romm's testimony that the Soviet Union has a "heavy military organization from the top right down to the bottom"⁴⁶ specifically to assist the civilian civil defense organization. The civil defense military organization is headed by V. I. Chuykov, a full fledged Marshal, and senior colonels are located in small political jurisdictions (equivalent to our cities and states), where they head up units of civil defense which consist principally of military people. The Soviet Union has several schools to train these people. One is the two-year Moscow military civil defense academy established in March 1967 to train junior officers in civil defense.⁴⁷⁻⁴⁸ The costs for operating this academy and maintaining the civil defense military units are difficult to determine, but undoubtedly are considerable.

We have yet to mention the costs for urban blast shelters, which the Soviets have provided, at least in some degree, for essential workers in vital industries. And, of course, there are expenses connected with the elaborate plans that the Soviets have for evacuating the bulk of population, all people who are non-essential to vital industries,⁴⁹ to the countryside.

A COMPARISON OF CERTAIN SOVIET AND U.S. CIVIL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

We have estimated the cost of instructing 100 million Soviet citizens in civil defense to be about \$2 billion. It is difficult to determine the time period over which this instruction has taken place, as we know that the trust to provide a fairly recent one.⁵⁰ However, even if we should say that this training took place over the past six years, the total federal allocation in the U.S. for all civil defense activities during this same time period—\$573.7 million—would represent 28.7% of the amount spent by the Soviets on one single aspect of their program: educating the public.

We have yet to mention the cost of the U.S. instruction program. Of the total federal allocation for civil defense over the past six years, \$573.7 million, the amount spent on educating and training activities was \$63.7 million.⁵¹ Thus, the budgetary allocation for all education and training activities over the past six years in the U.S. has averaged \$10.6 million a year, or 11.1% a year of the total authorized outlay for civil defense over this period (2).⁵² If we were to use this percentage to extrapolate the total cost of the Soviet program over the past six years, we would arrive at the staggering figure of \$18 billion, or \$3 billion a year. Even if we were to raise the percentage of the Soviet

civil defense outlay for education to 33 1/3%, we would still arrive at a figure of \$6 billion, or approximately \$1 billion a year. Thus, we can say with some degree of certainty that the annual Soviet budget for civil defense lies somewhere between \$1 and \$3 billion. Or, put another way, the Soviets spend one to three times more on civil defense in one year than the total amount allocated by the U.S. federal government for civil defense in eight years. For a country only 15% larger than ours to spend over ten times more than ours on civil defense points to a seriousness of interest an order of magnitude greater than ours.

SOVIETS RECOGNIZE NEED FOR BLAST PROTECTION

Thus, the Soviet Union, unlike the U.S., provides compulsory and nationwide civil defense instruction for its population. But the differences between the two programs do not end here: there is also an essential difference in philosophy over the importance of blast protection. The Soviets recognize the need for affording protection from the blast effects of nuclear weapons to people in cities and have provided such protection in all cities with subways. The Moscow subway system, for example, extends for over seventy-five miles and has more than eighty stations. U.S. visitors to the Soviet Union have attested to the depth of this subway and to the presence of both heavy blast doors in the stations and high-speed escalators, which convey passengers down into them. Nor is Moscow the only city with subways equipped with blast doors. Again U.S. visitors have observed similar protective facilities in both Leningrad and Kiev. Baki and Tbilisi also have subways, and new ones are being established in Tashkent and Kharkov. That all seven systems are designed for blast protection is substantiated by a recent Russian television scenario on "Reliable Means of Protection." This scenario, which includes shots from a film of a subway, has the accompanying script: "These structures can protect a person from blast waves, light radiation and radioactive contamination. Here you see the subway. In cities which have one the residents will always find protection in it."⁵³

PROTECTION IN UNITED STATES LIMITED TO FALLOUT

Meanwhile, since 1958, the policy of the U.S. has been to focus exclusively on fallout protection. Thus, there has been no emphasis even on using preferentially those fallout shelters that afford some measure of blast protection. This policy has led, for example, to the identification of 10 million fallout shelter spaces in Manhattan (much more than the peak population of the island) with no preferential selection of those shelters for public use which might offer protection from blast as well as fallout.

SOVIETS STRESS FALLOUT PROTECTION IN RURAL AREAS

While the Soviets recognize the need for blast protection in cities, they emphasize protection against fallout in the country. Thus, there are explicit manuals with detailed instructions both on erecting hasty shelters out of materials at hand and on converting vegetable bins, cellars and basements and sludge pits to fallout shelters.⁵⁴ Village dwellers are given blueprints and allotted bricks⁵⁵ for strengthening these facilities.⁵⁶ Since the centerpiece of the Soviet civil defense program is to evacuate all nonessential urban dwellers to rural areas, it is hardly surprising that they stress increasing the fallout facilities in the country.^{57,58}

U.S. DISCONTINUES RURAL SHELTER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Meanwhile, the U.S. Office of Civil Defense, which appropriated funds to four agricultural engineers for the past year and a half for a minimal "Rural Shelter Development Program," brought this program to a close on December 31, 1969.

SUMMARY: YES, THE SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM IS INDEED MUCH BETTER THAN OURS

Coming back to our original question—Is the Soviet civil defense really better than ours? We have no choice but to answer in the affirmative. That the Soviets take civil defense more seriously than we do and are instituting it much more effectively than we are is evident in these facts which we have considered:

(1) Instruction of Soviet school children is nationwide, compulsory and directed; instruction of U.S. school children is spotty, voluntary, undirected.

(2) Direction of public attention toward civil defense in the Soviet Union is apparent in the increased use of all press media for civil defense purposes over the past three years; direction of public attention away from civil defense in the U.S. is apparent in the virtual disappearance of any mention of civil defense from all news media during the same period.

(3) Party and government have issued mandates for strengthening civil defense in the past three years and have funded a greatly extended program, of which one aspect alone, public instruction, has cost about \$2 billion; U.S. government has decreased total appropriations for civil defense from \$105.1 million to \$68.1 million over the same period of time, its eight-year total for civil defense allocations coming to less than the Soviet expenditure for instructing their population.

(4) Soviet policy is to recognize the need for blast protection and to provide it, for example, in seven urban subway systems; U.S. policy is to focus exclusively on fallout protection with no provision for preferential use of shelters which offer some degree of blast protection.

(5) Soviets stress fallout protection in rural areas and provide free blueprints and materials to farmers and villagers; the U.S. brought its extremely small Rural Shelter Development Program to a close at the end of 1969.

FOOTNOTES

¹ V. I. Chuykov, "Civil Defense as Common Concern," *Nauka i Zhizn (Science and Life)*, January 1969.

² A. Bardin, "Role of Students in Civil Defense," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)* (Moscow, 1967).

³ I. Apostolov, "Methods of Protection: Evacuation and Dispersal," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 4 (Moscow, April 1967).

⁴ S. Nurmagambetov, "Civilian Defense in Kazakhstan Discussed" (originally entitled "Civil Defense—A Public Affair") *Kazhanskaya Pravda* (January 10, 1969).

⁵ D. Shuyvryn, "Development of Civil Defense System Traced," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 10 (Moscow, 1968).

⁶ "Secondary School Civil Defense Curriculum" (originally entitled "Civil Defense Training Program for Students in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Grades of the Eight-Year and Secondary General Education Schools"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 9 (Moscow, 1968).

⁷ A. Sychev, "Civil Defense Training in Secondary Schools" (originally entitled "Study and Expand Experience"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 9 (Moscow, 1968).

⁸ "Civil Defense Training in Cherkasskaya Oblast," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 7 (Moscow, 1968).

⁹ "Civil Defense Training in the Schools" (originally entitled "A New and Very Important Subject"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 3 (Moscow, 1968).

¹⁰ A. Tsikhun, "Civil Defense Training in Belorussia Discussed" (originally entitled "A Sacred Obligation"), *Sovetskaya Belorussiya* (10 April 1969).

¹¹ Ermits, "Estonian Teachers Instructed in

Civil Defense," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 8 (Moscow, 1968).

¹² For a more detailed account of what Soviet pupils learn, see: Joanne Gallar, "Soviet Civil Defense Instruction in Grades Five, Six and Seven," *Survive*, Vol. 2, No. 5, September-October 1969, pp. 2-5.

¹³ V. I. Chuykov (as interviewed), "Civil Defense Chief Outlines 1969 Program Tasks" (originally entitled "In the Prejubilee Year"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 1 (Moscow, January 1969).

¹⁴ "Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations for 1970," Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Ninety-First Congress, First Session, Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development, Part I, p. 796.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 789.

¹⁶ V. Sergeyev, "Current Civil Defense Propaganda Means Discussed" (originally entitled "Universal Attention to Informational Propaganda"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, (Moscow, July 1969).

¹⁷ K. Kotlukov, "Technique of Civil Training by Television Discussed" (originally entitled "If You Go on the Air"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, (Moscow, March 1969).

¹⁸ Bernard Gwetzman, "East Soviet Adds to Civil Defense," *New York Times*, August 15, 1969, p. 1.

¹⁹ Charlotte Saikowski, "Forces of Imperialism Cited: Kremlin Alerts Citizens on Civil-Defense Preparedness," *The Christian Science-Monitor*, February 26, 1969, p. 14.

²⁰ O. V. Tolstikov, *CPSU on Imperative Upgrading of Civil Defense*, Atomizdat Publishing House (Moscow, no date).

²¹ "Extension of Pupil Civil Defense Instruction" (originally entitled "What is New in Student Training?"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 10 (Moscow, October 1967).

²² "Spreading Civil Defense Information" (originally entitled "Only Specifically!"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 2 (Moscow, February 1968).

²³ L. I. Brezhnev in report to Twenty-Third Congress, as quoted in "Everyone Should Know This," *Kommunist Tadzhikistan*, March 29, 1968.

²⁴ "Extension of Pupil Civil Defense Instruction," p. 15.

²⁵ A. Getman, "The Role of DOSAAF in Training Youth" (originally entitled, "Teach the Youth Military Affairs"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 2 (Moscow, February 1968).

²⁶ V. I. Chuykov, *Civil Defense in Nuclear Missile War*, Atomic Publishing House (Moscow, 1968).

²⁷ Shuvyrin, p. 4.

²⁸ Chuykov, "Civil Defense Stressed As Common Concern," p. 43.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

³⁰ Tolstikov, p. 8.

³¹ Ye. Pipus, "Evacuation, Dispersal Discussed by Civil Defense Official" (originally entitled "Everyone Ought to Know This"), *Bakinskiy Rabochiy* (Baku, September 5, 1969).

³² Apostolov, p. 9.

³³ V. Vinogradov, "What Alarm Signals Mean" (originally entitled "On Signals"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 3 (Moscow, 1968).

³⁴ Morozov, pp. 1-3.

³⁵ G. Malinin, "Lessons Learned from a Factory Civil Defense Exercise," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 2 (Moscow, February 1967).

³⁶ "The Fiscal Year 1969-70 Defense Program and the 1969 Defense Budget," Statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the Senate Arms Services Committee—Prepared January 22, 1968, p. 215.

³⁷ "Independent Offices and Departments

of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations for 1970," pp. 806-807.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 788.

³⁹ "The Fiscal Year 1969-70 Defense Program and the 1969 Defense Budget," plotted from Table 2, p. 215.

⁴⁰ Federal Civil Defense Administration Release, SR 571, May 7, 1958, p. 1.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴² Tolstikov, p. 13.

⁴³ "On-Job Training in Civil Defense Makes Progress," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 8 (Moscow, 1968).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁴⁵ Sychev, p. 16.

⁴⁶ "Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations for 1970," p. 795.

⁴⁷ Ya Bryanskiy, "New Civil Defense School in Moscow," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 4 (Moscow, 1968).

⁴⁸ F. Popenko, "Moscow Civil Defense School Reports Activities," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, (Moscow, February 1969).

⁴⁹ Chuykov, "Civil Defense in Nuclear Missile War," p. 34.

⁵⁰ Tolstikov, p. 13.

⁵¹ As given by Miss Bette E. Funn, Administrative Assistant in the Training and Education Division of the National Office of Civil Defense.

⁵² Plotted from information given by Miss Funn. (See reference 51.)

⁵³ Kotlukov, p. 47.

⁵⁴ L. Gorchakov, "Vegetable Storage Bins as Shelters," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 4 (Moscow, April 1967).

⁵⁵ V. Morozov, "Civil Defense in Rural Areas (originally entitled "A Primary Concern"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 3 (Moscow, 1968).

⁵⁶ A. D. Gorchakov, Yu. A. Zhukov, L. I. Koshelva, N. A. Rossal and A. A. Khomko, *Simple Shelters for Protection Against Weapons of Mass Destruction*, State Publishing House on Literature on Construction and Architecture (Moscow, 1964).

⁵⁷ B. Morkovkin, *Civil Defense in the Countryside* (Moscow, 1964).

⁵⁸ A. P. Durikov and V. I. Chumakov, *Protecting the Rural Population Against Radioactive Contamination*, Publishing House for Agricultural Literature (Moscow, 1963).

CIVIL DEFENSE? IT'S THE NATION'S NO. 1 JOKE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Armageddon could come today, tomorrow, next week. Or maybe never. Better never, for the United States lies shockingly naked against a doom only 30 minutes away. You may think civil defense has prepared for the holocaust, but in fact the nation yearly spends but the cost of a hamburger on your protection and the price of such terrifying unpreparedness could be at least 33 million lives. That's 33 million.)

(By John T. Wheeler)

WASHINGTON.—If it finally came tomorrow—Earth's first and probably last atomic war—almost half of America's 200 million people would die. Period. No way to save them.

An estimated 33 million more would also die. Needless. There is a way to save them, but it hasn't been done.

Those are the hard figures, of the Office of Civil Defense, entrusted with overseeing sheltering of the nation's citizens for The Bomb. About 35 cents a year per person is being spent toward that end.

"You can't buy a hamburger for that in a lot of places," one federal expert said. "You sure can't buy much survival insurance."

A proper, full-scale shelter program could save 48 million American lives by CD estimates. That same estimate says present shelter programs would save only 15 million of these. Thus the cruel arithmetic: 33 million wasted lives.

An angry Midwest CD official called such unpreparedness "criminal negligence."

John E. Davis, national CD head, concedes the American public is poorly protected and that in some cases local civil defense is practically nonexistent.

An Associated Press survey that reached from coast to coast and from small towns to Washington and New York showed:

There are stocked public shelters for only 61 million Americans.

Shelters are concentrated in cities, almost certain to feel the leveling cataclysm of bomb blast, while there is a deficit in protective shelters in outlying areas where fallout but not blast can be expected.

Some federally approved shelters do not meet federal minimum standards for protection.

Many shelters are so poorly marked a sudden attack could leave millions perplexed, perhaps fatally so, as to where they should hide.

Trained shelter managers and radiological monitors are not assigned specific shelters in most cases, leaving those in shelters to survive on their own.

Water barrels have not been filled in many shelters.

Radiation monitoring equipment is sometimes not in place, or without batteries, or not working.

Although Omaha Civil Defense Director William Noyes' judgment that American civil defense amounts to "criminal negligence" was one of the most forceful condemnations of the present program, officials at the grass roots also were condemnatory. Given the present program, various officials predicted "pandemonium," "a complete breakdown," "looting and panic on a massive scale" and "totally unnecessary deaths."

A Pentagon official called the national program "an absolute farce based on hope—no, make that emotion—not reason."

One reason advanced for America's unpreparedness is that a fully effective civil defense program would "provoke" the Soviet Union by upsetting the implied balance of death between the two superpowers—both would suffer great civilian losses in the event of nuclear war. But similar arguments have been advanced against the Safeguard anti-missile program, the installation of which is under way.

Federal officials say a great deal more could be done under the present budget if state and local officials would organize properly. Top federal officials, including Davis, contend that Congress under no present circumstances would boost the federal budget of \$69 million.

Local officials say there is no way to organize given present public apathy and that only strong federal leadership, including the full influence of the President, can lead to anything approaching the longtime federal goal of a full fallout shelter program for the United States.

CD estimates 65 million Americans live in remote enough areas to survive in any event a hypothetical full attack.

A federal report shows 8 per cent of the buildings marked as shelter sites do not have any supplies—food, water, medical supplies and instruments to determine how much radiation is building within the shelter and when it is again safe to go outside.

Some of the stocked shelters are not marked, making them in fact private sanctuaries financed by the federal government contrary to regulations.

Federal officials concede the greatest single weakness in the shelter program is in outlying areas where survival would be most likely, but where the number of shelter spaces per 1,000 persons drop to as little as one-tenth of what can be found in the urban bullseyes.

In the South and Southwest, the civil defense shield is more like a fishnet. An Atomic

Energy Commission source said these areas are so underprotected they virtually are written off in case of attack.

Even finding and utilizing those 61 million stocked shelter spaces poses serious problems.

The sign marking the building partially occupied by New York's Civil Defense headquarters, for instance, is halfway down the block between a jewelry and a women's apparel shop. There is no sign inside the building pointing the way to shelter or telling how many could reasonably survive there.

Throughout most of the nation there are no maps prepared and published locally giving the location of fallout shelters or assigning persons to specific areas to insure that some buildings are not dangerously overcrowded while others are partially empty.

Federal literature shows Washington with spaces equal to nearly 600 per cent of the capital's population. District of Columbia officials say that while this is the number of potential shelter spaces that were identified, present spaces with emergency stocks cover only half the capital's daytime population of 1.4 million.

Spot checks turned up school buildings, federal buildings and other structures—even the main fallout shelter at Strategic Air Command's Omaha headquarters—that were approved but do not meet federal minimum standards.

Gamma radion, from radioactively hot particles that are in effect miniature X-ray machines, would be the chief nuclear killer outside the blast areas.

But discussions with local officials showed they either were unaware of the problem or, if they realized it, had neither sand nor bags to correct the situation. At SAC headquarters, where perhaps 100,000 or more sandbags are needed, the civil defense officer, Everette Hilfiker, a former assistant fire chief and a civilian, agreed he did not have more than a very small percentage of the needed sand or loose earth.

He said he could not estimate the number of sandbags on hand because so many had been used in the past during local flooding. He said he had never calculated how many sandbags actually would be needed, but said he was certain the job could be done in six hours. Washington's planning provides only 30 minutes to get into shelters and button upon against fallout.

A SAC spokesman assumed SAC bases would be attacked immediately in any nuclear war and destroyed.

But one of the command's civil defense officials stationed at Offutt Air Force Base said, "I can't see why an enemy would bother wasting a missile on this place. We don't have any attack craft here or missiles."

The theme was one heard repeatedly in talks with civil defense officials in areas which Pentagon sources say can expect to be hit not by one bomb but by many.

Caroline G. Novis, head of New York City's civil defense: "There is no reason to destroy us. I assume New York will not be hit."

Charles Willowby of Colorado Springs, Colo.'s civil defense office: "I don't think it would be logical to hit us. NORAD—North American Air Defense Command—will already have given the warning." NORAD is centered one-third of a mile inside a mountain because it is one of the prime targets.

Melvin M. McBride, deputy director of Washington's civil defense: "We don't plan on Washington being hit. Why would they bomb us anyway? The President and other key leaders would be safely out of the city."

A far different view was expressed in California where a senior state official said, "The Russian targeting concept is to attack the cities and carry out massive destruction. We consider San Francisco and Los Angeles to be prime targets."

A keystone to American civil defense is that it is a civilian show and that Washing-

ton can set standards, give leadership and provide some of the money, but that state and local agencies are individual powers unto themselves. Because of this national director Davis said, he can do nothing to force local organizations to come up to par or even to determine if they are operating at all. He said the present budget does not include enough money to finance federal checks of state and local organizations.

But last month Defense Secretary Melvin Laird did ask Congress in a message to appropriate \$1.5 million for incentive payments to builders to include shelter areas in new construction of schools, office buildings and the like.

He also requested \$2 million to construct an improved prototype radio warning system to serve the mid-Atlantic coast.

Near the bottom of the chain of command in the suburbs and less populated areas is just where the lack of effective command organization is most obvious.

Local directors in these areas, if paid at all, usually are part-time. There are no hard and fast requirements demanding that directors demonstrate leadership or managerial skills. Many are retired men and women seeking to supplement retirement benefits.

Some say they took the job because they liked the dignity of having a title. Some just wound up in control because no one else wanted the job.

Frances Helman, 66, says that is the way she got her job as Indiana County, Pa., director. Indiana, the county seat, is about 50 miles downwind of Pittsburgh, an industrial center which is considered a certain target.

The blast, heat and alpha and beta radiation particles which would make Pittsburgh a wasteland probably would not affect Indiana County much. Gamma radiation from fallout almost certainly would inundate it.

Mrs. Helman says less than 10 per cent of the county's residents could expect to find a stocked public shelter. She says arthritis in her knees and ankles inhibit her efforts to drum up enthusiasm for civil defense or find more shelter space.

She added there is no nuclear disaster plan for her county since city and county officials have not joined in working one out. This was a commonly heard complaint from civil defense officials across the country.

Mrs. Helman and other officials up to director Davis in Washington said the trend in the civil defense program's effectiveness could be traced upward from about the time of the Berlin crisis in 1961 to a peak during and after the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 when federal outlays peaked at \$295 million. The graphs have turned down since.

For those civilians who do reach stocked shelters, the potential for chaos is great. Many civil defense officials say they fear living will degenerate quickly to the fang and claw level. For however weak organization and command authority are at the local level, in many and probably most shelters it will be nonexistent.

More than 120,000 shelter managers and radiological instrument technicians have been trained under civil defense. But most had their last contact with the program five or six years ago. When interviewed, several expressed surprise they were still considered part of civil defense.

One, Jack Claggett of Loveland, Colo., said he had not heard from civil defense for five years and would call the local director to say he should not be counted on in an emergency because he was too rusty.

Although shelter managers have no legal authority to take command of a shelter, they are expected to do so, somehow imposing their authority by force of will and personality. They are armed only with wallet identification cards some say they have lost or never had.

Many designated shelter managers, some

with none or as little as two hours training, are not assigned specific buildings. If they are, they usually are part of the janitorial force.

District of Columbia officials say they believe the problem can be overcome by the shelterers picking one of their own as shelter manager. He in turn would appoint aides and deputies. Such so-called "emergent leadership" is part of the national program.

District officials say since their civil defense stores commonly are kept under lock and key to prevent pilferage, it would be up to those in the shelter to organize search parties for the goods. In Washington, some stores are kept behind heavy steel doors and in most cases the doors, steel or not, are not marked as the entrance to survival supplies. Keys for the doors often are kept by the janitorial forces and there is no way, officials said, to insure they would be available in an emergency.

With the supplies are manuals that tell what the shelter manager and his men must do right down to fairly voluminous paper work. The more than 600 pages are designed, federal officials say, so the "emergent leaders" throughout the country can train themselves if necessary.

Some of the instructions, particularly those covering operation of the radiological equipment, is both highly technical and obscure. Some are not. One section advises: "In the absence of a trained medical person, be prepared to determine that a death has occurred. Early indications are the absence of heart beat, pulse or breathing."

In New York, the head of civil defense said he did not know how many shelter managers had been trained. He said the city could count on the police to run shelters since they were under orders to guide people to safety and then go in themselves.

A police department official, however, said patrolmen were not assigned specific shelters and probably had no better idea where they were than the public. He said if there were enough time, probably a day or more, assignments would be made.

For those who get to a stocked shelter, this is what they will find if all the stores are there: fortified biscuits and candy, enough for 1,000 calories per person per day for two weeks; enough water for a quart per person per day; chemical toilets; medical supplies of the home medicine chest variety, and radiological monitoring equipment.

But radiological monitoring equipment sometimes is at the homes of those trained years ago to operate it.

Quite often, water barrels are not filled because they might collapse floors.

Those in charge at all levels say their major hope is that there would be an escalation of tensions over days, weeks and perhaps months before any nuclear attack. They said this period would stir local agencies to rectify any deficiencies.

However, Federal officials conceded that no official warning would be passed down to the civilian population until enemy missiles actually were in the air. They added that the seriousness of the crisis could very well be played down to forestall panic.

Ordering shelters readied, much less directing people to get in them, could be interpreted by a potential enemy as proof that the United States planned to shoot first, Washington officials said.

In federal civil defense planning, a number of assumptions are made about the aftermath of a nuclear attack. One is that there will be no breakdown in electric power, an assumption the military considers unrealistic. No auxiliary power generators are provided for federal shelters and flashlights and candles are not part of the federal stores. In shelters with little or no lighting, the shelter manager's guide suggests, tensions can be eased by singing, story telling and resting.

In a large percentage of buildings, especially in the Northeast, shelters are located in sub-basements which depend on electrically powered ventilation.

Another assumption is that one or more persons will have the presence of mind to bring a portable radio with them to the shelter. None is provided. Washington officials hope to have a crash course for shelter managers via radio after an attack.

But nuclear explosions include powerful current surges which can destroy telephone, radio and other electrical equipment.

During the winter the likelihood of shelters freezing is high, again particularly in the Northeast. Federal officials say there are no plans to put blankets into shelters. Asked why, one said, "People are supposed to know that they should take them to the shelter." Asked about the office worker caught at his desk, the official paused and said: "A good point."

Money is the real problem not only with blankets but with the narrow supply of medical supplies available. They could neither take care of a serious casualty nor many with moderate injuries.

Another reason for restricted medical supplies: About 1,400 caches were broken into in Washington alone the last year, mostly to get the medical kits' limited supply of barbiturates.

A two-term governor from North Dakota, Davis said the present effort is "just a holding operation, a minimum program."

Davis forcefully argues that much can be done even within the present budget if only state and local offices would tighten up their operations.

Noyes, whose reputation as the tough, aggressive head of civil defense in Omaha has reached Washington, sees it another way.

"What must be done? The top leaders of the country, including the President, must tell the truth forcefully about civil defense. That would mobilize the people behind a viable program."

The request for strong national leadership was one heard repeatedly in talks with local civil defense officials.

Can more be done fairly cheaply?

State and local authorities almost inevitably replied, "Yes."

Increase CD expenditure up to 70 cents per person annually. Switzerland spends \$5.69 per person on civil defense, Sweden about \$3.40.

Spend proportionately in the big cities in favor of areas less likely to be bombed.

Reduce the 50-space minimum for federally stocked shelters.

Upgrade local directors.

Show movies that portray the death and destruction caused by nuclear weapons.

A Strategic Air Command spokesman said SAC has an unclassified film showing in stark brutality the effects of nuclear explosions. He said the Defense Department has ordered the film not shown to the public for fear of causing panic.

Full-scale, community-wide tests that would actually send people into shelters.

In Russia, civil defense training for civilians is compulsory and extensive and includes sections on bacteriological and chemical warfare, something ignored by the U.S. program. Moscow has instituted an active shelter-building program; the United States has none. Russian civil defense is headed by an army marshal and is heavily laced with military men in command positions.

There are limited and realistic exercises at the local level, and the public is repeatedly warned that population centers are certain to be hit.

The Soviets claim to have some blast shelters. There are none in the United States.

What about Washington's plans for after fallout ends?

There is a plan on paper but not one that federal, state and local authorities are geared to carry out in an emergency.

A federal official who has studied the problem says the chances of chaos in the post-attack period are as high or higher than during the shelter period.

Again a number of assumptions are made that military authorities at the Pentagon say probably are unrealistic:

The prediction that rail and other surface transport will be reasonably intact.

That post-attack man will be selfless enough to part with food and other essential items to those less fortunate in other areas.

Although the nation has great stores of strategic metals to keep industry running in wartime, it has no food stockpiles strategically placed to insure that the men who must run the machines will survive.

The Department of Agriculture is charged with somehow making the necessary food available.

A department source said there was concern that governors, who are supposed to seize and control food warehouses in their states, would refuse to pass anything along to areas in worse shape.

He quoted a New York City civil defense official as saying all food trains passing through the metropolitan area would be seized and held for New Yorkers regardless of their destination.

The industrial East requires hundreds of tons of food imported daily. One agriculture official said: "But if the cities are wiped out, then that will lessen the problem."

The Pentagon assumes major communications, administration and industrial centers will be smashed. A tremendous communications system would be needed just to identify bottlenecks and the most needy areas.

Would the nation's telephone system survive blast and power surges?

City and county civil defense units lack radios. It is hoped that the nation's ham or amateur radio operators can fill the gap. But there is no detailed master plan for this.

Another major threat would be from the unburied dead; epidemics so virulent and widespread that millions who escaped death during the war could die of illness. Portable hospitals are stationed throughout the nation but there are no stockpiles of vaccines and antitoxins at the local level.

A New York official, when asked how the problem of several million dead might be solved in his city, said: "Oh, that's a problem for the Sanitation Department."

A Sanitation Department official said as far as he knew there were no plans for the handling of masses, perhaps millions, of bodies. "But it is certainly something to think about," he added.

Tucked away with the fortified biscuits, empty and full water barrels, medical kits and other gear in the shelters stocked some years ago is one box with no material value in the game of survival. Its legend reads:

"Shelter OCDM-Religious Materials, Scriptures and Prayers." A federal official said the boxes aren't being put in the shelters any more. Too bad. They may be needed.

THOUGHTS ON OUR NATIONAL DRUG PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, for several years now, drug abuse has been spreading with pestilential fury through the lives of active, healthy, and potentially creative young Americans. Now neither medical men nor lawmakers, enforcement officers, nor religious leaders, seem able to control the resulting epidemic. But indeed, both the need for dependence on drugs and the extent to

which drugs are used, must soon be limited if our young people are not to be drained of their vitality and their social usefulness.

As a Congressman and father of five children, three of them college students, I have watched with growing concern as our Nation's drug problem has increased over the past few years. Drug dependence is in itself now largely responsible for a high percentage of the crime in this country— theft, assault, and occasionally murder. Not only does society suffer from the prevalence of drug abuse, but those who take drugs are themselves subject to physical decay and even early and terrifying death. Myles J. Ambrose, Director of the U.S. Customs Bureau, has estimated that more Americans are being killed by hard drugs every day than are being killed in Vietnam.

According to the National Institutes of Health, heroin addicts in the United States number around 250,000, the largest number in the world. In Connecticut, according to the Drug Information Center in Hartford, the number is well in excess of 2,000. Although the 91st Congress passed the Drug Abuse and Education Act to provide a wide variety of facilities for education and rehabilitation, misuse of narcotic drugs is still increasing. One of the greatest factors which prevents us from making any significant headway against this terrible social problem is that a large number of veterans are returning from Vietnam, where hard drugs are easily accessible. Too many of our soldiers, while faced with experiences which are emotionally disturbing, succumb to the cheap temptation as an escape. As Time magazine recently pointed out:

Drugs are rapidly becoming as great a threat to American forces as the enemy.

But there is a problem resulting from these Army addicts which is even more serious. For when these young men return to the United States, they find that their addiction is not so easily supported here as it was abroad. As soon as these men return home, they need at least \$30 or \$40 a day to maintain themselves on heroin. Often these unfortunates— debilitated by their habit, are unable to earn enough to purchase the heroin upon which they have become dependent. Thus, they find that they must either turn to theft, or they themselves must become "pushers," and sell drugs to others in order to obtain the money to support their habit. In either case, the domestic drug problem has been compounded by the re-entrance of addicts to civilian life. If these men had been properly rehabilitated before they returned to the United States, our domestic problems with narcotics and with the crime resulting from the demand for narcotics, would be considerably reduced. But since there are not adequate drug detoxification facilities available to these men, these former soldiers, pathetic in their dependence, and menacing in their destruction of themselves and of others, become the responsibility of the people at home. The problem has ceased to be the Army's; it has now become the country's.

On May 10, I introduced legislation that I believe deals constructively with the drug abuse problem in the armed services. In addition to providing for comprehensive treatment-rehabilitation-prevention programs in each of the armed forces and containing a uniform amnesty-treatment provision, the bill states that no member of an armed force who, during his active duty is determined to be addicted to a narcotic drug may be separated from service until such time as he is adjudged to be free of any habitual dependence on drugs. The retention provision of H.R. 8216 is an innovative provision and I am pleased that it has been favorably received by other Members and by the press.

Not all of our addicts are Vietnam veterans, however. Many are young people, especially between the ages of 13 and 25, who take drugs to escape ghetto life, to "follow the crowd," or to attempt to deal with the problems of adolescence.

Some wish to rebel openly against the values of their parents—even to the point of their own drug-caused self-destruction.

Although we are all aware of the problems which drug abuse brings to society, the most disturbing one is the failure of parents, schools, enforcement officers and local, State and Federal government to deal successfully with a tripartite problem—the demand for drugs, the illegal importation of them and the illegal traffic in them within our own country.

Of course, the best way to reduce the drug supply is to reduce the demand, and this reduction might occur if only the taking of drugs were less "fashionable" than it is now. Fashion is a tricky thing—and is it impossible to predict when one fashion will die and another replace it. Those who now use drugs may turn to new and unusual religions, to health foods, or organic gardening, or even to some more socially meaningful activity, as a way of dealing with the problems which they confront, and which drugs, they believe, help them to face. Transfers of interest on the part of young people should not be too quickly criticized, for although these changes are sometimes not readily understood by parents, they are less harmful to the health of the children and young people than drugs are. If such a change in interest—which might be induced in a constructive way by efforts on the part of community leaders, family members, or friends, can occur on any significant scale, a solution to the drug problem might be effected.

But such a self-generating change is certainly not foreseeable in the immediate future, nor are solutions to all of the international, domestic, societal and family problems which may lie at the root of the widespread demand for drugs on the part of modern youth. And in any event, we have no time to wait. The demand for drugs, and the flood of narcotics through our ports to meet that demand, has become a problem of international ramifications. And—since the most dangerous drugs are not grown or manufactured in this country, drug abuse is a problem with significant impact upon American foreign policy.

There are two main types of drugs, both in plentiful supply, that are tempting our youth and causing the drug crisis in our country today—psychotropics and heroin. Psychotropic substances include chemically produced stimulants, depressants, and hallucinogens: Amphetamines, barbiturates, and LSD. They can bring about hallucinations, and even addiction, and because they are relatively inexpensive and easy to acquire, they are in high demand.

At the U.N. sponsored Convention of Psychotropic Substances, held in Vienna in February, an international treaty for control of the production and importation of psychotropics was signed by representatives of 20 of the 71 countries present. The treaty now awaits ratification by 40 governments before its provisions can be enforced. Although ratification may take some time, the signing of the treaty represents a significant international effort to limit the production and sale of psychotropic substances to medical and scientific purposes.

Heroin, the widely used narcotic which undoubtedly causes the most serious and debilitating state of dependence, is a by-product of opium. And opium is derived from the opium poppy, which grows primarily within an area extending from the Turkish Anatolian Plain to the Yunnan Province in China. For commercial purposes, the raw opium is converted into a morphine base. To meet the demand of the addicts, it is then most frequently synthesized into its most intense and dangerous form, heroin. Although legal production and export of raw opium and its byproducts is entirely controlled in theory and to some extent in fact by the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1953, in actuality, it is the diversion of opium into the illegal market which continues to be a major problem, and this diversion cannot be effectively solved by this or any other convention.

Controlling the supply of opium is discouragingly difficult. The opium poppies are grown in underdeveloped areas of the world where labor and land are cheap. Harvesting is tedious, for after the poppy pods fall to the ground, each one must be individually lanced by hand, and after the "gum" has dried, it must be collected by hand. Approximately 5½ hours of labor are needed to produce one ounce of raw opium. That labor, however, is highly rewarding. The Turkish farmer, for instance, receives a black market price of 71 cents an ounce for his opium, almost twice as much as it would command on the legal market. After it is collected, the black market opium is converted into a morphine base, 10 pounds of raw opium yielding one pound of morphine base. From Turkey, nearly all of the morphine base travels, by land or sea, to Marseilles, where it is then turned into heroin. In France, the wholesale price for heroin is \$142 an ounce, but by the time the heroin reaches New York, it is worth, on the retail market, \$6,232 an ounce in its pure form. Thus, in the illegal market, the price of the raw opium equivalent will have increased nearly 10,000 times between the Turkish farm and New York City. The farmer who grew the original poppies makes

proportionately little from his illegal transaction. It is the traffickers, experienced in the art of smuggling and usually members of criminal combinations, who make the greatest profits.

A number of alternatives to opium cultivation have been suggested to the producing nations, of which the most usual is the substitution of other crops. But crop substitution alone will not solve the problem, for the farmer who gives up the production of opium poppies will not be satisfied by the lesser profit he can make on another, more prosaic crop.

Some substitute crops might earn more income than opium in relation to the amount of labor required to produce it, but no other crop brings as large a profit in relation to the land used in its production. And the peasants of Asia are hardly land-rich. Therefore, the only way we now know of making crop substitution appealing to a farmer in an underdeveloped area is to pay him crop subsidies. Yet, few governments are rich enough to make such a financial commitment to their peasants in backward areas. Certainly the more rapidly those areas concerned are developed economically, the less incentive there will be for the cultivation of opium. But again we have no time to wait.

Another way to control the supply of opium is for the local governments simply to prohibit its cultivation, except in certain restricted areas and under close control. However, and particularly in Asia, such a limitation of production is often virtually impossible to enforce. The poppies are frequently grown and harvested by primitive, even tribal peoples, in underdeveloped areas of Iran, India, Burma, Thailand, the Soviet Union, China and Laos. In many of these countries, the national governments are far from strong enough to control the activities of the local farmers.

Turkey is one country which has made serious efforts at cooperation in crop control. Three years ago, poppies were grown in 27 provinces; for the planting season of 1971-72, the Government has limited poppy-growing to four provinces. The Government has also been buying up all of the crop within each of the regulated provinces. Yet even in these provinces, the farmers have been turning in less than their whole crop, and then peddling the rest on the black market for double or triple the legal price.

The new government has announced that it will continue with vigorous efforts to carry out the plan for the reduction of the opium crops and will continue to cooperate with the United Nations and the international community in the control of opium cultivation. To aid the Turkish Government in its efforts, the United States has advanced \$1 million of a \$3 million loan to Turkey to be spent partly on a crop substitution program and partly on the purchase of police cars, weapons, helicopters and the training of specialized police to be utilized in enforcement campaigns.

Mexico, which in addition to growing a small crop of opium poppies, is an important transshipment point for European heroin destined for the United States, is a joint participant with the United States in "Operation Coopera-

tion," an effort designed to control drug trafficking across its 1,900-mile frontier. The United States has also contributed \$1 million in technical assistance to Mexico, to help eliminate harvesting of and trafficking in drugs.

Iran, on the other hand, which had successfully stopped all cultivation of opium poppies for a period of 13 years, from 1956 to 1968, began to allow regulated opium cultivation again in the fall of 1970. Although this opium is theoretically controlled and designated for medicinal purposes, experience has shown that wherever opium is produced legally, illegal production is inevitable. Despite the fact that Iran has plans for controlling her opium crop very carefully, her decision to resume opium production after so many years of abstinence, creates a real danger of an aggravated drug problem for those countries that have worked hard to encourage worldwide cooperation in limiting the supply of illegal opium.

As a Congressman, I have taken a particular interest in searching for ways to assist in the efforts of those countries that suffer from the problems created by the international traffic in illegal opium. To this end, I have introduced two pieces of legislation in the 92d Congress.

One of these, a concurrent resolution, expresses congressional support for strengthening the ability of the United Nations to curb illegal production and illegal international traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs. The other would amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so that the President would be authorized to suspend, in whole or in part, foreign aid to any country which failed to cooperate with the United States in reducing illegal international drug traffic. Under this proposal, the President would have the power to impose economic sanctions on those countries which refused to make reasonable efforts to control their illegal production and export of narcotics.

In addition, in Caracas, Venezuela, I recently presented a resolution jointly sponsored by the delegations of France, Thailand, and Turkey, asking for international cooperation in the control of illegal narcotic drugs to the biannual meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, a gathering of delegates from 53 member nations for the purpose of discussing problems of an international character.

Since the conference was attended by delegations from several of the countries in which clandestine operators contribute to the world's production of illegal narcotics, there was an excellent opportunity to make these countries aware of the extent and seriousness of the drug problems in the United States and to encourage them to consider seriously the possibilities for controlling their own production and illegal trafficking.

So important did the Council members consider this motion that they voted unanimously to accept it. The U.S.S.R., in particular, spoke in favor of my resolution and Lebanon and Kuwait showed understanding of its intentions. The unanimous acceptance of the representatives marked a dramatic and positive

step toward the international cooperation and control of illegal drugs. My Caracas resolution requested the Parliaments of member countries to consider six proposals:

First, to increase the efforts of their states to improve and expand programs to eradicate the illegal growth, processing, manufacture and international traffic of drugs;

Second, to make the elimination of illegal narcotics and dangerous drugs a high-priority objective of both the domestic policies and foreign policies of their states.

Third, to encourage their states to participate in and cooperate with the United Nations, its agencies and programs, and with other interested nations, in carrying out measures aimed at the eradication of illegal narcotics and dangerous drugs, and limiting their use to medical and scientific purposes;

Fourth, to mobilize the efforts of their states for the speedy implementation of the decisions of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs;

Fifth, to encourage their Government in particular to contribute to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and to support proposals for amendments designed to strengthen the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961;

Sixth, to establish programs of prevention and cure, with special emphasis on the education and protection of youth.

Although the importance of international cooperation cannot be underestimated, there are other facets of the drug problem. For there can be no doubt that if drug abuse is successfully to be controlled, that control must be achieved by the effective enforcement of existing statutes, and this enforcement requires effort on every level—international, Federal, and local.

The U.S. Customs Bureau plays a major role in the enforcement of Federal statutes regulating the importation of narcotics. In recent months, the Customs Bureau has expanded its activities considerably. The number of customs officers has been increased, and all officers have received special training in narcotics detection and control. And the drug searches have thus become more comprehensive and effective. Drug seizures increased 88 percent between 1969 and 1970. The Bureau, which records having stopped 9,389 narcotic smuggling attempts during 1970, also reports having confiscated 346.87 pounds of heroin in that year, an increase of 66.18 percent over 1969. And yet, in spite of this improvement, the quantity of illegal drugs entering the United States continues to increase.

The powers of the Customs Bureau to inhibit the illegal traffic in drugs are limited. In the first place, no matter how thoroughly Customs officials inspect the baggage of people entering the country, they cannot possibly find all of the drugs that are illegal. Unless they have a "lead" and are anticipating the entrance of a shipment, of heroin, for instance, their searches can at best be only occasionally fruitful. And the inconvenience to the ordinary law-abiding traveler, often tired by a long trip and irritated by the thoroughness of the search conducted by his

compatriots, is a significantly unfortunate by-product of these fruitless searches. Also, of course, too much interference with the privacy of ordinary citizens cannot be tolerated for too long in a democracy, regardless of the validity of the reasons set forth.

How, then, can we eliminate this scourge of drug abuse that is spreading through our country? The best way is to reduce the demand, although at the moment, the possibility for any significant reduction does not look promising. However, we must not give up. We must increase Federal, State, and local efforts to support school and college information programs as well as radio and TV interviews with former addicts, to send more Drug Mobiles to residential areas, to inform children and parents alike about the dangers of drug abuse, to keep open the telephone lines which are manned by people trained to talk therapeutically with the drug user. And we must increase radically the number of treatment centers for addicts. With persistence and with luck, perhaps we can see the numbers of drug users decrease significantly before it is too late—for them and for the country.

A second way is through efforts to obtain world-wide cooperation and increased support for the efforts of the United Nations to limit the production of and traffic in dangerous narcotic drugs. Possibly we can make the countries that actually produce dangerous narcotic drugs aware of the large numbers of people in other countries whose creative abilities are seriously inhibited, or even destroyed, as a result of drug addiction. Perhaps we can encourage them to become more cooperative and more committed to the life-saving effort of limiting the cultivation and production of drugs to those used for scientific and medical purposes. There are countries which, although they have no serious drug problem today, may face one next year, or maybe 5 years from now. It is in the interest of everyone everywhere in the world to make efforts to come to terms with this epidemic, which, like any other, has the potential for spreading everywhere.

But singlehandedly or together, we must continue our struggle against this pestilence. For narcotics have shown us already that they threaten, not only our mental health, not only our morale as a nation, but the very fabric of our society. We must recognize now that a solution to the drug abuse problem deserves our highest national priority, for the pestilence of drug abuse represents the most clear and present danger to our lives, our pursuit of happiness, and our public order.

TOWARD ACHIEVING ELECTION CAMPAIGN REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an election campaign reform bill that provides an individual tax credit for Federal election campaign contributions of up to \$100, strengthens

the disclosure and reporting requirements for all candidates in contests for Federal office, and places a limit on campaign contributions.

Considerable thought has been given to the introduction of this bill, and I believe it to be legislation that is both pertinent and appropriate at this time. It omits one highly controversial section that has been included in many other bills on this subject—that of limiting expenditures. Ever since 1948, each Congress has been presented with numerous bills that have attempted to limit or restrict campaign expenditures. None have ever been enacted. And, in this session of Congress, expenditure limitation has also been a major source of controversy and discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us in this Chamber have long realized the need for generating greater citizen participation in the election process. This is why I have included the tax credit provision in my bill. Campaigns should be financed in a way that will build support for our political institutions and respect for the political process. I believe that the best political finance system is the one that is based on relatively small contributions from large numbers of citizens. Statistics reveal that the number of small contributors—those giving under \$100—has been growing over the last 2 years. This is a desirable trend, and one that should certainly be encouraged.

A modest tax credit, as I have proposed, will probably increase the number of contributors in this category, because the actual availability of the credit itself will enable many more people to afford a small contribution, and the mere fact that such a contribution is legally recognized by the Government will give it a certain status, not only of respectability, but also of acceptance. Many thousands of people today are still reluctant to contribute to a campaign because they feel there is something wrong with political finance.

As of 2 years ago, only about 8 percent of the American public had made any form of political contribution. Research polls indicate, however, that many others would probably have done so had they been asked. And, as of today, this figure is almost at the 9-percent level. A tax credit, as I have proposed, will create an opportunity for candidates, as well as for parties, to finance their election campaigns in a manner that will be above reproach. It will be a means of encouraging greater grassroots participation and activity in the election process.

This bill also provides for strengthening disclosure and reporting requirements. Full public disclosure of all campaign activity—both contributions and expenditures—is the best discipline available to insure that campaigns are both honest and fair. This will tell the public exactly where political contributions come from, and exactly where expenses are incurred. With full disclosure will come more confidence in politics. This, in turn, will help to encourage more smaller contributors to participate in the election process. Disclosure statements have normally been looked upon to be required of only winning candidates. But, this legislation provides that every candidate—

whether he wins or loses—must file a complete statement detailing his contributions and expenditures with each State and county in which the person filing such statement makes an expenditure, or in which he has a political committee. These statements are to be filed with the State and county officer as designated by the Clerk of the House. Candidates for Congress also are to file statements of disclosure with the Clerk of the House or with the President of the Senate, depending upon the office they seek. Such filings, in all cases, are to become public information. Not only are all campaign financial activities required to be disclosed, but the term "contribution" is expanded to include anything of value made for the purpose of influencing the outcome of a Federal election. This "anything of value" clause is especially important since many organizations or pressure groups can apply a variety of subterfuges in order to make what are actually contributions. To name just a few, they often lend office equipment, make available the services of their public relations experts, lawyers, and other personnel, or buy so-called advertising space at ridiculously inflated prices in political pamphlets and brochures.

Also under the disclosure requirements of this bill, I have expanded the term "State" to apply to not only all 50 States, but to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States. Most of us are aware that a glaring loophole exists in present law whereby the District of Columbia has heretofore been exempt from reporting requirements. This bill will close such loopholes by requiring full disclosure by any candidate who may be aided by any of the various political committees that invariably spring up in the District of Columbia before election campaign time.

And, the bill also places limits on the amount of money an individual may contribute to a candidate for Federal office. For those seeking election to the offices of President, Vice President or Senator, the ceiling is \$5,000; for those seeking election to the U.S. House of Representatives the limit is \$1,000. This contribution limitation is of equal importance with the other major provisions of the bill. It is significant in that it discourages the practice of some larger contributors of trying to "buy" an election for an individual candidate, and it precludes such contributors from attempting to wield unhealthy pressure at the expense of the public interest. The legislation further provides that the contribution limitation would apply singularly to the primary election and to the general election. No distinctions—other than that which applies to the various Federal positions sought—are included in the legislation. It applies equally to challenger and incumbent.

I have previously stated that I have placed no restrictions on expenditures. I am of the opinion that such a provision is unnecessary when there is full disclosure together with contribution limitations. With full public disclosure of all campaign contributions and expenditures during the course of a campaign, the voters themselves could better judge whether a candidate has spent too much,

or has spent unwisely. This would do much more to protect election campaigning from unbridled spending than the placing of legal limits on the size of an expenditure. This way a candidate may outspend his opponent, but with full disclosure of all his campaign transactions, he well knows that he would certainly be held accountable by the ever-watchful voter across the Nation, in a State or a congressional district.

This legislation, to review briefly, implements necessary election campaign reforms by allowing an individual a tax credit of up to \$100 for political contributions, it provides for full and complete disclosure, and it limits campaign contributions.

I believe the legislation, as introduced, will be easily enforceable, and will apply, without discrimination, just standards to both the challenger and the incumbent. Furthermore, it leaves intact the basic and inherent right to support the candidate or the party of one's choice. And yet, it remains an effective vehicle through which constructive improvements in the election campaign process can be made.

Its provisions are such as to instill renewed public confidence and respect in one of our most historic and cherished traditions.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. The number of passenger miles registered by U.S. airlines increased from 1 billion miles in 1940 to 105 billion miles in 1970.

ASSISTANCE TO THE UNEMPLOYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives had under consideration H.R. 3613, the so-called Emergency Employment Act. The Members of this House, after discussion and debate, determined that it was their will that the House should also consider, as a substitute to H.R. 3613, our substitute bill H.R. 8141. The majority of the Members of this House overwhelmingly, in three separate votes, indicated their desire to have a full airing of the problems of unemployment in the country and specifically how we might totally reform and coordinate our disjointed, ineffective system of delivering manpower services.

During the debate on the rule, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the majority leader, emphasized the urgency of enacting the committee legislation and the distinguished assistant leader from Massachusetts, Mr. O'NEILL, said:

This is truly an emergency employment bill.

I ask now, "Where is the emergency?" If indeed the desire is to help those unemployed, then why did we delay even a day. For the past 2 days this House has had before it no legislative business. In the meanwhile, people continue to be unemployed. Are we more concerned with demagoguing an issue than with truly helping the people? I submit that it is time this House faced up to its responsibility and act now on the question of manpower reform. The majority of the Members of the House have indicated their desire to be heard and take action on this issue. How long can their will be thwarted by unjustified delays?

It is clear to me that the discussion of the House this week reemphasized that the committee bill H.R. 3613 would not really solve the problem. By adding but one more narrow categorical manpower authorization to the already dozen existing programs we will not resolve the problem of unemployment in this country. Indeed, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), our distinguished subcommittee chairman, has specifically stated on the floor of the House that the bill would affect but 150,000 persons. Therefore, you see, they admit that their bill would solve but 3 percent of the problem. There is need for this Congress to attack head on the problem of unemployment, which has been brought on by the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. For since the President has reversed the course of the war, there has been nearly a 1.8-million reduction in jobs related to Defense Department expenditures.

I would submit that the problem can best be resolved by a total reform of our manpower training programs as offered in H.R. 8141. It is obvious that the Members of this House stand ready to discuss, debate, and to work their will on this important measure. When will the bill be rescheduled? How long is the will of the majority going to continue to be thwarted by narrow partisan interests? The majority of the Members of this House have shown that they are willing to lead the country toward a new direction in resolving the plight of our unemployed. Will the leadership follow?

TRUTH IN FOOD LABELING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Truth in Food Labeling Act which would require that all ingredients contained in a food product be listed on the label.

The present ingredient labeling practices range from nonexistent to misleading. For far too long unsuspecting consumers have eaten foods which are harmful to them because the package label did not list all the ingredients. And with the advent of widespread usage of food additives, some of which might prove injurious to certain individuals, it is essential that Congress act to require a full disclosure of the package contents.

Knowing ingredients is especially important to persons with allergies and

other dietary problems. Moreover, everyone should have the right to know what he is eating.

At the core of the labeling controversy are the standards of identity. The original and quite valid purpose of these standards was to make certain that manufactured food products, which had become known to the consumer by their common names, would contain substantially the same ingredients regardless of manufacturers.

The Food and Drug Administration, however, later permitted manufacturers of foods covered by standards of identity to withhold from the label many, and sometimes all, of the ingredients contained in the product.

Even if one should obtain a copy of the standard for a certain food, it is often impossible to determine exactly what is in a product because of regulations which allow manufacturers a choice of optional ingredients to include in their product without requiring them to tell anyone. Ironically, it is often the potentially harmful ingredients that are not listed, such as caffeine in colas or eggs in mayonnaise.

This legislation proposes an amendment to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. I was happy to note the other day that the FDA has published in the Federal Register and asked for comments on a petition that would accomplish essentially the same purpose as this bill.

I am skeptical, however, that the FDA seriously intends to act on this matter in the near future. It has had the authority to administratively require full disclosure of all contents since passage of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in 1938.

Instead, over the years the agency has created a labyrinth of regulations which allow manufacturers to conceal all ingredients, require that some be listed without specifying that it is only a partial listing, and allow certain additives—such as colorings and seasonings—to hide behind generic names. There are relatively few products which FDA requires to list completely their contents on the label.

I find it incredible that one product which usually lists all its ingredients on the label should be dog food. Not only does the label list all ingredients, it also bears the nutrient percentages.

I would like to give credit to a group called LABEL, Inc., an acronym for Law Students Association for Buyers Education in Labeling. Its five members, Arthur Koch, Gary Laden, Ellis Saul, Louis Kaufman, and Joan Levy, under the auspices of Prof. John Banzhaf at George Washington University, initiated the petition which the FDA has just published in the Federal Register. I am grateful for their help in developing this legislation.

It was the stated purpose of Congress when it passed the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in 1938 to "promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers." This mandate is being circumvented by the present complex labeling regulations. It is time for Congress to act to correct and simplify the labeling requirements in order to carry out the original stated purpose of the law it passed in 1938.

The bill I am introducing today is an important complement to "The Better Labeling Act," H.R. 4427, which I introduced earlier this year. That bill requires food manufacturers to list on their labels the nutritional content of the food product. It also requires, in the case of canned fruit and vegetable items, a statement of drained weight—the weight of the product without the packing liquid; and, in the case of combination processed items, such as "beef stew," "spaghetti and meat balls," and the like, a listing of ingredients by percentage weight.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put in the RECORD the text of the "Truth in Food Labeling" bill plus a newspaper article which points up the very situation this legislation is aimed at correcting, with respect to food additives. The article was written by Douglas Bloomfield, consumer reporter for the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

I also wish to include an Associated Press dispatch that reports even Mrs. Virginia Knauer, the President's consumer assistant, is perplexed by this problem, at least as it applies to orange juice. It seems the Food and Drug Administration, according to Mrs. Knauer, has put off for more than 7 years, a ruling on labeling dilution of juice drinks. Unfortunately, although Mrs. Knauer was "absolutely astounded and more than a little disturbed," even she apparently has been unable to get any action out of the FDA, and she is supposed to be the President's top consumer adviser. This episode is further evidence of the need for the bill I am proposing today:

H.R. 8670

A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labels on all foods to disclose each of their ingredients

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

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Truth in Food Labeling Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) There are no Federal laws or regulations which require the labels for all food products to state the name of each of the ingredients present in the products.

(2) The absence of such information is harmful to consumers who unknowingly consume food with ingredients which for health or dietary reasons they should not ingest.

(3) The purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is to promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of the consumer. This purpose cannot be met in the case of food products unless labeling requirements for all food products are changed to require the disclosure of all ingredients.

SEC. 3. (a) The next to the last sentence of Section 401 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 341) is amended to read as follows: "In prescribing a definition and standard of identity for any food or class of food, the Secretary shall require all manufacturers and distributors of food to include on the label all ingredients contained in such food in the order of their predominance in the food."

(b) Clause (2) of Section 403(g) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 343(g)) is amended to read as follows: "(2) its label bears the name of the food specified in the definition and standard and lists (in the order of their predominance and by their common name) each of the ingredients present in such food."

(c) Section 403(1) of such Act (21 U.S.C.

343(1)) is amended by striking out all after "and" immediately after clause (1)) and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, a listing (in the order of their predominance and by their common or usual name) of each such ingredient."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by Section 3 shall take effect on the first day of the seventh month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act."

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1971]

WHAT'S WHAT IN ORANGE JUICE

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ.—The President's consumer adviser accused government and industry Friday of unconscionable delay in resolving consumers' doubts over whether they are getting flavored water or the real thing when they buy orange juice.

Virginia H. Knauer, special assistant for consumer affairs, said consumers are practically helpless in determining from titles like "juice," "juice drink" and "drink ade" how much the product has been diluted.

She noted it has been seven years since the Food and Drug Administration proposed requiring that labels show the percentage of dilution in juice drinks.

"I was absolutely astounded and more than a little disturbed to find that seven years have now elapsed since the rules had first entered the Federal Register for comment, and no general public discussion, let alone resolution of the matters raised had transpired in the interim," said Mrs. Knauer in a speech read for her before the National Juice Products Association by one of her staffers.

Mrs. Knauer said she was amazed the FDA proposals permit as little as 50 per cent orange juice in any drink labeled orange juice drink.

"Women will wonder what they have been paying for all these years, flavored water or orange juice," said Mrs. Knauer.

[From the Plain Dealer]

ADDITIVES FORTIFY FOOD, BUT SOME ARE A PERIL

(By Douglas Bloomfield)

There are more than 3,000 different chemical additives in our food supply.

Many are useful. Others contribute only a cosmetic effect. Some are dangerous.

Additives help retard spoilage, improve flavor and add vitamins. They make beer foam, oranges orange and maraschino cherries red. But a few have been linked to heart disease, cancer and brain damage.

Dr. Jean Mayer, President Nixon's adviser on nutrition, has said: "We can live perfectly well without additives."

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration is supposed to keep a careful eye on additives, barring all not proven safe. But there appears to be a wide gap between theory and practice.

Even President Nixon is bothered. In his consumer message last fall, he asked FDA to review and revise its list of food additives classified Generally Recognized as Safe (GRAS).

There is a concern within FDA as well. Leo Friedman, acting director of the agency's toxicology division, said: "It is becoming increasingly clear that untoward effects in people, stemming from food additives, are exceedingly difficult to recognize or even establish with any degree of certainty once suspicion has been aroused."

He feels that "every effort should be made to re-examine and update the safety evaluation of all such compounds at regular intervals."

A two-year investigation of FDA sponsored by consumer advocate Ralph Nader concluded that the agency "should face up publicly to what it knows privately about food additive regulation—that the program

is a mess. The consumer might be more wary, and therefore better off, if there was no program of food standards designed to protect him."

Chemicals may get into foods in several ways:

Deliberately added as flavorings, preservatives, enhancers and so on.

Inadvertently introduced into food in manufacturing (from packages or machines, for example) or through natural processes such as formation of toxin-producing substances in mold.

From animals treated with veterinary drugs before being slaughtered.

The use of chemicals as food additives has increased by more than 50% in the past 10 years, according to FDA, which cautions that "many of these chemicals are known to be toxic in large quantities."

Last year FDA received 476 new applications for food additives. 62 were approved and 148 rejected.

Part of the consumer's problem in identifying what has been deliberately added to his food is FDA's requirement that technical, not common names be used. Thus water is hydrogen oxide and table salt is sodium chloride on some labels.

Using common names and issuing a dictionary of additives are two of the remedies proposed by consumer interests.

Many additives are not even listed on food labels. Neither, for that matter, are the ingredients of many products. These all are items that FDA accepts as standardized, such as mayonnaise, margarine, vinegar, ice cream, cocoa and macaroni. Even some nonstandardized foods are exempted from identifying spices, coloring, additives and other ingredients.

This can be dangerous for persons with allergies, diabetes and other problems who want to avoid certain ingredients such as eggs, sugar and milk. About 20 million Americans are in this category.

Nearly all standards were set at the request of the producers. When a standard of identity is agreed on, all products of that type must comply with the standard on ingredients. Use of some optional items is often allowed, but basic ingredients tend to be strictly controlled.

Nonstandardized foods must list ingredients in descending order of weight in the product, but there is no requirement that relative amounts be noted.

Pet foods tend to be more informatively labeled than human foods. This can be seen in a comparison of two cans of stew. The one for human consumption lists the ingredients, but not by percentage. The pet food label includes ingredients plus a percentage analysis by nutrient so the dog owner can get the best protein buy for his pet.

The human consumer, by reading food labels, has no idea how much beef is in his beef stroganoff, peanuts in peanut butter, orange juice in orange drink, strawberries in strawberry jam, meat in hot dogs or chicken in chicken soup.

Copies of standards for specific products are available to consumers who send a request to the FDA, Washington, D.C. Alert shoppers have learned that the difference between two or more brands or a standardized product is primarily price, and thus they are able to save money.

Industry strenuously fights efforts for full disclosure of ingredients, contending that this would require them to give secret recipes to competitors. Consumerists, however, contend that they would not be disclosing recipes or production methods, but would merely be telling customers what they are eating and how much of it.

"The various FDA food standards and exemptions now in force read like a catalogue of favors to special industrial interests," said the Nader study.

It called the GRAS list "a tool for sup-

pression of consumer information, allowing dozens of ingredients unknown to customers to be used in food."

The GRAS concept should be abolished, it added, and in the meantime the number of items should be drastically reduced, removing each chemical about which there is even a single doubt.

FDA Commissioner Charles C. Edwards said the review of the GRAS list requested by President Nixon is being done "within the context of an over-all look at the safety of our food supply." He expects to be halfway through the list by next summer.

The study, Edwards said, will apply "1970 scientific knowledge to safety judgments which in fact were last made 15 to 20 years ago."

The FDA is responsible for evaluating all chemicals proposed as food additives and to establish a tolerance level for each. But it was allowed to exempt more than 600 chemicals from clearance requirements "because they were considered safe by experts" and put on the GRAS list, according to the agency.

Cyclamates were one of those "safe" chemicals. The artificial sweetener was banned last year as a possible cause of cancer. Another, still on the list, is mono-sodium glutamate (MSG), the flavor enhancer.

Recent studies indicate that MSG "is potentially hazardous," FDA, reports, but "available information is insufficient to justify action." Research is continuing.

Cyclamates were banned last fall under the Delaney amendment to the FDA law, which requires removal of any additive causing cancer in test animals.

Critics have assailed the law from both sides.

Some, like Edwards, feel it is too rigid and leaves no room for administrative or scientific discretion. They argue that even salt and sugar could be harmful in excessive amounts. This has not been proven, however.

The Nixon administration reportedly is planning to ask Congress to repeal the Delaney amendment.

Others like Nader say the law is not strong enough. They oppose giving political appointees such discretionary powers. They also want the measure to cover additives which may cause genetic damage and birth defects.

"In view of the possibility that other additives may be as dangerous as the cyclamates," says the agency, "it now appears essential that FDA and the food-additive industry jointly reevaluate over the next three years all of the known GRAS additives, other additives that have been unilaterally classified by industry as GRAS, and some approved additives for which tolerances now in existence may have to be changed."

The Plain Dealer has learned that Nader may not be willing to wait three years and is considering filing suit in federal court to have the GRAS list abolished.

In the use of many additives, Nader says, the agency "has permitted a sell-now, test-later posture by the companies. FDA has admitted that it has heavily relied on summary assurances by food companies about additives and has not checked in detail the raw test data."

Consumer interest want the government not to rely on industry labs but to do as much of the testing as possible and to supervise more closely testing it cannot do itself.

The additive problem can be seen well in five examples:

MSG, salt and sugar were added to baby food, with FDA permission, for no other purpose than to make the food palatable to mothers. Despite scientific evidence showing that MSG caused brain damage in mice and the urging of its removal by Dr. Mayer, FDA resisted taking action.

The baby food producers themselves finally removed the ingredient voluntarily in the wake of unfavorable publicity. But the FDA

still has taken no further action of MSG or on any other unnecessary ingredients in baby food.

The presence of MSG must be listed on all products except mayonnaise, French dressing and salad dressing. Its function is to enhance flavor.

Red 4 is an artificial food coloring described by the World Health Organization as dangerous to humans. When the FDA considered declaring it unsafe, the producers of maraschino cherries argued that nobody eats enough of their product to do any harm. The FDA bowed to pressure and excluded Red 4 from all foods except maraschino cherries. No health warning is required on the label.

Cyclamates, the artificial sweeteners, were first linked to cancer in FDA's own labs about 20 years before the agency slapped a ban on them.

Caffeine is added to cola and Dr. Pepper soft drinks, but the makers of those beverages won FDA permission to keep that information off their labels by having them declared standard ingredients. All other soft drinks containing caffeine, however, must reveal that fact on their labels. FDA scientists and officials opposed the exemption but bowed under pressure from the White House, a U.S. Senator and the industry.

The senator was Richard Russell, D-Ga., who called FDA to express "interest" in the matter, according to former Associate Commissioner Kenneth Kirk in an interview with Life magazine. The world's largest cola producer is one of Russell's constituents, Atlanta-based Coca-Cola.

Some approved food colorings in baked goods have been found to decompose during baking or to react with vitamins in food to form compounds whose effects are unknown.

The FDA reports that about 10 million Americans get some form of food poisoning every year.

Although development of new foods and new technology have ended some forms of contamination, these same "improvements" bring an increased threat to health.

"Technology has also contributed to the proliferation of products about which relatively little is known and has actually increased the potential for widespread food-borne epidemics to occur," FDA reports.

"At the same time," it continues, "changes in food processing methods have tended to disguise some common indicators of contamination, such as decomposition, noxious gases and discoloration, that used to alert consumers that food might be unsafe."

But safety is not the only consideration, according to Edwards. Effectiveness and quality of food also must be considered.

"If I am reading consumer complaints correctly, among other things, they are saying that at least for some foods, there must be a positive gain or benefit in the food or, in the case of food additives, there must be a positive reason for its use," he said.

Toward this end, he added, FDA plans to establish nutritional guidelines for selected classes of foods.

These would not be formal standards of nutritional quality, he explained, but informal guidelines for industry to follow voluntarily.

This would involve agency-industry collaboration on deciding, how nutritional quality should be explained on food labels.

"We would then expect that commercial pressures would cause processors to use the guidelines in formulating and designing their products," Edwards said. "If they do so extensively, there will be no reason to consider a mandatory mechanism."

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY IS A REMINDER OF AMERICA'S PLEDGE TO RESTORE FREEDOM TO CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, May 20, 1971, marked another anniversary of the independence of Cuba. On that glorious date, May 20, 1902, the Cuban flag waved for the first time over the Morro Castle in Havana, capital of a free, sovereign, and independent Cuba. This scene climaxed the heroic struggle of the Cuban people, who for over 50 years had fought the powerful forces of Spain.

Cuba—Pearl of the Antilles—except for British occupation of Havana in 1762–63, was ruled by the Spanish Government from its discovery by Columbus in 1492 until 1898.

Cuban history records a lengthy struggle for independence. Over a century ago, the great Cuban, General Narciso López, landed an expedition in the city of Cardenas, Province of Matanzas, Cuba. This city is not far from the "Bay of Pigs"—"Bahía de Cochinos." General López came as a leader to liberate Cuba. With this expedition came a retired U.S. Army officer from West Point, Col. William Logan Crittenden, and a group of Americans from Kentucky. This may have been when the United States of America and Cuba united in the fight for freedom. This expedition was successful and, after the defeat of the troops of the city of Cardenas, the Cuban flag waved over Cuban soil for the first time. For this reason, the city of Cardenas is called "Flag City"—"Ciudad Bandera."

However, this victory was of short duration since the General Governor of Spain in Havana sent strong reinforcements which defeated General López and his men. A great number of them died on the battlefield; others, as General López, were executed after being tried by the island's Spanish government according to their army regulations. This tragedy silenced the people of Cuba for a short period of time. On October 10, 1868, on "La Demajagua" farm in the Province of Oriente, Carlos Manuel de Cespedes, another Cuban patriot fighting against the Spaniards, engaged in another battle and gained a short-lived victory in the city of Bayamo. When a large number of Spanish troops were sent to take over the city, Cespedes asked the people of Bayamo what he should do; and they answered him, "Liberty or Ashes"—"Liber-tad o Cenizas." When the Spaniards arrived, they found only ashes since these patriots had burned all their properties, such as houses, stores, and so forth, which had taken them years of honest labor to build. The fire burned years of honest labor, memories, and fortunes in just minutes.

Their 10-years' war ended in 1878 with guarantees of rights which Spain failed to carry out. This treaty was called "The Peace of Zanjón" and was initiated by one of the greatest of Cuban generals, Gen. Antonio Maceo.

An exile movement started in 1878, when many Cubans came to the United States where they settled in New York, Key West, and Tampa. This period of exile lasted 17 years. A great man and Cuban patriot, José Martí, who lived the greater part of his life in exile, recruited men in the United States, Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean Is-

lands for the war for Cuban independence. A full scale movement began February 24, 1895, under José Martí. The military commanders were Máximo Gómez, Antonio Maceo, and Calixto García.

En route to Santiago to join with other Cuban patriots, José Martí was killed when his group was attacked by a Spanish patrol. Referring to the death of José Martí, an historian wrote:

José Martí died, but a people was born.

Martí is considered by freedom loving Cubans as the "George Washington of their country" and as the foremost martyr and hero of the Cuban struggle for freedom.

By 1897 over half the island was in Cuban hands. The Spanish governor, Valeriano Weyler, destroyed sugar plantations, banned export of tobacco and held patriots in concentration camps. A U.S. offer to mediate was rejected by Spain.

The movement to help Cuba gain its independence gained U.S. support by the sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine* in Havana Harbor. On April 19, 1898, the U.S. Congress approved a joint resolution for the liberation of Cuba, declaring that "Cuba is and has the right to be free and independent." The United States declared war on Spain April 25, 1898.

The famous "Rough Riders," led by Theodore Roosevelt, landed in Oriente Province and the Battle of San Juan Hill was fought by the Americans and Cubans against the Spaniards. The Spanish troops were defeated not only in Cuba, but also in Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands.

In the Treaty of Paris, December 10, 1898, Spain surrendered all claims to Cuba. From January 1, 1899 to May 20, 1902, Cuba was under U.S. military rule with most of the government positions filled by Cubans. Then, on May 20, 1902, the United States granted complete and unconditional freedom to the Cubans. The United States formally withdrew from Cuba on this date when Tomás Estrada Palma was inaugurated first President of the Republic.

It was on May 20, 1902, that the lone star flag, the Cuban flag, was hoisted to fly victoriously above the Morro Castle. Today free Cubans commemorate the 69th anniversary of the independence of Cuba; yet today, May 20, 1971, Cuba and its people suffer greater tyranny and repression than in the past.

Fidel Castro, a traitor to the Cuban Revolution which began on October 10, 1868, has surrendered the liberty, sovereignty, and independence of Cuba to international communism of Moscow-Peking. The bearded butcher—who was referred to by a segment of the U.S. press as the "Robin Hood of the Sierra Maestra" and who was welcomed in Washington by the then Vice President Richard Nixon, was able to seize power in Cuba with the aid of the New York Times, the CIA, and the State Department.

The United States is largely responsible for allowing the cancer of communism to get a foothold just 80 miles off our coast and for permitting it to continue to spread.

President Eisenhower ignored the long established Monroe Doctrine and allowed

Communists to establish a base in Cuba. Robert C. Hill, our ambassador to Mexico in 1959; and Earl E. T. Smith, our ambassador to Cuba from June 3, 1957 to January 20, 1959, tried but to no avail to make it known to our official policymakers that Castro was a Communist and that our own State Department was promoting Castro.

Testifying under oath after his resignation, Ambassador Smith stated:

The Batista government was overthrown because of the corruption, disintegration from within, and because of the United States and the various agencies of the United States who directly and indirectly aided the overthrow of the Batista government and brought into power Fidel Castro. . . Without the United States, Castro would not be in power today. I will put it as straight as that to you, sir.

During the Kennedy administration, the Castro dictatorship was consolidated and strengthened with U.S. Government help. The role of the CIA in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion is well documented by a Cuban authority, John Martino, in his informative book, "I Was Castro's Prisoner" and by Haynes Johnson in his book, "The Bay of Pigs." Their conclusions indicate that the CIA not only helped Castro to power, but also sabotaged every effort by Cuban patriots to win back their country.

During the Johnson administration the Soviet missile build up and the use of Cuba as a base for training revolutionaries was ignored while the Cuban exiles and the Cuban underground were rendered less effective.

The attitude of the Kissinger-Nixon administration toward Cuba can be described by the expression: "Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil." With regard to Cuba, the present administration appears to be like an ostrich which buries its head in the sand. When U.S. Naval Intelligence as well as our colleague, the late Hon. Mendel Rivers, revealed that Russians had a nuclear submarine base at Cienfuegos, President Nixon by television assured the Nation that no Russian nuclear naval base existed in Cuba, that the Russians had promised President Kennedy in 1962 they would not place offensive missiles in Cuba and promised him on October 11, 1970 that they would not establish a military naval base in Cuba, and that it was his belief that the Russians would keep their promise.

A Cuban and American patriot, Dr. Manolo Reyes, who is presently a news editor in Miami, knows that most of the U.S. young people going to Cuba are not going to cut sugar cane but to join the so-called "Venceremos Brigade" and to receive urban guerrilla training in one of 80 or more camps now operating for that purpose. How many urban fires—how much urban violence was spawned in Castro's camp no one can estimate. In bygone days, when only loyal Americans stood guard in the State Department, such activities would have been considered treasonous—rather than humanitarian.

In a recent editorial, Dr. Reyes provided information to show that the Soviets, despite the supposed Kennedy-Khrushchev understanding, are indeed exporting their revolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Communist cancer in Cuba is spreading and it must be stopped before it destroys Christian civilization. A spreading cancer which endangers the life of a human being requires surgical removal by a physician. I believe that it is America's historical role—our duty and responsibility—to be the physician to remove the cancer in Cuba, not just to rectify a dangerous situation which we helped create but also to protect the security of the United States.

It seems rather strange that we talk of controlling Communist aggression half way around the world in South Vietnam but ignore the Communist danger just 90 miles off our coast where it constitutes a real and present threat to our security. Besides there are thousands of valiant Cubans, many in exile, who are anxious to recover their homeland if we would but help instead of hinder them.

I remember well a stirring pledge made by President John F. Kennedy to the members of Cuba Brigade 2506 at the Orange Bowl in December of 1962 when he said:

I can assure that this flag will be returned to this brigade in a free Havana.

That promise was made over 8 years ago. During these years, this still great Nation has taken no action nor given any indication of honoring that pledge.

We learn that the chief adversary of free men, the Soviet Union, is gradually becoming militarily stronger while our defense posture weakens.

There comes a time in the life of a nation when its moral conscience can tolerate no more compromise; when, if for no other reason than for its self-respect and its obligation to posterity, it must risk a measure of safety and do what it knows in its heart is right. History records that those nations which chose "safety" ended up with slavery; and that those which chose self-respect earned peace and freedom with honor. I believe that this country must make such a choice now. The cries for compromise with evil—coexistence with communism—for appeasing the enemy out of fear for our safety, for peace-at-any-price, and of "better Red than dead," are not the voice of America. The real Americans—who built this country, whose taxes pay its bills, who do the fighting for it—are anxious, frustrated, upset, but are not afraid. They are asking how did we get in this predicament and why is not something done. They are asking questions but not getting answers.

I am reminded of a stirring statement by the late Winston Churchill which is pertinent at this point in my remarks:

If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves.

Mr. Speaker, America should take an active lead in assisting all captive peoples to throw off the restraining shackles of atheistic communism. A good place to begin is in Cuba.

By taking such action, we will be giving a sign to the world that America is still "the land of the free and the home of the brave." And the liberation of Cuba will give hope and courage to all enslaved peoples, encouraging them to rise up and cast off the yoke of their oppressors.

And I am reminded of the sage advice of a great patriot in the early days of our Nation's history:

We will not fight the battle alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations.

Surely, if we strive to do His will, He will guide us to freedom and peace through victory.

I can imagine how Patrick Henry must have felt when he declared to the House of Burgesses of Virginia in March 1775:

Gentlemen may cry, Peace, Peace! But there is no peace. The war is actually begun! . . . Why stand we here idle? What is it that Gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

What practical measures should we take to aid Cubans in restoring freedom to their fatherland again?

Let us follow the wise counsel of George Washington:

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

Let us strengthen our military posture so that the United States will be the strongest Nation in the world and let us use that power in defense of justice and freedom. The President's Blue Ribbon Defense Panel in a supplemental statement released by the Department of Defense on March 12, 1971, "identifies and discusses trends which if continued will result in the United States becoming a second-rate power incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people."

Let us tell the American people the full truth about what is going on in Cuba. Let us tell the world of the violations of human rights by the tyrannical system of totalitarian communism not only in Cuba but in all of the captive nations. Let us identify the enemy—Soviet Russia—and stop helping the enemy and start helping our friends.

Let us support Cuban exiles in this country and the Cuban underground in Cuba in their plans and efforts to overthrow the Soviets. Soviet Russia makes no secret of her aid to Communists who seek to overthrow or have overthrown free governments. Why should we not profess openly as a proud and brave Nation our support of free peoples?

As stated in the above mentioned Joint Resolution of 1898, Cuba has the right to be free and independent. Its liberation will be an example for other captive nations to emulate. The liberation of Cuba will be the tomb of communism in the American continent, even if it be necessary to go back to the history of Bayamo, that is, "Liberty or Ashes," because the Cuban people were not born to be slaves. Nor were the American people.

I have introduced two measures to help restore Cuba as a free nation. My House Concurrent Resolution 65 would

make it the sense of Congress that the question of denial of the right of self-determination and other human rights violations in Cuba be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Organization. If this is done world attention will be called to the slave state that is today's Cuba. The other proposed legislation, House Joint Resolution 160, seeks to prevent subversion of the United States, Central and South America as proposed by Castro and to encourage—not hamper—Cubans in exile in restoring freedom and constitutional government in their homeland.

I insert the text of House Concurrent Resolution 65 and House Joint Resolution 160, the text of the joint resolution of Congress of 1898, an editorial of April 21, 1971, of Dr. Manolo Reyes, two articles by Fernando J. Rojas and Jose Tenreiro of the Cruzada Anti-Comunista Internacional—International Anti-Communist Crusade—an article entitled "Cuban Communism and the United States" from the Mindszenty report by Father John J. Kelly, O.S.A., president of Villanueva University in Havana from 1953 to 1959, an article entitled "The Lesson to be Learned from Cuba" by Bob White from Life Line, and two articles by the eminent writer Frank A. Capell, "It's Time for a Change" from the Herald of Freedom and "No Intelligence—A Worried Look at the C.I.A." from American Opinion:

H. CON. RES. 65

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of denial of the right of self-determination and other human rights violations in Cuba on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

H.J. RES. 160

Joint resolution to prevent the subversion of the United States and the American continents as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba under Castro, and for other purposes

Whereas there have been many suggestions and several resolutions as to the procedure necessary to stop Cuba's Fidel Castro from subverting the American continents; and

Whereas Fidel Castro's Communist regime has, by its actions, merited the condemnation of the Organization of American States as an aggressor nation; and

Whereas the Castro government at the Tri-Continental Conference declared, openly for all to know, its intent to overthrow every legally constituted government on the American continent, including that of these United States; and whereas, it has already put into practice the revolutionary plans of the Tri-Continental Conference of Havana in Bolivia, Venezuela, and Guatemala; and

Whereas the citizens people of Cuba, terrorized by huge arms buildup and foreign mercenary troops, cannot regain control of their government without outside help from the nearly one million fellow countrymen in exile; and

Whereas it is to the best interest of these United States not to have an aggressive dictatorship, supported by foreign arms and troops, menacing our people with atomic missiles pointed at our cities; and

Whereas it is in the peaceful interest of the United States Government, as well as a moral obligation to all Americans, to prevent Latin America and the United States from

becoming battlefields for guerrilla warfare, as planned by Castro at the Tri-Continental Conference of Havana; and

Whereas it would be a waste of the American taxpayers' dollars to donate funds for the Alliance for Progress in Latin America while Castro is at liberty to organize, finance, and direct guerrilla bands to attack and overthrow these same governments we are trying to help financially: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Government withdraw political recognition of Cuba's Communist government and thus encourage all Latin American countries to do likewise; and

That all governments who wish to participate in the Alliance for Progress must first withdraw political recognition of any Communist government in Cuba; and

That the United States State Department policy be clearly defined as no longer recognizing the Communist regime of Castro at Havana and that no reprisals will be taken against any Cuban in restoring freedom and constitutional government in their homeland Cuba; and

That any nation doing business with Cuba's Communist aggressor government of Fidel Castro will be subjected to an embargo by the United States in equal amounts to that country's imports to the United States; and

That the United States Government will recognize no government in Cuba until a truly constitutional government is established by free elections participated in by all Cubans.

[From U.S. Statutes at large, vol. XXX, p. 738]

THE INDEPENDENCE OF CUBA, APRIL 20, 1898

(NOTE.—April 11, McKinley sent his message to Congress recommending intervention in Cuba. See Doc. No. 346. The Joint Resolution of April 20 authorized the use of the army and the navy to effect Cuban independence; the formal declaration of war followed April 25. The most important of the resolutions of April 20 was the fourth, known as the Teller Amendment.)

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the Island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battleship, with two hundred and sixty-six of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Havana, and can no longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April eleventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore,

Resolved, First, That the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second, That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the

militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth, That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said Island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the Island to its people.

[A WTVJ, channel 4 editorial, Miami, Apr. 21, 1971]

CASTRO CONFESSES HE IS EXPORTING HIS "REVOLUTION"

There is an old saying that reads: "On confession of part, relief of proof".

This saying became undoubted reality in the last speech given by the dictator Fidel Castro. In the same, Castro reaffirms that he continues exporting his revolution.

Only a few hours ago, in Havana, at a public appearance, not very frequent lately, the puppet of the Moscow-Peking axis said that they would continue supporting the revolutionary movements in Latin America. Undoubtedly, this ratifies what constitutes a violation to the supposed Kennedy-Khrushchev understanding, which specifies as a third requisite, that Cuba shall not export its revolution; but there is something that continues to support the Castro-Communist titled revolution, because it is definite that Castro is an international communist agent, and this is what he is trying to export. And, that something which contributes to the Castro-Communist export is the military and naval Soviet presence on the island of Cuba.

Besides Cuba being converted in a Trojan Horse, and the base at Cienfuegos, and various other things, lately, an increase in military convoy traffic by the Russians in Cuba has been observed, particularly in the Province of Matanzas. Reports have reached us from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance, that less than a month ago, the 26th of March, a Russian military convoy was seen near Varadero. This was made up of ten military trucks with Russian soldiers and was headed East on the Central Road of Cuba. The Resistance informed that they saw another convoy near Varadero in the first half of April. This convoy was made up of eight trucks, carrying forty soldiers each, with arms, helmets and olive green uniforms, very dirty, as though they have come from military maneuvers. The convoy was headed for the Peninsula of Hicacos on the point of Varadero, and one of the points closest to the United States. According to the information, the Russians were between 20 and 24 years of age. The expressions on their faces were sullen and very serious. All of this ratifies that the Fidel Castro regime continues exporting its revolution to Latin America, and puts the security and peace of the American Continent in jeopardy.

[From the Latin American News, March 1971]

FACILITIES FOR THE COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CRUZADA ANTI-COMUNISTA

INTERNACIONAL

NEW YORK 10017, N.Y. U.S.A.

Generally speaking it can be said that in no other country in the world, outside of the Marxist-Leninist field, do the communists have more facilities to work and indoctrinate than in the United States of America.

This reality is due, to a great extent, to two fundamental reasons: First, to the widespread lack of knowledge in the United States about the way in which the communists in and out of the country behave. In this sense almost incalculable degrees of naivety are reached. Second, here, in a way, an almost suicidal attitude is demanded from democracy. That is, in the name of public freedom the enemies of those public freedoms are allowed to work and to conspire against them.

The top American leaders, as well as the people in general—that here comprises individuals who have had many years of schooling—should begin to realize that communism is not only a system enemy of individual freedoms and of all the public freedoms, but also that it fundamentally has as a goal the destruction of their country. Sometimes—not to say always—the attitude seen in the United States regarding the native and foreign communists gives the impression that it is not known that communism is a fierce enemy of the United States of America. And probably because of this the communists are seen with relative indifference and are given opportunities for agitation and indoctrination that seem inconceivable to any observer from other parts of the world. Nowhere else, with so much impunity, can the fatherland be offended and can one go along with her enemies with the tolerance of the generality of the people.

If all this would not lead to a serious danger, of incalculable dimensions, regarding the fate of the United States of America and world democracy, what happens could be acceptable and even a generous eccentricity be seen in it. But on the contrary, what is taking place leads, or could lead, to a chaos that, sooner or later, would destroy the foundations of the social and political life of the United States of America. And if this country falls into the abyss it would leave the free world totally unprotected.

The consequences of this erroneous interpretation of democratic tolerance, taken to extremes in the United States of America, are already being felt in different fields of national life. And may this serve so that those whose responsibility it is to save this country take the necessary measure to prevent its fall.

CRUZADA ANTI-COMUNISTA
INTERNACIONAL,
New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

Peoples of America, come to our aid, not with words of the O.A.S., but with force, with men, with arms. There is no other way to stop the savage killings by the Bolsheviks.

People of the United States, we implore your help in the name of justice, liberty, of moral principles and of genuine solidarity. Hear the cries of the Cuban people, peoples of America, and let us help each other, hand in hand.

When Cuba perishes, the rest of the peoples of America will be in line.

(This is the message which comes out of Cuba and covers the Continent.)

Cuba will not be the Hungary of the Americas!

The Cubans themselves will know how to win their liberty even though they are left alone. And if it is impossible to win our liberty from the Communist yoke, Cuba will be completely razed and in the center of the island, a cross will bear the final epitaph: Here lived a people who preferred death, before slavery.

[From the Mindszenty Report, May 15, 1965]
CUBAN COMMUNISM AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Father John J. Kelly, O.S.A.)

I would like to share with you some of my own ideas and experiences concerning:

1. The false beliefs about Communism which I have detected on the American scene.

2. A brief analysis of how Cuba, a supposedly Catholic cultured country, succumbed to the Communists.

3. How the United States is succumbing because, like the Cubans, we do not recognize the symptoms.

The most formidable obstacle we face today is that most Americans are convinced it can't happen here.

In every country which Communism has

taken over, this same attitude prevailed in the face of the same old tactics: deceit and force. Kerensky knew the Bolsheviks; hence deceit did not prevail, but force did. In Hungary deceit precondemned Nagy; for accepting the traitorous word of the Communists, he paid with his life and that of his country. In Cuba likewise, deceit was the instrument. After a few weeks of Castro's regime, I remember some "intelligent" observers reasoned this way: "Father, we are a highly individualistic people. Communism demands conformity and regimentation, just the opposite to our nature. It just won't work in Cuba. We should let Communism take over, and then watch it fall miserably." After 6 years, and many firing squads, prisons and torture, it is still working in Cuba, and I know exactly what these same fine friends of mine think: "Why couldn't we foresee this and defeat it?"

Most Americans feel that Communism is no danger because we have the greatest military force in the world, etc. That kind of thinking completely ignores the fact that most Communist countries were taken from within, and not from without by military force. To all the people who say it can't happen here, I say that not only it can happen, but there are indications that it is happening here.

A second psychological obstacle results from propaganda of a pre-Soviet type: we just don't believe that there are traitors in America, even in the face of evidence to the contrary. Much of our present government policy is based on this schizophrenic position.

This attitude of unwarranted confidence was aptly illustrated by one of my best friends, a Cuban professional with three engineering degrees: "Father, we don't worry about Communism in Fidel's 26th of July Movement. We don't worry about Communism at all, because we are in a favored geographic position: we are only 90 knots from Uncle Sam, at his very doorstep, and Uncle Sam won't let them do anything to Cuba." Well, tragically Uncle Sam did let them, not only in Cuba, but in many other parts of the world.

Our own attitude as a nation is much like his: in the face of contrary evidence, we feel that Uncle Sam will take care of things, and we don't have to worry as individuals. We don't want to believe that a conspiracy, world-wide, is intent on destroying us. The thought is repellent—so we don't think about it. I wonder how many of us have thought of even more-unpleasant things: the slavery, the prisons, the torture, mental and physical, and the firing squads of Communist regimes?

Another attitude is: "Why get excited about a few thousand Communists in this country; the United States is a strong nation of over 190 million people." We ignore the lesson, so simple and so homely, of the iceberg. Apathy and indifference and, more than anything else, a lack of knowledge and facts about the enemy, have lost whole nations to the Communists. If I were to guess, I would say that one conspirator or useful dupe out of every 500 people, is more than sufficient to turn the trick; it has done so in every country that today is behind the Iron Curtain; or the Sugar Curtain.

Lack of knowledge is tragic, lethal, fatal. Communism really functions like the huge iceberg: the greatest danger comes from the hidden, under-the-surface part of the Red iceberg, that is, the crypto-Communists, the specialized agents who seem to spring right out of the earth. These are aided and abetted by the sympathizers and useful dupes.

Americans in general do not realize that they are the long-range (perhaps short-range now, even shorter than we think) objective, for they have been indoctrinated into discrediting those who do realize the tremendous danger and try to tell them about it. Some way must be found to awaken

Americans on a wide scale soon. The Communist timetable for takeover moves up alarmingly through American inability to understand the tactics of the enemy. Plus XI certainly put his finger on the American Achilles heel: our ignorance and our apathy. If this situation continues, we undoubtedly as a nation shall fall tragically like overripe fruit into the crushing iron vise hands of the Communists as Lenin predicted.

This exact fate befell the Cubans. Ignorance and apathy did it. Cuba fell from within, deeply deluded and deceived by the glowing promises of a perfidious Castro and infiltrated-July 26 Movement.

There were some misgivings about Castro, who had a very bad record as an incorrigible juvenile delinquent, a young university tough involved in assassinations, and an amateur-type revolutionary engaged in many disturbances about the Caribbean. These misgivings were dispelled by Castro, in his frequent broadcasts over secret radio transmissions, from his mountaintop, and his hideouts: "We are not a Communist group, the government accuses us of that to get your support; we are Cubans, who hate Batista more than you do, and want to get him out and restore free elections, honesty and the Constitution to our nation. You must help the revolution." And they did!

Castro's subversive propaganda went out to all sectors of Cuba. The *Military* were urged: "Don't fight, don't accept orders from your corrupt officers. Join us to liberate Cuba; you will maintain rank and pay." There were many defections, whole garrisons at a time.

Students were easily identifying themselves with Castro, a student leader himself. State universities of all Latin America are breeding grounds for political and social agitation, and academic freedom is abused for political purposes.

The *politicians* were promised help in free elections of the new Castro regime. Most accepted; those who refused were threatened with penalties or assassination.

The *Church* in Cuba, especially lay groups, were led to believe that Castro would put into practice the Social Doctrine of the Church. *Frequent requests from the rebels for religious articles and chaplains allayed suspicions.* The Hierarchy was divided in opinions about Castro and his revolt. The church tried several times during the revolt to bring about a government which would exclude both Batista and Castro. Why these attempts were unsuccessful is best described by American Ambassador Earl Smith, in his book, *THE FOURTH FLOOR*. Let me tell you what one of the Professors, a Socialist, from my University said, in a speech to the Socialist Congress of the Lay Apostolate, New York, 1961:

"At the beginning many Catholics believed sincerely that the reforms proposed by Fidel Castro were good and in conformance with Papal Encyclicals. They say, yes, that there were known Communists in the government and that some of the methods used had a violent Marxist color; but they overlooked these 'small' details and thought only of the great good they could obtain from these reforms. Some even deluded themselves into thinking that by infiltrating into Communism's ranks and accepting positions in the governmental organism, they can prevent the seed of Communism from flowering. But, as is always the case, one cannot play with the Communist, and these 'small' details later turned out to be the principal threads of the snare. Behind was the enemy pulling the strings and in all probability they laughed mockingly when they saw how Catholics, and even priests, worked ingeniously for the Communist cause."

Business men, aloof from politics, considered the Castro revolution a sordid mess. But the businessmen were intent on making money. Many paid Castro taxes as well as the regular contributions to the Cuban Govern-

ment. They were shortsighted; they lost everything.

The workers and farmers were the only group where Castro's program failed. Unions and farmers ignored Castro, refused to cooperate, and yet ironically Castro claims that these were the backbone of his movement.

Castro found complete acceptance among the middle classes, the professions, students, and much of the monied classes for his Socialist revolution, which they thought was just another political revolution so frequent in Latin America. Even so the ultimate push which overthrew the government of Cuba was administered by some members of the U.S. State Department, when in December 1958 (still time for our government to do something about Castro), Ambassador Smith was instructed to inform Batista that the U.S. would not support a Batista-backed government in Cuba. Batista fled, and Cuba was enslaved in a violent, bloody Socialist revolution.

Here is an eye-witness account of some of the things I saw in the first few months of the Communist takeover:

While Fidel Castro made his triumphal journey from Santiago to Havana, in the first few days of January 1959, a general strike was called to paralyze everything and prevent opponents from using communications and transportation. Duly constituted authority was systematically eliminated. The armed forces, from generals to privates, were accused of "collaboration with the tyranny of Batista" or of "war crimes." The entire police force was charged with "brutality, repression, torture and collaboration." All were threatened with the death penalty at drum-head military courts. So the army barracks and the police stations were abruptly abandoned. Castro's followers took over the abandoned police stations and military posts, while Boy Scouts directed traffic. Militiamen swarmed over the police and military establishments. They were mostly eager youths, amateurs seeking a foothold in the echelons of the "new Cuba."

The breakdown of authority meant that no organized or effective police or military action was possible; there was no one in authority to whom a person might appeal against unjust charges. There was "one man revolutionary law." The hand-picked President and his Cabinet post factum approved new laws made haphazardly by Castro in his speeches on TV or elsewhere.

The Cuban Bureau for Investigating Communist Activities (BRAC) was rapidly dismantled. It was whispered around Havana that "Che" Guevara, commander of La Cabaña fortress, upon arrival in the first few days of January, made his first confiscation—all the offices, archives and records of this anti-Communist agency—and moved them to the Fortress for "safe keeping." The three top officials of the BRAC mysteriously disappeared.

The Cuban Courts became practically functionless. Most matters were put into the hands of the drum-head military tribunals, usually a three-member *ad hoc* panel, in which the defense of the accused was nil. Hundreds of Cubans were rapidly purged as "war criminals, collaborators, informers, or counterrevolutionaries" by the youthful judges, often illiterate juveniles, swelled with the importance of their so-called victory, and all too eager to listen to any accusation against the prisoner.

All communications began to serve the new regime, and the way was cleared for mesmerizing and brainwashing the people. Interminable speeches were delivered by Castro on TV and radio; everyone hung breathlessly on every word; the "liberator" was speaking and he was the Law!

The Minister of Public Education moved drastically against private education in the very first days of January. Under the outrageous and ludicrous excuse of preserving

"public order," and "equivalating private university students with State University students who had lost time (2 years) while fighting against Batista," infamous Law #11 promulgated on January 11, canceled outright two years of academic credits in private universities.

The largest private school in Cuba and one of the best, the Baldor School, was the scene of Communist-inspired riots and demonstrations. It was closed by government order, to reopen a few weeks later under new administrative policies! The Minister of Education on nationwide TV accused the Rector of the Catholic University of numerous crimes against the Revolution. At the same time he announced a new program for all Cuban education, from preprimary through postgraduate studies, following "one uniform philosophy, that of the Revolutionary Government. There cannot be and may not be, two types of education, one private and the other public, but one alone and indivisible." His handwriting on the wall could not be clearer: The question of religion should not be imposed upon a child; he should be allowed to choose when he is 18 years old what his religious affiliations will be."

In this beautiful tropical island where everyone gets along rather well with each other normally, there was hardly any evidence of antagonistic racial discrimination. Fidel, Raul, and el Che artificially invented discrimination, and fomented divisions of society by stimulating various fronts with artificial or imagined goals of eliminating racial discrimination, which never existed in Cuba.

Labor has always had a favored place in Cuban social legislation. Yet Castro deliberately pitted the already strong unions against what he called the "grasping capitalists," the farm laborers against the sugar farmers; students against their professors; the whole populace against so-called Batista collaborators.

Under the pretext of reclaiming government lands which allegedly had been appropriated by unscrupulous officials and politicians, the regime began the universal, rough-shod, unjust expropriation of lands of any considerable size, regardless of how acquired. Safety deposit boxes in the banks were sealed officially for later confiscation, and all checking accounts were limited to small withdrawals. This wholesale robbery was carried along through the Ministry for the Recovery of Stolen Goods, under the promise of "returning ill-gotten goods to the people." Overnight the regime plunged the country into economic chaos. The Ministry for Stolen Goods gave an apparent legality to this grand larceny and ferreted out anything of value for confiscation.

Within three months the evidence was more than sufficient for anyone living in Cuba and keeping abreast of the moves of the regime. When people realized what was happening and raised their voices in protest, they were silenced by threats, imprisonments, exile or the firing squads.

Cubans were deceived about Castro, because they refused to accept the evidence: the background of incorrigible Castro, his advisors, his policies of a highly-centralized regime. Too late the Cubans woke up to the real character of the revolution and its Communist leader.

I wonder if we see what is happening here. In the United States, the history, government, culture and life in general are quite different. Most Latin American nations are man-centered, caudillo-type countries; they want and need a strong leader. We are a law-constitution centered people; the legal structure is more important than personalities. The process for destroying the United States cannot be the same as in Cuba or elsewhere; the techniques must be adapted to our system: the Constitution itself must

be used to destroy us and, as a starter, law itself must become meaningless.

It is impossible to destroy our Armed Forces; it is possible to vitiate their effectiveness, as top military men are muzzled, as more and more dispersed fronts claim personnel for guard duty or actual combat conditions, as arms and equipment are restricted.

Our police forces have done yeoman service; yet lawlessness, disorders, riots, demonstrations in defiance of local authority and local police officers are often not only permitted but encouraged by public government officials; in other cases, as at the University of California, lawlessness is permitted by weak authorities. The end result of such conduct is the breakdown of law and order and the discrediting of police officers and other authorities. Civilian Review Boards are the vehicle for frustrating law enforcement. And all this is done in the name of "free speech," "civil rights," or other apparently just motives!

Our educational programs slowly but surely fall more and more under the control of a Federal agency, either through directives or economic suasion. Private education finds it more and more difficult to compete with state education, and in time may succumb to succulent offers of state-federal aid.

There is evidence of conflict and struggle in the artificially stimulated race questions; hatred is widely bandied about by our communications media; mass guilt is encouraged over the assassination of a president, as over the problems of unfortunate negroes. Much of this atmosphere is created and augmented by well-meaning people, who are not well-informed.

The breakdown of morality in America is the worst and most meaningful symptom. Hon. Spruille Braden, experienced diplomat and statesman, recently in Los Angeles characterized the breakdown in morality this way:

"For many years I have declared that the gravest issue facing humanity is not nuclear warfare and all the horrible death-dealing weapons science has produced; the insidious dangers of inflation; budgetary and balance of payments deficits the undermining of the private enterprise system; nor even the gradual erosion of freedoms. Nor is it aggression and the threats thereof; or socialism which inevitably leads to some form of totalitarianism, usually communism in our day. No, the major threat to mankind is the breakdown in morality everywhere, including government, where morality, like memory, seems to fade with the passage of time. I further hold that the worst of all immoralities is Communism."

These immoralities extend far beyond our domestic activities; by and large our foreign policies tend to aggrandize Communism, make neutrals out of friends, and make enemies out of neutrals. Foreign policy experts have repeatedly characterized Cuba as a military threat, and a center for subverting South America. Since then it seems that our policy is: see no Cuba, hear no Cuba, speak no Cuba.

Why? I wish I knew the answer . . . because the fate of the United States depends on Cuba. If Cuba is permitted to remain Communist, that ultimately will be our fate. Four hundred years ago, a Spanish monarch said: "He who owns Cuba, the Island of Cuba, has the key to the New World." I think that is true today; the Communists own Cuba today, and also the key to the New World of the Americas.

Cuba is now an advance base for Soviet and sometimes Chinese subversion and aggression on both North and South America. It is one of the last pegs being set for the encirclement of the United States. We had evidence of this in October of 1962, in the so-called missile confrontation, which our government hollowly trumpeted that we won

because Khrushchev said he removed his missiles. But Khrushchev also claimed the victory since his troops were still there, with Cuba still allied to the Kremlin, and because the U.S. had guaranteed that no one would attack Cuba—not even Cuban exiles who want their country back.

What about those missiles? It is of sinister importance that the same sources which originally discovered the missiles and sites, are saying today that not only were the missiles not removed, but that they have been augmented, and are stored in various natural caverns and man-made storage places. The U-2 flights, which are normally the clinching arguments in the Government's appraisal of missiles and sites in Cuba, have been drastically reduced to only one or two a month.

Can we, who are better informed, accept this state of affairs, or are we not morally obliged by all that is good, holy and decent to expose by knowledge and facts this dangerous situation? Are we not only obliged to oppose it, but with God's help to defeat it? We must redouble our enthusiasm and our efforts for this fight. It must be carried forward at all cost, under the armor of God, no matter what the odds, until that day of final victory of Godliness over godlessness, of good over evil, of spirit over matter, of virtue over vice.

THE LESSON TO BE LEARNED FROM CUBA

Open: This is Life Line, Bob White from Washington.

"Cuba today is living proof that no nation is immune to communist subjugation just because it is prosperous or because it is Christian. Cuba was both. Nor is literacy a protection. It was not the illiterate people in Cuba who were responsible for its present condition; it was a segment of the middle-class, and some wealthy people also, who were too absorbed and complacent with their own pursuits, and too sure that their country could never be ruled by communists; they were too indifferent to bother to inform themselves about communist techniques or to search into the background of the men they allowed to lead them."

Those convictions are offered by a Cuban citizen, Serafin G. Menocal, who spent 24 years with the Cuban Electric Company at Havana. Mr. Menocal, an electrical engineer, has served as President of the National Council of Boy Scouts of Cuba, Vice President of the National Electrical Engineers Association, Director of the Cuban Society of Engineers, President of the Lions Club of Camaguey and a member of the Rotary Club of Havana.

Mr. Menocal is now an executive in New York City and spends much of his time giving talks across the U.S.A. on the truth about the communist takeover of Cuba. His disclosures are most revealing. It is his message to Americans that we present on this broadcast.

There are many myths surrounding the so-called Cuban revolution which gave the rich island country to the communists. It would seem to be human nature that unpleasant things, like communism, only happen to the other fellow. Our familiar world is protected by our high traditions, our military power, our sound economy and our high educational standards. We are too sensible to be fooled by propaganda. At least that's the way many Cubans felt until disaster struck. Then it was too late.

One of the myths exploded by Cuban refugee, Serafin Menocal, is that Cuba was in need of a social revolution. Mr. Menocal reports, "That's not true. All that it really needed was a change of government administration by democratic means. It is known to the world how the communists took advantage of the motivations that existed among Cubans for the removal of Batista, and how the very small communist minority

in Cuba, backed by the know-how and resources of international communism, quickly seized power and victimized the Cuban people."

Another myth about pre-communist Cuba was the claim that the standard of living in the country was very low. Facts prove the contrary. In 1958, Cuba held an outstanding economic position among the Latin American countries. In comparison with them, Cuba ranked third in annual per capita income, and first in TV broadcasting stations, in TV receivers, in motion picture attendance, and in percentage of national income invested in education. It rated second in the value of imports and exports and in radio receivers per capita. Cuba was third in the number of newspapers and magazines; in paper consumption; in telephones; in automobiles; and in per capita consumption of electric power.

In 1958 Cuba had one radio receiver for every 5 inhabitants; one TV set for every 20; an automobile for every 27; a telephone for every 28. Cuba consumed that year 32 pounds of lard and 73 pounds of meat per person, and had a daily consumption of 2,683 calories per capita.

The standard of living of the Cubans in 1958 was, of course, above that of Russia and almost on a level with the most advanced European countries. The Cuban peso was worth \$1.00 before Castro—today it is traded for about 10¢ in the black market.

Another commonly accepted myth about Cuba is the charge of Yankee exploitation. However, hard facts disprove it. American capital did help Cuba to develop its resources, but as time went on, Cubans, whether owners, management or workers, increasingly came into control of the island's wealth. Cuban-owned sugar mills produced 22 per cent of the sugar crop in 1939 and 62 per cent in 1958; while American sugar mills produced 55 per cent of the annual crop in 1939 and only 37 per cent in 1959. And this happened in only 19 years.

The same trend towards prosperity was observed in banking and business in general. Statistics published by the International Labor Organizations in Geneva show that Cuban workers received 60 per cent of the gross national income, preceded only by workers in Great Britain with 74 per cent, the United States with 71.7 per cent and Canada with 58.5 per cent. These facts about the pre-communist economic conditions in Cuba prove that the bulk of propaganda exported by the communists to justify their revolution consists of distortions and outright lies.

True, Cuba—like all countries—had its poor, but it also had a large and growing middle class. Poverty, like wealth, is relative. In 1958, Cuba's standard of living was much higher than that of communist satellites and immensely superior to the standard of living prevailing in Cuba under communism today.

Just as Americans, Cubans had high ideals and traditions. They professed the Christian philosophy and religion was the center of much of their social and spiritual life. Politically, Cubans were proud of their liberty and the Constitution of 1940 with the popular mandate it embodied. But this was not enough.

Educationally, pre-communist Cuba had an extensive and advanced public school system in which education from primary schools to universities was available to everyone without discrimination of any kind. It was cheaper and easier to get a college education in Cuba than it is in the U.S.A. But this was not enough either to protect Cuba from communism.

The myth which has been accepted for far too long is that poverty, illiteracy and backward economy are the principal breeding grounds of communism. This is not so. It is

time to rid ourselves of this dangerous and fictitious notion.

Cuba today is living proof that no nation is immune to communism because it is prosperous, because it has high ideals, or because of its high educational standards. The fact is that communism stems from ideas accompanied by planned strategic and tactical action designed to exploit human desires and needs. This is accomplished through the manipulation of people who are too busy with other affairs to recognize what is being done to them.

It was not the illiterate or the poor people of Cuba who were responsible for the Red takeover. It was a segment of the middle class, some of the intelligentsia and a group of wealthy men too absorbed in their own pursuits, and too sure of themselves to take the trouble to become well informed about communism or to take a more searching look at the men who sought to lead them.

The Cuban exile, Mr. Serafin Menocal, declares the Castro claim that the Cuban revolution was the work of the people is also a myth. Mr. Menocal sets the record straight in these words: "It was precisely the laboring classes and the agricultural workers, the two groups who are now represented as being the backbone of the revolution, who gave Castro very little support."

Mr. Menocal continued, "Organized labor was protected by some of the world's most advanced legislation, and attempts to promote a general strike, or significant local strikes, were unsuccessful. The agricultural workers were generally indifferent, except in the limited areas where they were either converted to, or terrorized into supporting Castro by the roaming or entrenched guerrillas."

"The people, not Fidel Castro, defeated Batista, but they turned to Castro as the symbol of what they expected to be a new life for Cuba—free elections and an end to political murder, torture, and repression. We all know now that Castro did not keep any of his promises, but on the contrary has enslaved the Cuban people. He betrayed his people."

Castro's labor legislation has meant the enslavement of the workers, since a man who has no freedom to choose his employer is a slave, as is the case in all communist countries. In order to retain his job, a worker must appear to be loyal to the regime; if he is not, he and his family are doomed to starvation, unless they can leave the country and have the means to do so.

The Cuban worker has lost all his hard-won benefits. He now has to put in longer hours with no overtime pay; instead of wage increases, he must make various supposedly voluntary contributions, which, in effect, are additional taxes; he has lost his sickness benefits; he has no right to strike and no union to protect him.

As to the Cuban agricultural workers, which many American newspaper writers and radio-TV commentators have credited with being Castro's main support in his struggle with Batista, the well-known fact is that it was the middle classes who supported Castro, financially and otherwise.

This does not mean that the agricultural workers didn't help, but there is no question in the mind of the average Cuban that it was the resources and the money and the muscle of the middle classes that clinched the fight for Castro. It is now known that the communists masterminded and galvanized the opposition to Batista, without these classes knowing they were being so used.

Mr. Menocal outlines the lessons Cuban businessmen learned from the Castro betrayal: "We learned the hard way that businessmen cannot afford to remain aloof from politics. For instance, the by-laws and regulations of our trade associations prohibited members from discussing political issues. The businessman simply would not stoop to what he considered the low standard of poli-

tics. It's evident now he should have contributed to the improvement of such standards by taking an active interest in politics himself." Mr. Menocal continued, "We should have made sure that our contributions to education went only to institutions which fulfill their mission with full respect for the permanent values of a free society: civil rights, freedom of worship, respect for the family institution, moral integrity, love of country and respect for private property." Those were the words of a Cuban citizen, and a former Cuban executive now working in New York City, Mr. Serafin Menocal.

There is no insurance against communism in America. This is a risk against which only you and I can provide the necessary protection. The only way to fight communism is to acquire accurate knowledge about how it operates and what leads to it. Then we must put our knowledge to work for us by backing it with a portion of our energy and a portion of our resources.

One statement sums up the lesson to be learned from Cuba. It is not a new lesson, but every generation must re-learn it for themselves. It is that the cumulative results of what each of us chooses to think and do as individuals is what determines more than anything else the course of history in our time. Or, to put it more concisely in a statement attributed to for the triumph of evil is that good men neglect the problem and do nothing." All Americans must earnestly do all they can to push back the tide of communism which threatens every free nation of the Americas. It is not enough to be in agreement that a common evil threatens all of us. We must face up to the problem with resoluteness and determination. It is a challenge that calls for knowledge and intelligent positive action. Communists are willing to do whatever is necessary to achieve world conquest. Are we determined to stop them?

Until we meet again, remember these words spoken by Abraham Lincoln: "Tell the people the facts, and they will save the nation."

[From the Herald of Freedom, Oct. 18, 1968]
IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE

The "\$64 Question" to be asked of all candidates for national office this crucial year of 1968 is: "When is something going to be done about the Communist stronghold only 90 miles away in Cuba which threatens the security of the United States?" While the U.S. Government claims to be "fighting Communism" thousands of miles away in Vietnam, it seemingly ignores the missile build-up in the Communist-occupied island whose native inhabitants enjoy none of the "civil rights" our humanitarian clerics and politicians are always blabbering about. Since the "U.S. Government" is not an entity in itself but composed of "People" we have but to listen to and look at some of those "People" to see the reason why the sad state of affairs in Cuba and the danger it poses not to the "Government" of the United States but to the "citizens" of the United States are being concealed from the American public.

The bearded Communist dictator, Fidel Castro, came to power in January 1959. Earl E. T. Smith, Ambassador to Cuba from June 3, 1957 to January 20, 1959, when he resigned, testified under oath:

"The Batista government was overthrown because of the corruption, disintegration from within, and because of the United States and in the various agencies of the United States who directly and indirectly aided the overthrow of the Batista government and brought into power Fidel Castro. . . . Without the United States, Castro would not be in power today. I will put it as straight as that to you, sir."

Cuba is now "one vast concentration camp in which people are taken out of bed in the

middle of the night and propped up against a wall and shot." This description was made by Paul Bethel, a U.S. Foreign Service officer who served in Cuba from 1958 to 1961. In sworn testimony he stated further: "Cuba is just a figure of speech right now, actually . . . (Russian Communists) control the postal system, they control the INRA, the national institute of agrarian reform . . . they control the communications. The Russians are just in control, period. . . . The Russians and the Communist Party, the central committee of the Cuban Communist Party (run the country.) . . . everything that the Russians have done since they moved into Cuba, and I mean moved in, in 1960 and 1961, has been military in nature. . . . What we have, really, is a base for the subversion of the entire world to expand Vietnam-type wars throughout the world, located right in Havana. . . . Among the Latin American Countries, certainly, Cuba is the only country that has a nuclear strike potential." This last statement shocked the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee counsel, Mr. Sourwine, who asked: "You think there are atomic warheads in Cuba?" To this Mr. Bethel answered: "There would be no other reason, it appears to me, to have missiles of the size and description . . . unless, indeed, they were capable of doing that. In fact, of course, they do. . . ."

Not only does Cuba have missiles poised to attack the United States, U.S. Army officials have testified that the Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile system could not protect us from any missiles that might be fired from Cuba, since it is too close; and that there are no other U.S. defensive systems to stop a missile attack from Cuba. Scientists estimated in 1962 that the missiles in Cuba could hit the U.S. mainland less than five minutes after launching.

There are reportedly in Cuba 43 guerrilla training camps which turn out an estimated 10,000 activists per year who are infiltrated back into their homelands. Among those trained and sent home are U.S. Negroes and whites. African Negroes are taught to act like Americans and sent along to do their part in the U.S. Negro Revolution. An article in the Miami Herald of October 5, 1968 stated:

"Fidel Castro had a hand in disorders that have rocked American campuses recently, a U.S. Senate subcommittee investigator claimed Friday.

"Cuba's main export is subversion," Al Tarabochia, a U.S. Senate internal security subcommittee investigator, told a gathering of detectives on Miami Beach.

"Concentrated effort to foment subversion among professors, students and intellectuals in the United States has become one of the hottest items in Castro's bag of tricks," claimed Tarabochia.

"The universities of America are the most vulnerable soft spot of the nation and it is there that the Communists are aiming their blows," Tarabochia charged in an address to a regional Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit conference.

"He claimed a Havana-based leftist group called the Continental Organization of Latin American Students had planned campus disorders in the U.S. and Latin America.

"He said a steady stream of leftist U.S. students have been visiting Cuba and added that 'only recently 42 more members of Students for a Democratic Society arrived in Cuba, and as far as I know they are still there.'"

Subversion is exported through the air waves as powerful radio stations in Cuba beam exhortations to "revolt." An article by Paul Bethel stated: "The April campus riots were, for the most part, treated by our press as local stories triggered by local grievances. But the fact is that in virtually every instance the riots began or reached their peak in response to a Communist call from

Havana which designated April 21-28 (1968) as the 'week of solidarity with Viet Nam,' which is to say a week of riots against the U.S. war effort.

"On April 22, Havana's Radio Liberation gave out the following exhortation: 'The Committee for Student Mobilization to End the War in Viet Nam has ordered a student strike in the United States . . . demonstrations are the culmination of months of preparation and negotiation among the many left-wing and liberal groups that sponsor those demonstrations.'

"The following day, Students for a Democratic Society seized and held Hamilton Hall at Columbia University in New York City. This was unsurprising since Mark Rudd, head of SDS, had completed a three-week visit to Cuba. . . . Three complexes of transmitters broadcast round-the-clock instructions for revolution and sabotage. Castro's official newspaper, "Granma," is sent each week by the thousands to every U.S. campus and every pressure group and militant organization. J. Edgar Hoover recently testified:

"Experienced operatives utilizing Soviet tactics are actively engaged in a continuing program of recruiting Cuban agents in this country. . . . The stepped-up Cuban espionage program has been able to draw from the large reservoir of Cuban refugees who, between December, 1965 and December, 1967, have entered the United States at the rate of over 3,700 a month . . . the Cuban regime has redoubled its efforts to utilize this humanitarian refugee channel as a means of infiltrating trained agents into this country."

F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned in his September bulletin that during the last six months' silence by President Johnson on the subject of Cuba, revolutionaries from Cuba have been infiltrating this country and heading for college campuses and that instructions have been coming nightly from Radio Station Havana. A local newsletter noted that Johnson's Austin, Texas, radio station, KTBC and Havana Cuba are on the same wave length and that at night the power on the Austin station is cut back drastically, thus giving Havana Radio use of the air waves for its propaganda.

According to the American Security Council's Washington Report, "The core of the Castro subversives in the United States is the anti-Batista apparatus established here between 1952 and 1959. When Castro came to power, his first trip was to the U.S. and Canada where he re-organized this anti-Batista group and weeded out those dedicated members who were also anti-Communist.

"Initially, Havana's underground in America was based in Chicago and Detroit and used Windsor, Ontario and other Canadian border points as contact centers for the transmission of money and intelligence information.

"Now the 'Cuban Power' network is set up in New York, Miami, Baltimore, Washington, New Orleans and Tampa as well.

"Its directives generally come through the Cuban U.N. Delegation headquarters in Washington, some messages are funneled to Castro's operatives from the Cuban delegation that participates in meetings of the U.N. World Health Organization. . . .

"Castro is reaching into the heart of America, training guerrilla fighters for the war in our streets, stimulating unrest and popularizing violence from ghettos to campuses, and posing a new and increasingly serious naval and missile threat to our national security."

Cuba, now a Communist stronghold and sanctuary, a seat of subversion from which trained agents operate throughout the world, and especially in Latin America and the United States, presents a clear and present danger to the future of the United States. How did this all come about?

In 1948 a meeting was held in Bogota, Colombia, for the purpose of the formation of

the Organization of American States. At approximately this time there also occurred a Communist instigated, controlled and directed insurrection and attempted revolution. Present in Bogota at the time of the conference and the revolution were two U.S. diplomats, William Wieland and Roy Rubottom. The U.S. Army Military Intelligence (G-2) prepared a report which detailed the Communist background and activities of one of those involved in the insurrection . . . a certain Fidel Castro. A copy of this intelligence report was handled by an officer of the U.S. Military Attache's office to William Wieland at this time, 1948. As a precautionary measure William Wieland was asked to sign his name attesting to the fact that he had received the report.

Wieland had been in charge of the Office of Caribbean Affairs at the Department of State. Hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee disclosed that he had blocked reports coming in from U.S. diplomatic offices in Havana and Mexico City concerning Fidel Castro and the fact that his revolutionary movement was Communist controlled. Wieland had been in the employ of the U.S. Embassy in Bogota in 1948 at the time of the Communist-inspired insurrection there. Before coming into the State Department Wieland had been employed by the Havana Post and had been discharged "for cause" by the owner. Intelligence agencies reported that Wieland, who was also known as "Montenegro," had engaged in abnormal sex activities and had maintained contact with a suspected Soviet KGB agent known as "Sonya."

After Wieland's discharge from the Havana Post, he was reportedly employed by the Associated Press on the recommendation of U.S. Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles, reported many times as a practicing homosexual. A former employee of the State Department who worked with William Wieland at the American Embassy in Brazil had reported Wieland as being friendly with Fidel Castro and the U.S. Ambassador in Brazil was reported as having considered Wieland a dangerous and irresponsible leftist whom he tried to have removed but was overruled by "higher authority." Wieland was until recently in the employ of the State Department and was defended against charges of being a "security risk" by the late JFK personally.

Sen. Strom Thurmond puts the Wieland case in context when he says in his new book, "The Faith We Have Not Kept."

"The Wieland case brought about the first confrontation between Otepka (then Chief of State Department Security-Ed.) and his superiors. In August, 1961, Otepka completed an extensive summary and analysis of various charges against Wieland, including the allegation that Wieland was the recipient of significant intelligence information indicating that Fidel Castro was a Communist, but that he, Wieland, had concealed that information. The summary was important enough for Otepka to recommend that the Foreign Service should determine whether Wieland had been guilty of misconduct. . . .

"In January 1962, a newspaper reporter questioned President Kennedy about Wieland, whom the reporter described as a security risk. . . . Immediately thereafter Otepka was instructed in writing to issue a security clearance for Wieland. . . .

"However, in February 1962, Otepka developed new evidence indicating that Wieland had made false statements with respect to the number of times he had personally met with Castro. Otepka recommended that the case be reopened, reinvestigated, and readjudicated. His recommendation was ignored."

According to Sen. Thurmond, a few months later the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee pointed out the following violations

of regulations and good sense in the Wieland case:

"1. Wieland was appointed to a position at the State Department for which his qualifications were highly doubtful—at a salary more than twice what he was making as a civilian.

"2. Wieland was appointed without any security check.

"3. Wieland's appointment was effective even before he filled out an application form.

"4. Wieland falsified his job application by omission.

"5. When Wieland later filled out an expanded personal history form, he falsified that by direct misstatement. . . ."

Robert C. Hill, U.S. Ambassador to Mexico from 1957 to January 3, 1961, testified under oath that he had tried to inform the State Department of Castro's Communist connections but got nowhere and finally in desperation tried to get the information to Dr. Milton Eisenhower when he made a trip to Mexico, accompanied unfortunately by Wieland. Because Wieland denied that Castro was a Communist every time Hill tried to discuss the situation with Eisenhower, he decided to ignore the warning since it was causing an argument. Mr. Hill testified that there was so much information available on Castro and communism "that it grew rather tiring reading about it." He also testified as to the person he felt "must bear the responsibility as the chief architect of the Cuban disaster." He placed the blame squarely on Ambassador to Cuba Philip W. Bonsal who succeeded Ambassador Earl Smith, being nominated by President Eisenhower January 21, 1959 and confirmed by the Senate February 16, 1959. Castro who became "Premier" in February 1959, found Bonsal as "acceptable" as Smith had been "unacceptable." Castro's appraisal of Bonsal was that he was "friendly, cordial and knowledgeable about Cuba. A good ambassador." Bonsal, upon arriving in Havana in February, 1959, at once walked up to one of Castro's bearded rebels, shook his hand, and expressed admiration for the courage of the Cubans in their revolution. He showed no interest in the fact that the rebels had seized the American-owned Cuban Telephone Company and considered requests for extradition of Cuban refugees to be tried as "war criminals."

In April 1959 an Ambassadors' Conference was held in San Salvador. Ambassador Hill was required to attend along with the other ambassadors. Mr. Hill testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as follows: "My opinion was that the meeting was designed to set the policy of patience and forbearance in dealing with Mr. Castro. . . .

"I took issue with Ambassador Bonsal, because I felt that, despite his excellent presentation . . . that patience and forbearance in dealing with a Communist would lead to disaster for the United States. . . . I wanted the record to show that I was 100 percent in disagreement."

Bonsal was quite annoyed at Ambassador Hill and reportedly said to him: "If you cannot be a team player, why not resign?" Mr. Hill also testified concerning a conversation Bonsal had with Ambassador Whelan after the El Salvador conference which went as follows: "Mr. Ambassador, I noticed that you did not join in support of Ambassador Hill regarding his position on Castro. You have influence in the Republican National Committee. I hope you will utilize that influence to get rid of Hill."

Much plotting went into the overthrow of Batista and the installing of Castro in his place. More plotting went into the handling of the "planned fiasco," the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba by anti-Castro patriots; and more plotting went into the "Cuban Confrontation" which resulted in that "victory" for the United States by which Castro is secure from attack in his Communist fortress. The Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement in October 1962 provided for the removal of the

missiles, which Kennedy finally had to admit were there, in exchange for the U.S. dismantling of overseas bases in Turkey and Italy and the U.S. guarantee of protection of Castro from invasion. No such formal agreement was published but this is what it amounted to, except for the fact that the missiles are still there and increasing in number and strength all the time. We are adhering assiduously to our end of the bargain, however, as U.S. boats patrol the waters between the U.S. and Cuba and prevent even the small pathetic attempts of Cuban patriots to do some damage to Castro. Boats equipped with much sacrifice on the part of the Cubans are promptly seized and the owners are officially informed: "Seizure was made under the provisions of Title 22, United States Code, Section 401 as it was established that this vessel was to be used on raid against a country with whom the United States is at peace. The vessel is subject to forfeiture."

It has sadly dawned upon the many Cuban patriots awaiting the help of the U.S. Government in the liberation of their homeland that this is just not going to happen under the present power structure. Castro was aided into power by the U.S. Government and the N.Y. Times (Herbert Matthews reporter). This happened during the Eisenhower Administration. During the Kennedy Administration, the Castro dictatorship was consolidated and strengthened with U.S. Government help. During the Johnson Regime the Soviet build-up of missiles and use of Cuba as a training ground for revolutionaries has been completely ignored while the Cuban exiles have been made more and more helpless.

The unfortunate experiences of Jose Miro Cardona, who was President of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, were related in his letter of resignation dated April 9, 1963. He had been forced to deal with Richard N. Goodwin, whom he found "evasive"; McGeorge Bundy who was "courteous but cold"; and Adam Yarmolinsky with the "attendant of Mr. Robert Hurwitch" . . . who held a meeting with the Cubans in which they requested "with extraordinary urgency, the massive incorporation of all Cubans of military age." This was at the time of the "Missile Crisis" when the Cubans were prepared to take action but Kennedy backed down, thereby winning his "victory."

The Cubans are terribly disillusioned with the U.S. Government and it seems that many Americans feel the same way. It truly is time for a change.

[From the American Opinion, January 1971]
NO INTELLIGENCE—A WORRIED LOOK AT THE CIA

(NOTE.—Frank A. Capell is a professional intelligence specialist of almost thirty years' standing. He is Editor and Publisher of the fortnightly newsletter, The Herald of Freedom, has contributed to such important national magazines as The Review of the News, and is author of Robert F. Kennedy—A Political Biography, The Untouchables, and other books of interest to Conservatives. Mr. Capell appears frequently on radio and television, lectures widely, and never fears controversy. He lives in New Jersey, is an active Catholic layman, and father of seven sons.)

The Central Intelligence Agency was established in 1947 after its wartime predecessor, the Office of Strategic Services (O.S.S.), was exposed as thoroughly infiltrated by the Communists. Let me examine some of that O.S.S. personnel.

In 1948, former Communist spy Elizabeth Bentley appeared as a witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. On Page 529 of the formal report of these Hearings is the record of Miss Bentley's testimony about intelligence she received from Comrades inside O.S.S. while she was operating as a Soviet courier:

"All types of information were given, highly secret information on what the OSS was doing, such as, for example, that they were trying to make secret negotiations with governments in the Balkan bloc in case the war ended, that they were parachuting people into Hungary, that they were sending OSS people into Turkey to operate in the Balkans, and so on. The fact that General Donovan [head of O.S.S.] was interested in having an exchange between the NKVD [the Soviet secret police] and the OSS."

That's right, O.S.S. and the N.K.V.D. were working very close indeed.

When asked what kind of information Communist O.S.S. operative Maurice Halperin gave her to be forwarded to the Soviet Union, Miss Bentley testified: "Well, in addition to all the information which OSS was getting on Latin America, he had access to the cables which the OSS was getting in from its agents abroad, worldwide information of various sorts, and also the OSS had an agreement with the State Department whereby he also could see State Department cables on vital issues." Halperin was Chief of the O.S.S. Latin American Division at the time when, as Miss Bentley has sworn, he was one of her contacts in a Soviet espionage ring.

Carl Aldo Marzani was Chief of the Editorial Section of the O.S.S. Marzani has been several times identified under oath as a member of the Communist Party. Using the most highly classified information, he supervised the making of charts on technical reports for higher echelons of the Army, the Navy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the O.S.S. Comrade Marzani made policy decisions and was a liaison officer between the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army and the Office of the Undersecretary of War.

When questioned before a Congressional Committee, Irving Fajans of O.S.S. took the Fifth Amendment rather than admit to his Communist Party membership and long history of activities on behalf of the Soviets. Comrade Fajans was a key O.S.S. operative despite the fact that he was known to have been a member of the Communist Party and to have served in the Communists' Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain during the years 1937-1938.

Robert Talbott Miller III was another contact of Soviet courier Elizabeth Bentley. An O.S.S. employee assigned to the State Department, he was Assistant Chief in the Division of Research. On a trip to Moscow, Comrade Miller married a member of the staff of the *Moscow News*.

Leonard E. Mins, a writer who had worked for the International Union of Revolutionary Writers in Moscow and written for *New Masses*, was also on the staff of the top secret O.S.S. Comrade Mins took the Fifth Amendment rather than deny his past and present membership in the Communist Party. He refused to deny that he was a Soviet agent even as of the day he was questioned by a Congressional Committee.

Philip Keeney of O.S.S. was treasurer of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern policy, a cited Communist Front which was active in promoting Communism in China. Both Keeney and his wife, Mary Jane, invoked the Fifth Amendment when questioned about their many Communist activities. Philip Keeney was chief researcher for the United States Coordinator of Information, assigned to the O.S.S.

Donald Wheeler of O.S.S. was another Communist underground contact identified by Elizabeth Bentley as being actively engaged in espionage for the Soviet Union.

When questioned under oath before Congressional Committees, Milton Wolff of the O.S.S. took the Fifth Amendment rather than admit his past and present membership in the Communist Party. He, like O.S.S. Comrade Fajans, had been a member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and fought with

the Communists in Spain. After the War he became National Commander of a Communist Front called the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

George S. Wuchinich of O.S.S. was also identified in sworn testimony before Congressional Committees as a member of the Communist Party. Given the opportunity to deny it, he too took the Fifth Amendment.

Jane Foster Zlatovsky was an identified Soviet agent, married to a well-known Communist who had fought for the Communists in Spain. She was nonetheless recruited by O.S.S., and while in a key position supplied top secret information to Soviet Intelligence. On June 8, 1957, a federal Grand Jury in New York indicted Mrs. Zlatovsky and her husband on charges of espionage for the Soviet Union. As is so often the case when our government finally decides to prosecute, the defendants were permitted to slip out of the country. The indictment against the Zlatovskys showed they had turned over to Soviet agents important U.S. defense secrets, including the names and backgrounds of anti-Communists in the American intelligence services.

Exactly how many such Communists and Soviet agents were in key positions in the O.S.S. is unlikely ever to become public. Elizabeth Bentley testified that there were at least two other Soviet espionage rings operating within the U.S. Government which were never exposed. What is known is that, when the heavily infiltrated O.S.S. was dissolved, O.S.S. employees went directly into the Central Intelligence Agency.

Lyle Munson, an anti-Communist who served in both the O.S.S. and the C.I.A., has observed that the American public "has logically assumed that the operational arm of the C.I.A. was a hard-hitting and militantly anti-communist organization, since the only avowed enemies of this country are the communists." This, he tells us, "has proved to be a tragic misconception," the truth being that "the operational arm of the C.I.A. has been the haven for more left-of-center dreamers, social climbers, draft-dodgers, do-gooders, one-worlders and anti-anti-communists than any other single department or agency in Washington."

Little is revealed about the actual structure of C.I.A. The Director and Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Coordinating the intelligence activities of the several government departments and agencies, the C.I.A. operates as an arm of the National Security Council, now under the thumb of Henry A. Kissinger. The United States Government Organizational Manual describes its official duties as follows:

"1. Advises the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities . . . as relate to national security. 2. Makes recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities . . . 3. Correlates and evaluates intelligence relating to the national security, and provides for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government . . . 4. Performs, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines . . . 5. Performs such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct."

All of which sounds rather vague. It is supposed to. A look at some specifics over the last decade may prove more enlightening.

When the Eisenhower Administration gave way to that of John F. Kennedy, plans were already being made under the direction of Whiting Willauer, the C.I.A. planner who had engineered the successful overthrow of the

Communist Government of Guatemala, to organize an invasion of Cuba and oust the Communist regime of Fidel Castro. The Cuban operation was taken out of Willauer's hands without explanation and turned over to William Bissell, an intimate of White House advisor McGeorge Bundy. The result was orchestrated disaster at the Bay of Pigs. The C.I.A. *Insiders* who had assisted Castro in capturing Cuba in the first place were now fully in control. They were immediately successful in sabotaging the invasion and formally securing their man in Havana. It was the culmination of a move dating back to the first efforts of subversives at C.I.A. to eliminate Cuban President Fulgencio Batista by assassination.

Early C.I.A. involvement in the sellout of Cuba is described by Cuba authority John Martino in his highly informative book *I Was Castro's Prisoner*. There Mr. Martino reports as follows:

"In addition to being ultra-liberal in their political thinking, some CIA men were implicated in a series of conspiracies to murder President Batista, supposedly a friend of the United States, and to overthrow his regime. There was a scandalous involvement of this sort in the so-called Cienfuegos Naval Conspiracy, an assassination plot against the Cuban Chief Executive.

" . . . a CIA man named Earl Williamson met with some of Fidel Castro's agents and supporters at the Retiro Odontológico, a dentists' building. Without the knowledge or approval of American Ambassador Smith, Williamson stated that the United States would recognize the Castro Government as soon as the Rebels overthrew Batista. There was also some discussion of the arms which the CIA was giving Castro surreptitiously.

"Williamson's remarks were recorded on tape and given unofficially to Ambassador Earl E. T. Smith."

American Ambassador Smith had Williamson sent home, but his machinations on behalf of a Communist takeover of Cuba were apparently a part of his job as he continued in C.I.A. service within the State Department and was sent to Madrid and then to San Jose, Costa Rica, where he is now operating.

The C.I.A. not only helped Castro to power, it sabotaged every effort by Cuban patriots to win back their country. Again, John Martino comments:

"The abandonment of the Cuban underground may have been the result of cumulative blunders, but, to the Cubans in prison and the Cubans abroad, it had the reek of treason. A thorough investigation of what happened would seem to be an elementary act of justice toward those who died because of what the CIA did and because of what the CIA failed to do."

Haynes Johnson, author of the *Bay of Pigs*, also concludes that responsibility for the sellout of Cuba must rest with the Central Intelligence Agency. He says the betrayal at the Bay of Pigs was so carefully arranged that later there was no way for Cubans drawn into the project to prove they had been promised anything at all. "In American terminology," Johnson says, "they were left holding the bag." Martino confirms this from his interviews with fellow prisoners inside Castro's political prisons:

" . . . I learned about the men who were supposed to have been alerted by the CIA so they could leave Havana immediately before the invasion and proceed stealthily to the Escambray Mountains, there to organize guerrilla warfare. There were only two things wrong with this operation. They were never told that the invasion was coming and somebody, presumably somebody inside the CIA, betrayed the names of these Cubans to the G-2. The result was wholesale executions. In one instance, three brothers were shot.

"Another instance. A man had been dropped into Cuba by the CIA to organize

an underground. He recruited a guerrilla band and went into action. Then his radio contact with the United States evaporated into thin air. He was given no orders, no arms, no supplies, no contacts with other groups. Isolated in a hostile police state, he tried to encourage his men to rely on prayer. He too was captured."

The same *modus operandi* was used shortly after World War II when anti-Communist Albanians were "supported" by C.I.A. in efforts to free that country from the Communists. The mastermind of the Albanian betrayal was Kim Philby, who had been assigned by the British to help America organize C.I.A. The Central Intelligence Agency was at the time cooperating in a joint British-American project to bring about a general uprising behind the Iron Curtain. Philby, later revealed to have been a Soviet agent, was selected by C.I.A. to coordinate the operation.

In the summer of 1949 a "committee of free Albanians" was formed in Italy, and in the spring of 1950 they were shipped in small groups through Greece and over the mountains into Albania. Kim Philby had drafted detailed plans whereby some were to go to their homes, others to designated points of rendezvous. Within a month, half of the infiltrators were either killed or captured. Those who sheltered them were butchered.

A few of these operatives managed to escape back over the mountains to Greece, knowing they had been betrayed but not knowing that Soviet agents in C.I.A. had seen to it that the Communists had advance knowledge of their every move. The technique of encouraging an uprising and then withdrawing support has been used again and again to identify and destroy enemies of the Communists. The people of Hungary, East Berlin, Poland, and Czechoslovakia—all spurred to premature revolt by promises of American aid which was never forthcoming—are only too well aware of how C.I.A. cooperates in such efforts.

The pro-Communist bias of the Central Intelligence Agency is even more obvious in the role it played in the assassination of anti-Communist President Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. As Norman Gall revealed in "How Trujillo Died," an amazing admission against interest which appeared several years ago in the "Liberal" *New Republic*:

"The assassination of the Dominican Republic's Rafael L. Trujillo was carried out with assistance from the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Arms for . . . slaying . . . the 69-year-old dictator . . . were smuggled by CIA into the country at the request of the assassins, according to highly qualified sources I interviewed in Santo Domingo shortly after the collapse of the Trujillo rule.

"The CIA began shipping guns to the Dominican Republic in late 1960. . . .

"The key link between the assassins and the CIA in the arms shipment was a longtime American civilian resident of Ciudad Trujillo . . . who operated a supermarket in a fashionable neighborhood where Trujillo also lived. . . .

"Weapons were imported in small parts, to be assembled later by the plotters, among the routine grocery shipments for the supermarket arriving regularly in the capital's port. . . ."

Arturo Espallat explains in *Trujillo: The Last Caesar* that "The arrival of weapons from the Government of the United States was, for the plotters, tangible evidence that the might of the United States was behind them. Without that support there would simply have been no conspiracy. Trujillo had put together a powerful political-military machine which could only have been destroyed by intervention from the outside world." And the State Department had decreed that Rafael Trujillo, our most reliable

anti-Communist ally in the Caribbean, must die. The C.I.A. did the job.

It also arranged to do the job when the Diems of South Vietnam were no longer useful. In fact the Reverend Paul D. Lindstrom of the "Remember The Pueblo Committee" has determined from a high-ranking government source that a C.I.A. official involved in setting up the recent Green Beret assassination case was also neck deep in the 1963 execution of the Diem brothers. This C.I.A. officer was, in fact, identified as a Soviet espionage agent by Colonel Michal Goleniewski, a top defector from Polish Intelligence, in hearings before a C.I.A. review board.

The Goleniewski case is a fascinating one. The Colonel had been cooperating with the United States by supplying information from behind the Iron Curtain. When his own information began coming back to him in his capacity as a high official of the Communist Secret Police, he realized he would soon be exposed and escaped from Warsaw, via Berlin, to the United States.

Shortly after his arrival in this country, Goleniewski was scheduled for a debriefing conference with the C.I.A. When he entered the room he recognized one of the C.I.A. agents present as an undercover operative for the Communists and, under a pretext, refused to talk. There was plenty to say—but to whom?

It was Goleniewski who exposed an American Embassy official in Warsaw who had been a Soviet agent for eighteen years. This man was Edward Symans. Yet, in spite of his exposure, Symans was not prosecuted but allowed to retire on a federal pension. Edward Symans was an agent of C.I.A.

Colonel Goleniewski disclosed the presence of nineteen Americans working in important capacities for the Soviet Secret Police—twelve in the State Department at least four in C.I.A., and three in U.S. scientific laboratories "with ties to others in the same category." He identified several hundred K.G.B. operatives in Europe and the United Kingdom—including such top agents as George Blake, John Vassall, Israel Beer, Gordon Lonsdale, and Stig Wennerstrom. All were important figures in the Soviet espionage apparatus. The Europeans were prosecuted by their governments; the Americans were not.

Vaba Eesti Sona, a New York foreign language newspaper, carried a most revealing article concerning Colonel Goleniewski in its issue for March 5, 1964. The following excerpt was translated for our use by the Library of Congress on November 6, 1970:

"Former Polish intelligence man Michal Goleniewski, who together with his German-born wife defected to the West and since 1961 has resided in the USA, has given US authorities valuable information about Russian espionage against the USA. In closed hearings of the Special Congressional Committee on Tuesday, he gave more new and sensational information while exposing four US diplomats. . . . The diplomats retained responsible positions at the embassies and the State Department, and their "contribution" has been used by Moscow for several years. . . .

"Goleniewski has given the names of . . . secret communists who succeeded in obtaining responsible positions in US Government agencies. Some of them are even employed in intelligence. One . . . was a CIA worker . . . on duty in Vienna. He managed to give 1.2 million dollars to the Communist parties in the USA, Italy, and elsewhere from the money assigned for US counter-intelligence. He [Goleniewski] further disclosed the names of three scientists who are working for the benefit of Russian espionage. Supposedly there are many more such scientists, but he did not know their names.

"Russian KGB (NKVD) agents have successfully infiltrated many US embassies. Only the FBI is not infiltrated by communist agents, according to Goleniewski, or if there

are any there, their names are not known to him.

"After questioning Goleniewski the Special Congressional Committee hurriedly took the necessary steps and ordered an investigation of about 300 persons employed by the diplomatic services. . . . Goleniewski has . . . accused the CIA of concealing the fact that some diplomats and officials were working for the benefit of the KGB. . . ."

That Colonel Michal Goleniewski knew what he was talking about is beyond question.¹ Certainly C.I.A. support of Communist interests is so shockingly aggressive that even American "Liberals" have been known to find it offensive.

In February of 1967, for instance, the *New York Times* expressed shock at revelations that the C.I.A. had been covertly financing radical students, academics, researchers, journalists, entire businesses, and legal and labor organizations at home and abroad. It was revealed in the *New York Times* for February 18, 1967, that literally millions of dollars had been channeled by C.I.A. through tax-free foundations to such radical Leftist organizations as the National Student Association, the International Union of Socialist Youth, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions at Brussels, the American Newspaper Guild, and others.

The international operations of the American Newspaper Guild, alone, were financed by the C.I.A. to the tune of millions. This is disturbing since the Guild was thoroughly dominated by Communists throughout the Thirties and has remained a force for radicalism in the American mass media. It was organized by Heywood Broun, described by *Reader's Digest* senior editor Eugene Lyons as a "literary trigger man" for the Communists. Former General Secretary of the Communist Party Benjamin Gitlow testified under oath that "Broun was understood by domestic Communists to be carrying out Kremlin policies in the newspaper unions."

The C.I.A. turned a million dollars over to Charles A. Perlik Jr., secretary-treasurer of the American Newspaper Guild, who deposited it in a special "international affairs fund." The Guild's international activities are carried out by the International Federation of Journalists in Brussels, and the Inter-American Federation of Working Newspapermen's Organization in Panama City. The latter, an organization which ignores anti-Communist journalists, received direct C.I.A. grants totaling \$1 million.

Beginning in 1958 the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees also fronted international operations which were financed by the C.I.A. Arnold Zander, former president of the Federation who subsequently became president of the radical United World Federalists, a group openly dedicated to the destruction of American sovereignty, admitted that by 1964 the C.I.A. was putting \$60,000 per year into the operation through one of its "dummy" conduits, the Gotham Foundation of New York. This money was in turn funneled into unions representing members of the public bureaucracy at all levels in governments throughout the world—especially in Africa and Latin America. Given Zander's commitment to the Far Left, the purpose of this operation is entirely too obvious. As we shall see, the man who cleared these funds inside C.I.A. was a former president and founder of the United World Federalists.

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions at Brussels is another group which has been on the take for C.I.A. millions. This while its activities in Algeria, Mali, Guinea, and Ghana were instrumental in turning those countries over to the Communists. A key international labor operative was Jay Lovestone of the United States.² He

¹Footnotes at end of article.

was a founder of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and editor of the Party newspaper, *The Communist*. Mr. Lovestone was a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party until his contention that Comrade Trotsky was a better disciple of Marx than Comrade Lenin resulted in his "expulsion" from the Party—permitting him to promote the "Marxism" of Trotsky without the stigma of Party membership.

Commenting on Lovestone's efforts for the I.C.F.T.U. on behalf of the Communist F.L.N. in Algeria, Hilaire du Berrier wrote in 1962: "When F.L.N. control of Algeria results in the inevitable consequences—Communist outflanking of Europe, Red control of the Mediterranean, and a wave of racial violence that will spread to the Near East—doubts as to Mr. Lovestone's break with Communism will increase."

The C.I.A.-financed International Confederation of Free Trade Unions finally became so well known for what it is that A.F.L.-C.I.O. President George Meany announced in February 1969 that he was withdrawing affiliation. The *New York Times* of February 21, 1969, reported he gave as his reason that "the A.F.L.-C.I.O. had no intention of maintaining contacts or relations with 'so-called unions' in the Soviet Union that are currently headed, he said, by Aleksandr Shelpin, former chief of the Soviet political police."

It was in 1958, says the *New York Times*, that the M.D. Anderson Foundation of Houston began to receive funds from such C.I.A. "dummy" conduits as the Gotham Foundation, Borden Trust, the Beacon Fund, the Price Fund, the Tower Fund, Williford-Telford Fund, and the San Miguel Fund. The amount received just happened to match the amount it passed on to the American Fund For Free Jurists, Inc., a radical group now called the American Council for the International Commission of Jurists, whose principal officer is Eli Whitney Debevoise, law partner of Francis T.P. Plimpton, U.S. Delegate to the United Nations and an intimate of Adlai Stevenson.

The Hoblitzelle Foundation of Dallas, Texas, one of whose trustees was Federal Judge Sarah T. Hughes, who administered the oath of office to President Johnson following the assassination of President Kennedy, began making major C.I.A. grants in 1958 to the International Cooperative Development Funds and the Congress of Cultural Freedom. The latter subsidized a Socialist magazine in Britain called *Encounter*.

Another Texas foundation, the Hobby Foundation of Houston, also received money from C.I.A. fronts which it passed along to designated radical groups. Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, chairman of the foundation, was Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in the Eisenhower Administration. While in that post her assistant was the wife of top C.I.A. man Thomas W. Braden. Among the organizations to which the Hobby Foundation delivered C.I.A. money were the American Friends of the Middle East (\$50,000 in 1963, \$75,000 in 1964, and \$50,000 in 1965), Fund for International Social and Economic Education (\$50,000 in 1963, and \$100,000 in 1964 and 1965), and the pro-Communist Foreign Policy Association.

Two names emerged at the time of the "scandal" concerning all of this secret C.I.A. financing which have loomed larger on the national scene within the past year. One was that of Sam Brown, who was in 1967 a "student spokesman" and chairman of the supervisory board of the National Student Association. He has since associated himself with the Presidential campaign of Senator Eugene McCarthy and was much publicized as the coordinator of the pro-Communist "Vietnam Moratorium" who declared that "the United States is now the great imperialist-aggressor nation of the world" and called for a Vietnam victory. Brown was then a Harvard

divinity student. When the story broke, he said he was "shocked at the ethical trap young men of great integrity were placed in" by the C.I.A. Until the exposé, however, there is no record that Sam Brown ever complained about the subsidies which had for fifteen years been supplied by C.I.A. to support the radical activities of the National Student Association on whose supervisory board he served.

On February 14, 1967, U.P.I. reported that since the early Fifties some \$3 million had been poured by C.I.A. into the National Student Association. In short, C.I.A. had picked up the tab for up to eighty percent of N.S.A.'s expenses since 1952. This is the same National Student Association which during that same period had urged that Communists be allowed to teach in the public schools; condemned the maintenance by the U.S. Attorney General of a list of subversive organizations; demanded that Communist literature be made available on campus to college students and teachers; called for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; rejoiced at the Communist takeover of Algeria; urged U.S. sponsorship of the admission of Red China to the U.N.; extended hospitality at its 1962 convention to the Communist party, U.S.A.; allowed distribution by S.D.S. of Communist literature at the 1965 N.S.A. Congress; and even demanded repeal of the Internal Security Act. This is only a partial listing. The Communist causes pushed by N.S.A. with that \$3 million from the Central Intelligence Agency would, if fully listed, fill the next three pages.

Another "student spokesman" financed by C.I.A. was Gloria Steinem, now identified with the Communist-inspired Women's Liberation Movement. Along with Comrades David Dellinger, Arthur Kinoy, and Pete Seeger, she is now a national sponsor of the Committee To Defend the Panthers. Gloria, however, was not "shocked" at the idea of using C.I.A. money to support radical causes. In fact she said that she had welcomed it and worked gladly for a C.I.A.-financed operation originally called the Independent Service for Information on the Vienna Festival, later renamed the Independence Research Service. This outfit had headquarters in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and concentrated on disseminating information about the Communist Youth Festival at Vienna in 1959.

Miss Steinem continued as a full-time employee of this C.I.A. front until after the Communist Youth Festival in Helsinki, Finland, in 1962. Through her efforts over a hundred young American radicals were recruited to attend the Communist Vienna Festival, and before the Helsinki Festival the group again recruited young teachers, lawyers, scholars, linguists, and journalists to attend. She described them as mostly "very liberal Democrats." Which has got to be the euphemism of the year.

The secrecy necessary for its operations has made C.I.A. a perfect haven for employing as well as subsidizing subversives. As the *New York Times* observed in its issue for March 30, 1967:

In the late 1940s and early 1950s many liberals who wished to serve their country found in the CIA not only a personal haven, safe from the onslaughts of McCarthyism, but also an opportunity to bring to bear on the problems of the cold war a realistic and liberal understanding of the pluralism of emerging countries.

Yes, American history is replete with examples of how "Liberals" afraid of McCarthyism serve their country. They are typified by the man at C.I.A. who was in charge of covertly subsidizing N.S.A. and a long list of other Leftist causes and organizations. That man's name is Cord Meyer Jr. He has been described by the *New York Times* as a "hidden liberal," submerged for sixteen

years "in the anonymity of the Central Intelligence Agency," but is said to be well known in Washington's social and intellectual circles. The revelation of Cord Meyer's role came as a surprise even to his friends, one of whom is quoted by the *Times* of March 30, 1967, as observing: "He was not the C.I.A. type. He was a world government man." That friend knew Meyer, all right, but he did not know C.I.A. The *Times* adds that "at age 47, Mr. Meyer seems no less dedicated to the C.I.A. than to world federalism."

Cord Meyer's association with the Central Intelligence Agency was first revealed at the time of the murder of his divorced wife, Mary Pinchot Meyer, on October 13, 1964. The *New York Times* states that this murder was never solved. The Meyers had been divorced five years earlier after the death of a son in "an automobile accident." Meyer quickly remarried.

Cord Meyer and his twin brother, Quentin, were born in Washington, D.C., on November 10, 1920. Their father, a career officer at the State Department, was a well-known "Liberal." Cord was educated at St. Paul's School in Concord, New Hampshire, and graduated from Yale in the Class of 1943. Later he attended Harvard. On April 19, 1945, he married Mary Eno Pinchot, the wedding being performed by the Reverend Reinhold Niebuhr, whose active participation in Communist Fronts is well documented in government records. Miss Pinchot's father, Amos, was an active Leftist who had been vice chairman of the Civil Liberties Bureau, founded by such Comrades as Soviet spy Agnes Smedley and Communist Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. Her mother was chairman of the super-radical Women's Peace Party of New York City.

While at Harvard on a Lowell Fellowship, Cord Meyer Jr. was invited to attend a Conference on World Government presided over by Justice Owen J. Roberts and called by Greenville Clark, Robert Bass (former governor of New Hampshire), and Thomas H. Mahoney, a Boston lawyer who was chairman of the Massachusetts Committee for World Federation. The Conference was held in Clark's home at Dublin, New Hampshire, and launched Cord on his career as a radical Leftist.

In February 1947, all the U.S. organizations working to destroy American sovereignty in the quagmire of a world government met in Asheville, North Carolina. Out of this meeting was created the United World Federalists. Cord Meyer Jr. was named its first president and made hundreds of lectures throughout the United States promoting this cause.

It was as president of the United World Federalists that Cord Meyer Jr. wrote a book entitled *Peace or Anarchy*, in which he outlined a plan for militarily disarming the United States and merging it in a "Federated World Government" under the control of the United Nations. Meyer proposed that "... once having joined the One-World Federated Government no nation could secede or revolt ... because with the Atom Bomb in its possession the Federal Government (of the world) would blow that nation off the face of the earth."

Cord Meyer Jr. was no small-time radical. In fact he had been Harold Stassen's aide during the summer of 1945 when the United Nations Organization was being set up in San Francisco. A story concerning young Meyer which appeared in the radical *P.M.* on March 21, 1948, declared of him: "Recently, Stassen was again asked to size up Meyer in the light of his activities in behalf of world government. 'That young man has the best mind,' Stassen said without hesitation, 'of any young man in America.'" Around this time Cord was getting a heavy buildup by the Comrades, and another "profile" (in *Closeup* for January 14, 1948)

observed: "To a growing number of Americans—and people in other countries, too—Cord Meyer, Jr. is taking his place rapidly in the select ranks of the shining young hopes of the world."

This "shining young hope" was personally placed at the administrative level of the C.I.A. by Allen Dulles, over the objections of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. There, under the cloak of anonymity, he has labored diligently for world government. In an article he wrote for *Atlantic* shortly after the formation of the United Nations, Meyer declared:

"For those of us who have fought not for power but because we believe in the possibility of peace, the [U.N.] Charter is more than a series of harmless platitudes. Weak and inadequate as it stands today, it is all that we have won from the war. By our effort, it may yet become the symbol and instrument of a just order among men. No matter how remote our chances or how distant our success, we have in simple honesty no alternative but the attempt to make it that. As I have suggested, it is possible that we shall fail, and that the death agony of nationalism will be prolonged beyond our lifetime. But eventually, if the civilization of the West is not to disintegrate completely, others who believe as we do will succeed. . . ."

Remember that the above is from the man in charge of the unvoiced funds for C.I.A.'s clandestine operations! With unlimited amounts of money from the coffers of C.I.A. at his disposal, Cord Meyer has subsidized exactly those organizations most interested in concluding America's "death agony of nationalism" with a *coup de grace*. Through devious channels (one of which was the J.M. Kaplan Fund, Inc., of 55 Fifth Avenue, New York City) Meyer dispensed C.I.A. monies to such wildly Leftist organizations as the Institute of International Labor Research, Inc. This outfit maintains an office at 113 East 37th Street, New York City, and has also been known as Labor Research, Inc. It was headed by the late Norman Thomas, Chairman of the Socialist Party of the United States, at the very time C.I.A. turned over nearly \$1 million to it for the purpose of financing what the *New York Times* of February 22, 1967, described euphemistically as "17 left-of-center parties throughout Latin America."

Secretary-Treasurer of the Institute of Labor Research was Sacha Volman. He set up radically Leftist "Institutes" in Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic. According to Otilia Ulate, former President of Costa Rica, the San Jose Institute supported only those Parties which "have the characteristic features which make them identical in doctrine and homogenous in political and social attitudes with Russian Communism." Ulate said that all democratic Parties opposed to the Marxist regime in Cuba were excluded from this offshoot of the Norman Thomas and Sacha Volman Institute.

Through the Dominican Institute, using C.I.A. funds, Volman promoted political careers for such key Communists as the notorious Juan Bosch. Sacha had close ties with Comrades throughout Latin America and was neck deep in the Marxist-Leninist "Center of Research in Economic and Social Development" at Santo Domingo. This organization (C.I.D.E.S.) was financed by the C.I.A., the U.S. State Department, and the Ford Foundation. When his intelligence organization infiltrated C.I.D.E.S., General Wessin y Wessin of the Dominican Republic found it to be a Communist training and indoctrination operation. Sacha Volman was an instructor in that operation and was the man who, with State Department and C.I.A. direction, promoted Communist Juan Bosch all the way to the Presidency of the Dominican Republic.

Volman is suspected of being a Soviet agent assigned to Latin American Affairs. He was born in Russia, lived in Romania, and came to the United States as a "refugee." He is now a U.S. citizen and has been living at 245 East 80th Street, New York City. In the Hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on *The Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean*, General Wessin y Wessin testified under oath about Volman's C.I.A. operation:

"Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you spoke of 40 Communist indoctrination centers operating in the Dominican Republic under Juan Bosch. Did these centers operate openly as a Communist operation?"

"General WESSIN. Openly."

"Mr. SOURWINE. Did they display Communist banners or signs?"

"General WESSIN. One of these schools located on Caracas Street No. 54 displayed the Soviet flag."

"Mr. SOURWINE. The Soviet flag? Not just a Communist banner with a hammer and sickle, but the Soviet flag?"

"General WESSIN. It was the red flag with the hammer and sickle."

"Mr. SOURWINE. Now, do you know where these centers were operated? You named the location of one. Can you tell us where others were?"

"General WESSIN. In the school Padre Villini Calle-Mercedes. This building, in spite of the fact that it belonged to the Government, was turned over to the Communist Dato Pagan Perdomo to install a school of political science."

"There was another one, which went under the initials of CIDES located in the farm, or Finca Jaina Moza. In this school, the teachers were among the others, Juan Bosch, Angel Miolan, and Sacha Volman."

"Mr. SOURWINE. One of those names has come up before. One new. Let's identify these men."

"Who is or was Angel Miolan?"

"General WESSIN. Angel Miolan is a Communist, and I say that he is a Communist because in order to be secretary of Vicente Lombardo Toledano for 10 years you have to be a Communist."

"Mr. SOURWINE. Vicente Lombardo Toledano was an outstanding Communist, was he not?"

"General WESSIN. Yes, sir. He was, in fact, head of all Communist political activities in Mexico."

"Mr. SOURWINE. Now, who is Sacha Volman?"

"General WESSIN. He was a Rumanian brought there by Juan Bosch. I don't know him."

"Mr. SOURWINE. Did you consider him a Communist?"

"General WESSIN. In my country there is a saying that says tell me with whom you go, and I will tell you who you are."

Also involved with the Communist-oriented C.I.D.E.S. organization was Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. The Parvin Foundation, of which Douglas was a member of the board of directors, joined with the National Association of Broadcasters and C.I.D.E.S. to produce "educational" films. According to the *New York Times* of February 22, 1967, Douglas became a member of the board of C.I.D.E.S., which administered the film project in the field. The "educational" films and the C.I.D.E.S. Communist training school had to be abandoned when President Bosch attempted an open Communist takeover and was overthrown by a military coup late in 1963. The C.I.A. had been financing an effort to turn the Dominican Republic into another Cuba.

One of the most important of the countless operations of the C.I.A. is the Center for International Studies, established in 1950 with an initial C.I.A. grant in excess of \$5 million. The Center was founded at M.I.T. by

Walt Whitman Rostow, who served in the O.S.S. during World War II and went to M.I.T. in 1950 from the staff of Swedish Marxist Gunnar Myrdal after teaching briefly at Oxford. Rostow was associated with the Center from 1950 until a security check was waived in 1961 and he was appointed by President Kennedy as Deputy Special Assistant for National Security Affairs at the White House. In the meantime he had three times been turned down for a security clearance—twice by the State Department and once by the Air Force.

Another key man, in the C.I.A. Center at M.I.T. since 1953, has been Harold R. Isaacs, a super-radical with a well-documented record as a subversive. The following quotations, with the pages on which they appear, are from the record of the Senate Internal Security Hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations:

Page 2607—"In the last issue of Pacific Affairs there appears an article by Harold Isaacs entitled 'Perspectives of the Chinese Revolution, A Marxist View.' " Page 3627—"Some years ago, Mr. Isaacs published a book called 'The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution,' with a preface by Leon Trotsky." Page 4103, a letter to Owen Lattimore from Frederick Vanderbilt Field, both identified under oath as Communists—"Since I first learned that you had arranged for an article on the Chinese Communist movement from Harold Isaacs, I hoped it would be possible . . . I was very pleased with the way Isaacs' article turned out." Page 1220—Soviet agent "Agnes Smedley" was an associate of Harold Isaacs and C. Frank Glass, locally classified as a card-bearing Communist. Isaacs was for some time Editor of the China Forum, an English language Communist periodical first published in 1932." Page 1221—Soviet agent "Agnes Smedley" joined the Noulens, who were jailed by Chinese authorities for espionage activities and tried and convicted as bona fide Comintern agents. Associated with Smedley on the Committee was Harold Isaacs." Page 1238—A Soviet agent named "Irene Wiedemeyer as well as Agnes Smedley and Harold Isaacs were in close contact with John M. Murray, the American correspondent for the Pacific News Agency, listed as an outlet for the Comintern." Page 1247—"The Society of Friends of the USSR, Shanghai branch, was founded in 1932 by Edmond Egon Kisch, a Czech journalist and long known as a Comintern agent. Among the more important members was Harold Isaacs (G-2 Document No. 31, S.M.P. File D-4718)."

As we have noted, this same Harold Isaacs has been at M.I.T.'s C.I.A.-created and C.I.A.-financed Center for International Studies since 1953. He went there directly from stints at *Newsweek* and *Harper's*, where he had praised Ho Chi Minh as "the George Washington of Asia." Today he contents himself with preparing position papers for the C.I.A. and other sensitive agencies. The Twelfth Annual Report of the M.I.T. Center says that Isaacs has been conducting investigations concerning "political change" in a number of countries—supported by what is likely a dummy grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. The records of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare show another such direct grant to Harold Isaacs (No. M.H.—09179-2) for "A Comparative Study of Personality Development," further defined as (get this) "Stress, Social Change, World Politics, Comparative Study." Isaacs is the Center's top brain-truster.

The M.I.T. Center has published numerous books and studies by Rostow, Isaacs, and other security risks. For example, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency made a grant to Dr. Lincoln P. Bloomfield, a member of the Center's staff, for studies in "Re-

global Arms Control Arrangements" and "Soviet Interests and Attitudes Toward Disarmament." Dr. Bloomfield worked out plans for U.N. "peace-keeping" forces to occupy part of the United States for inspections. Assisting Dr. Bloomfield was Amelia Leiss of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. She will be recalled as the editor of the 1965 study, *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures*—an analysis financed by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of which Agler Hiss was the president in 1947—which details plans for a United Nations invasion of South Africa down to the last aircraft carrier, casualty estimate, and cost in dollars.

Director of the C.I.A.'s Center for International Studies at M.I.T. from 1952 until his death in December, 1969, was Dr. Max F. Millikan. Dr. Millikan was president of the World Peace Foundation, a collaborator on at least one book with Walt Rostow, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. He was simply transferred to the job of Director of the M.I.T. Center from his position as Assistant Director of the C.I.A.

Lyle Munson, formerly of both O.S.S. and C.I.A., discusses the strategy behind creation of the C.I.A. Center at M.I.T. and a general diversification of C.I.A. operations:

"State Department policies and personnel were under bitter and continuous attack. It was decided that the secrecy of the CIA could be used to fight back. The operational arm of the CIA set about dividing and dissipating the growing anti-Communist movement in the United States and began to seek ways of molding and recasting public opinion. The charter of the CIA expressly forbids domestic operations, but ways were found. . . . It began to finance studies and research projects. . . . Next, the CIA began to route monies through tax-exempt foundations for these purposes and to employ scholars, writers and public opinion leaders covertly. Then it went after the press. It began to 'clear' certain newspapers, radio and TV reporters and editors as 'consultants'. . . . Emboldened by its covert consultations with the newspaper, radio and TV industries, the CIA began to cause certain books to be published and to subsidize certain U.S. published periodicals. . . ."

Washington's authoritative Government Employees' Exchange for April 16, 1969, carried a report from one of its high-level sources which linked even the New York Times with the C.I.A. But, first a bit of background. The article in the Exchange concerned the takeover of the reins of government by the "New Team," a group of top-level advisors to incoming President John F. Kennedy:

"... the 'New Team' was to be a 'paragovernment,' performing for the United States 'the same kind of functions' which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union performed for the Soviet Union. . . ."

"This required the 'New Team' to penetrate every department and agency of the Executive Branch . . . by inserting 'trusted members' of the 'New Team' into key positions. . . ."

"Besides key persons officially already in the Government, the 'New Team' selected persons in leading banks, law firms and foundations for the penetration of the 'non-governmental' apparatus of the United States. . . ."

"One of the major 'roadblocks' to the 'infiltration' of the State Department by the Central Intelligence Agency New Team was Otto F. Otepka [in charge of State Department Security]. . . ."

While these vast and secret reorganizations of the Central Intelligence Agency's "operational" side were evolving, Mr. Otepka "naively" continued to apply the long-standing Federal and Civil Service Standards. . . .

"Mr. Otepka's 'miscalculation' lay in his loyalty to the law and regulations, the

source said, and his failure to comprehend that a 'coup d'état' was about to take place, in which the 'paragovernment' of the 'New Team' would displace the 'formal government' of the United States. He did not fully comprehend the 'coup d'état' even after the 'Thanksgiving Day Massacre' in the State Department in 1961 which liquidated the last vestiges of the old order in the State department and raised George Wildman Ball to Under Secretary of State."

Among the important members of this "New Team" were McGeorge and William Bundy, Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara, Walt Rostow, General Marshall Carter, Richard Helms, Cartha DeLoach (F.B.I.), and Harding Bancroft. Mr. Bancroft is the Executive Vice President of the *New York Times* who is reported to have used the organization and facilities of the *Times* on behalf of the C.I.A. and the "New Team."

The vigor with which the *Times* attacked Otepka, the roadblock to their takeover, suggests that it may indeed have been carrying out a C.I.A. assignment, representing the new "paragovernment" in the way *Pravda* represents the Central Committee of the Communist Party in the U.S.S.R. Harding Bancroft also had a personal interest in Otto Otepka. As columnist Paul Scott revealed at the time the *Times* was working so hard to block confirmation of Mr. Otepka's appointment to the Subversive Activities Control Board:

"The anti-Otepka strategist is Harding F. Bancroft, the *Times'* executive Vice President who once was under investigation by Otepka for his close association with Alger Hiss, the former high-ranking State Department official convicted of perjury. . . ."

"Testimony and documents gathered by the Internal Security Subcommittee provide an insight into Bancroft's opposition to Otepka. These records show that Bancroft was first employed in the State Department in 1946 on the recommendation of Alger Hiss. . . ."

Whatever the role of the "New Team," when John F. Kennedy took office as President of the United States, he replaced Allen W. Dulles as C.I.A. Director within the year. On November 29, 1961, Kennedy named John McCone to head the Agency. On January 31, 1962, General Charles P. Cabell, the Deputy Director, resigned and was replaced by Major General Marshall S. Carter of the "New Team." On February seventeenth of the same year Richard M. Bissell, who is "credited" with engineering the "failure" of the Cuban invasion, also left the Agency—being replaced by Richard Helms of the "New Team."

Of the "New Team," Dean Rusk was now Secretary of State; Robert McNamara was Secretary of Defense; Walt Rostow, the C.I.A. man who could not even get a security clearance, was first named a Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, and then waived over to the State Department as Chairman of the Policy Planning Staff; General Carter was Deputy Director of C.I.A.; and, Richard Helms was Chief of Planning at C.I.A. Cartha DeLoach was promoted and remained in place at the F.B.I., and Bancroft in place at the *Times*. The Bundys, for their part, were virtually placed in charge of national security—McGeorge at the White House and William in the Defense Department. It was a complete coup.

William Bundy has begun a ten-year career with C.I.A. in 1951. He is a member of the *Insiders' Council* on Foreign Relations. As a member of the "New Team," the C.I.A.'s William Bundy became Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. This was an outrage in view of the fact that Bundy had been in charge of raising funds to pay the trial expenses of Communist Alger Hiss, had himself contributed to that fund, and had been an intimate of both Hiss and

his brother Donald, also identified under oath as a Communist and espionage agent.

McGeorge Bundy, a former member of the staff of the Council on Foreign Relations, played an even more important role as Special Assistant for National Security Affairs to both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. He had studied at Yale under the (now former) chief C.I.A. planner Richard Bissell and selected as his deputy one Robert W. Komer, who had been with C.I.A. since its inception. As *Newsweek* observed in its issue for March 4, 1963: "Bundy is director of the National Security Council and boss of its high-powered staff"—which, in turn, runs the Central Intelligence Agency.

In his book, *Lyndon's Legacy*, the late Frank Kluckhohn observed of Mr. Bundy's tour at the White House:

"McGeorge Bundy is said by Washington insiders to be one of the most influential men around the president. . . ."

"All moves toward U.S. unilateral disarmament are widely credited to McGeorge Bundy—as is the adoption as official policy of the plan to liquidate U.S. armed forces and destroy our weapons, while simultaneously building an all-powerful UN army and accepting the UN's International Court, which could then overrule our U.S. Congress."

These are the goals of the United World Federalists, before whose General Assembly Presidential advisor McGeorge Bundy declared in June of 1964:

"... In the years in which I have seen the United World Federalists at work on immediate concrete issues, it has had a combination of practical effectiveness and sound long-range instinct which suggest to me that this force is one which has a depth and a power and a value—both in our country and around the world—that it would be very difficult to overestimate. . . . nothing is more important to the Presidency of the United States than the existence of this kind of organization."

This from the man who ran the National Security Council, overseeing the C.I.A., for two Presidents. One could cheer McGeorge Bundy's departure if he were not now employed as President of the powerful Ford Foundation, through which he has continued to pursue his Leftism.

Although the C.I.A. has been able to keep secret from Congress the names of most of its 15,000 employees and even the amount of the huge fortune it spends annually, its Director is neither "faceless" nor "nameless." Currently he is Richard McGarrah Helms, a member of that "New Team" who was made Deputy Director of C.I.A. during the Kennedy Administration and Director by President Johnson. Helms succeeded Vice Admiral William F. Raborn as C.I.A. Director on June 30, 1966. He had been in the O.S.S. during World War II, and at the end of the War was assigned to work in Berlin under the direction of Allen Dulles. Mr. Helms, Allen Dulles, and Soviet agent Kim Philby have all been described as the "architect" of C.I.A.

Helms worked from the very beginning with the C.I.A.'s covert operations or "plans" division, which was concerned with espionage and undercover activities. He reportedly helped to recruit, train, and assign its most important agents. A number of these were personally recommended by Soviet agent Kim Philby. As director of the "plans" division his duties, says *Current Biography*, "included supervision of the CIA's political propaganda section, which secretly subsidized various private groups and individuals in such areas as education, labor, and the sciences." It was he and Cord Meyer Jr. who arranged C.I.A. subsidy of the Leftist and Communist groups we discussed earlier.

Little wonder that when Helms was named Director of C.I.A. the *New York Times* called him "the best man available," the *Wash-*

ington Post described him as "a professional to his fingertips," and Walter Lippmann declared that he is "an admirable director." In fact, says "Liberal" Senator Mike Mansfield, he is "the best administrator the agency has ever had."

If that doesn't make you feel uncomfortable, try the *New York Post* description (February 25, 1967) of C.I.A. Director Helms as "assuredly the most liberal person to head any intelligence agency."

One is hardly surprised that C.I.A. intelligence operations have come under fire. But if Director Helms is the "most liberal person ever," one can only cringe. A sample of such previous C.I.A. "liberalism" was revealed in Part III of a Senate document called *Communist Threat To The United States Through The Caribbean* in the testimony on November 5, 1959, of General C.P. Cabell, then Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency. When asked to supply figures concerning Communist Party membership in Latin America, General Cabell gave the number for the Dominican Republic as 50, for Haiti as 15, and for Panama as 110. His testimony beginning on Page 162 is even more interesting:

"The CHAIRMAN. What do you have information about? About what Communists fought in Castro's forces?"

"General CABELL. In Cuba?"

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir."

"General CABELL. That question is related to the question: Is Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro a Communist?"

"Let me develop that thought for you, sir. Our information shows that the Cuban Communists do not consider him a Communist Party member, or even a pro-Communist . . . We know also that it has been the assigned task of the Cuban Communist Party to prevent Castro's revolution from going to the right, that is, from establishing friendly relations with the United States, or ending its tolerance of Communist activities."

"Our conclusion, therefore, is that Fidel Castro is not a Communist . . ."

This is the same quality of C.I.A. "intelligence" we may expect from Director Richard Helms—who at the time was the C.I.A. deputy in charge of espionage agents. He apparently did not communicate the reports of his agents that Castro had been a Communist since he was a teenager. Or that Castro had been identified as an International Communist agent by the Government of Colombia as early as 1948, when he was arrested for participating in an attempted revolution in Bogota.

At the very time General Cabell, using the reports of Richard Helms' agents, had declared the C.I.A. "conclusion" that Fidel Castro "is not a Communist," hundreds of reports had come in (and had been ignored) from U.S. Ambassadors, foreign service officers, friendly diplomats, and "other" intelligence sources—all warning of the imminent Communist takeover of Cuba. One begins to wonder if "New Team" Director Richard Helms and his C.I.A. are on our side.

Suppose they are not!

FOOTNOTES

¹ See *Imperial Agent*, Guy Richards, Devin-Aidar, New York, 1966.

² Thomas W. Braden, former assistant to C.I.A. Director Allen W. Dulles, revealed to the *New York Times* of May 8, 1967, that he had turned over sizable sums of C.I.A. money (nearly \$2 million a year) directly to Jay Lovestone and the I.C.F.T.U.'s Irving Brown. He also admitted delivery of large sums from C.I.A. to Walter and Victor Reuther. At Victor Reuther's request, Braden told the *Times*, "I went to Detroit one morning and gave Walter \$50,000 in 50-dollar bills. Victor spent the money, mostly in West Germany. . . ." Walter Reuther responded by revealing that Braden had tried to recruit Victor into the C.I.A.

³ Agnes Smedley was an agent in the direct

service of the Far Eastern Bureau of the Central Committee of the Third International or Comintern. She received orders directly from the Central Committee in Moscow.

SUPPORT FOR TAX SIMPLIFICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by 31 Members of the House in a bipartisan effort to get Congress to undertake a comprehensive study of methods of simplifying the tax return process.

The bill which we are introducing would set up a select joint committee composed of five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate. The select committee would be directed to make recommendations to Congress on ways the filing of income tax returns could be made easier in time for changes to be implemented for the filing of next year's returns. The resolution also directs the General Accounting Office and the Internal Revenue Service to conduct studies and report directly to the joint committee.

I am very pleased at the amount of support my resolution has received from both Republicans and Democrats. Presently, the process of filing Federal income tax returns is so complicated that over 50 percent of the people who file have to turn to professional tax return services for aid in filling out their forms. This is both a ridiculous and unnecessary situation.

Too often, I think, we accept the complications of the Government bureaucracy with just a sigh of resignation. But I strongly believe that there are ways of making this process simpler, and I think it is Congress responsibility to undertake a comprehensive study in this area. Because of this responsibility I hope that this resolution will receive serious consideration in the committee.

The list of cosponsors follows:

COSPONSORS OF TAX SIMPLIFICATION BILL
Representative James Abourezk, of South Dakota.

Representative Joseph P. Addabbo, of New York.

Representative Phillip Burton, of California.

Representative Goodloe E. Byron, of Maryland.

Representative Shirley Chisholm, of New York.

Representative John Culver, of Iowa.

Representative W. C. Daniel, of Virginia.

Representative Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois.

Representative Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia.

Representative Don Edwards, of California.

Representative Marvin L. Esch, of Michigan.

Representative Bill Frenzel, of Minnesota.

Representative Seymour Halpern, of New York.

Representative Craig Hosmer, of California.

Representative Manuel Lujan, Jr., of New Mexico.

Representative James R. Mann, of South Carolina.

Representative Romano L. Mazzoli, of Kentucky.

Representative Mike McCormack, of Washington.

Representative Abner Mikva, of Illinois.

Representative Parren J. Mitchell, of Maryland.

Representative F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts.

Representative Melvin Price, of Illinois.

Representative Charles B. Rangel, of New York.

Representative Donald W. Riegle, of Michigan.

Representative Edward R. Roybal, of California.

Representative Paul S. Sarbanes, of Maryland.

Representative James Scheuer, of New York.

Representative John F. Seiberling, of Ohio.

Representative Robert O. Tiernan, of Rhode Island.

Representative Victor V. Veysey, of California.

Representative John Ware, of Pennsylvania.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK BRASCO

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues an article about the Banking Reform Act that appeared in the May 17 edition of the *New York Law Journal* written by my distinguished colleague from New York, Hon. FRANK BRASCO.

I want to commend Congressman FRANK BRASCO for the outstanding service he is rendering as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and for his keen insight into the problems confronting our Nation which have been of invaluable assistance to the committee. He is hardworking, conscientious, knowledgeable, and dedicated, and it is a privilege for me to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee with him.

The article follows:

THE BANKING REFORM ACT: ANTIDOTE TO ABUSE

(By FRANK J. BRASCO)

The greatest responsibility for the financial well-being of American society is entrusted to banks and other institutions handling other people's money. Both savings and investments of millions of households are managed by commercial and mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, credit unions and brokerage firms. It is essential there should be regulatory safeguards against any potential to violate this trust to the disadvantage and financial loss of depositors.

Furthermore, confidence in the integrity of our entire financial structure must be maintained to avoid a repetition of past financial panics which can seriously disrupt the economy. It is necessary, therefore, to avoid even the appearance of less than complete integrity by directors and officers of financial institutions. This is a hard and fast rule with which there can be no compromise.

Individual institutions, and holding companies which control some of them, can allocate millions—and even billions—of dollars in the form of loans to borrowers for various purposes. Opportunities and temptations for discrimination in favor of enterprises in which institutional officers and directors have an interest obviously must be numerous. This has been proven. Such discrimination can be injurious to the best

interests of all depositors whose funds are entrusted to the lending institution.

A bill designed to eliminate or at least minimize conflicts of interest and potential abuses of trust in management of financial institutions, as well as to enhance competition among financial institutions, has been introduced in the House of Representatives. I have joined Chairman Wright Patman and seven of my colleagues on the House Banking and Currency Committee in this move. The proposed Banking Reform Act of 1971 (H.R. 5700) is based on studies and recommendations for reform by various Federal Government agencies as well as by special committees and commissions over a number of years.

Such studies and recommendations, covering different aspects of proposed reforms, have emanated from the Federal Reserve Board, Federal Trade Commission, Advisory Committee on Banking to the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Home Loan Bank Board and various distinguished individuals who have studied the problem. Some conditions giving rise to the need for reform need to be examined as well as the main reform features of the proposed Banking Reform Act.

FAVORITISM IN LOAN APPROVALS

There have been proven instances in recent years in which savings and loan associations and banks made loans to finance high-risk activities in which directors or officers, or their relatives, had an interest. Such matters came to light with respect to institutions in the District of Columbia, Maryland, Illinois and Texas when large loan amounts could not be repaid. In these cases the solvency of institutions became questionable, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation had to take control in order to protect depositors through various arrangements.

Instances of such mismanagement, thus far, have been infrequent enough and of small enough magnitude, so that they have not had an overt nationwide impact. There was, however, tangible inconvenience suffered by several thousand depositors who were delayed before they could withdraw funds. To date, FDIC and FSLIC reserves could readily absorb any deficiencies which had to be covered under deposit insurance.

There is, however, a more subtle and intangible effect which bears comment.

Growing cynicism pervades our society, particularly among its most youthful segment, as case after case of abuses of trust by directors and officers of financial institutions are reported in the press. Cynicism about the morality of the financial establishment is bound to increase. Directors and officers of banks and savings and loan associations are community leaders, by definition. That image is reinforced when they are ensconced in either old temple-like masonry structures or modern marble-and-glass buildings. The failures I spoke of have not enhanced that image. They have accelerated its corrosion.

POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

While the need to maintain the integrity of financial institutions has become more critical, the framework for potential abuses has been expanded as institutions have increased in size and number. In a study of the savings and loan industry in 1968, for example, it was found that among officers and directors of savings and loan associations there were ancillary affiliations by about one-fourth in real estate sales, and about the same proportion in commercial banking.¹ Potential for a profitable real estate sales business is enhanced through access to a loan source which might be persuaded to finance sales of homes where credit underwriting of the property or borrower might be marginal.

Approximately one-fourth of officers and

directors in the sampled savings and loans also had affiliations with loan originations and closings. Probably most of them were lawyers. Fifty-eight per cent of savings and loan associations had at least one attorney on their boards of directors. Law clients could, no doubt, be helped in obtaining loans, and conflicts of interest would inevitably arise.

The most frequent affiliation of savings and loan associations officers or directors was with property insurance enterprises. About one-half of them had such connections. Generally, such alliances provide the affiliated insurance agency (or the officer or director) with a competitive advantage over unaffiliated insurance agents. There is a question as to whether some of the insurance commission earned through a preferentially situated agency should not belong to the savings and loan association, to benefit the depositors. Here again we have an ethical question emerge.

Another form of conflict of interest, with much broader implications for our general economy, arises from interlocking relationships between banks and major corporations. In a study of forty-nine commercial banks (which held over 54 per cent of all bank trust assets, or more than \$125 billion in trust assets), it was learned that these forty-nine banks had a total of 8,019 director interlocks with 6,591 companies. On some company boards certain banks apparently had more than one interlocking director. Interlocking directorships included a total of 768, with 286 of the 500 largest corporations in the United States. These same forty-nine banks also held 5 per cent or more of the outstanding shares of one or more classes of stock in 5,270 companies.²

CONCENTRATION OF POWER

In a broad sense, interlocking directorships make for a concentration of power which can be used to the advantage of banking interests. A recent specific example was a sell-off of Penn Central Railroad stock by large banks possessing interlocks with the railroad shortly before it went into bankruptcy. Chase Manhattan Bank, whose board of directors included Penn Central's president, Stuart Saunders, sold 436,300 shares of Penn Central stock. Allegheny Corporation, a holding company with two large mutual funds, sold its entire Penn Central holdings of 330,000 shares on May 27. Until March, 1970, Fred Kirby, chairman and president of Allegheny, had been a director of Penn Central. Financial institutions were protecting their own interests in this instance by unloading stock of a tottering company. That stock was then bought by the general public, which probably was infinitely less well-informed.

Here is an example of what certainly appears to be a classical abuse of position by highly-placed insiders. The public faith in financial institutions is badly shaken when such instances are revealed.

A greater danger to the financial free enterprise economic system of our country stems from continuing and widespread interlocking directorships. Large industrial corporations with whose boards banks have interlocking directorships and in which they own stocks, have inside influence in obtaining essential credit. When money becomes tight and allocation of credit is critical to survival of many businesses, large corporations with interlocking bank affiliations have a pronounced advantage.

There is also great potential for conflict of interest when a bank manages an employee benefit fund and acts as banker for the employing corporation. Fund assets may often be invested in corporation securities, although this may not be in the best interests of the involved employees.

To help correct the previously described type of situations, the proposed Banking Reform Act would prohibit officers, directors, employees or trustees of designated types of

financial institutions from serving in a similar capacity with other business entities where a close relationship existed between the financial institution and the business entity. Such close relationship include managing pension and other benefit plans, voting of securities held in trust for the benefit of others, granting of credit, performing of legal services, and control of certain types of businesses by various financial institutions.

This proposed law would also make it illegal for a financial institution to give a personal benefit to an officer, director or employee of a company, or for such a person to accept from a financial institution without his employer's consent any personal benefit in order to influence his conduct in transacting business for the firm with the financial institution in question.

EFFECTS ON COMPETITION

Multi-corporate stock ownership by banks for their own account and while exercising their trust functions, plus interlocking directorates, can thwart competition. Such interlocking interests have the potential for dampening competition between normally competitive non-financial corporations which may be linked through interlocks with a single banking institution. Mergers may also be fostered under such conditions.

A more direct avenue for avoiding competition arises in the business of financing itself. For example, the forty-nine banks surveyed in the 1968 study held 146 interlocking directorships with twenty-nine of the largest life insurance companies in the United States. Data collected from 700 financial institutions in a companion study showed 272 commercial banks have between 9 and 99 per cent of their stock held by another institution in some capacity. This includes stock of 183 banks held by trust departments of sixty other banks. As previously mentioned, about one-fourth of a sample of savings and loan association officers and directors had commercial bank affiliations. In New England, where mutual savings banks are most prevalent, forty-eight commercial banks (out of 189 covered in a survey) had between 10 and 61 per cent of their stock held by mutual savings banks.

All such interrelated ownership interests and interlocking directorates tend to reduce competition in the business of extending credit. Interest rates may be higher and other loan terms more restrictive, particularly where interlocking institutions are in one region or one city, as is often the case.

Therefore, the proposed legislation would (1) prohibit mutual savings banks from holding stock in other financial institutions, and (2) prohibit commercial banks from holding in the aggregate in their trust departments more than 10 per cent of any class of stock of any corporation whose stock must be registered under the Securities Act of 1933.

OTHER FEATURES OF ACT

Another provision of the proposed act would prohibit lending institutions from requiring "equity kickers" as a condition of making a loan. The practice of demanding equity kickers grew during the tight-money period since 1966. In this situation, lenders require that the builder-developer of a rental property, or other equity owner, shall agree to give the lender an equity interest or right, in addition to repayment of principal and interest.

The "equity kicker" may be in the form of an outright partial equity ownership (e.g., 10 or 25 per cent) or a right to a percentage of gross rental receipts (e.g., 20 or 40 per cent), or both. These conditions became so onerous that they discouraged many developers from building planned housing projects and commencing other undertakings.

The proposed act would also outlaw brokered deposits. This involves attraction of deposits through brokers who are paid for the

Footnotes at end of article.

service. In some instances, depositors have been attracted to unsound savings and loan associations, credit unions, etc., and have ended up by losing their savings.

Another lending industry abuse that would be prohibited involves the use of gifts to attract deposits. This practice does not induce a net increase in savings. It is a cost which reduces net income available for distribution to depositors or for reserves. Transfers of savings can cause liquidity problems for some institutions.

Finally, the bill proposes there should be 100 per cent insurance for public fund deposits. Since taxpayers as a whole lose if there is a loss of money in a deposit of a federal, state or local governmental unit, it is justifiable to have government-sponsored deposit-insurance agencies cover them fully against loss.

PHASING OUT INTERLOCKING

Probably the key reform envisioned in the Banking Reform Bill is elimination of interlocking directorates. A widespread network of interlocks encompasses hundreds of large financial institutions and business corporations which, together, represent a major, perhaps even a dominant, portion of our entire economy. Interlocking directorships hold great potential for widespread conflict of interest and lessening of competition. Both processes operate to the disadvantage of the general public and to advantage of large financial institutions and business corporations. While numerous abuses have come to light over the last decade, many more have surely gone unnoticed.

Given widespread existence of interlocking directorships, there may be concern that management capabilities of major economic units would be injured by an overnight prohibition of interlocks. On the other hand, potential for harm to economic interests of the general public is so great that undue delay would be indefensible.

This proposed legislation provides that prohibitions of interlocking directorates shall become effective between three and four years after date of enactment. This would, I believe, provide an adequate period during which financial institutions and other corporations affected could phase out interlocks without undue injury to continuity and stability of management. However, the institutions concerned are presently testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee, and the time period for the change-over will be most thoroughly explored during the hearings.

We must understand that the faith of the public in our financial structure was once virtually nonexistent. Over a period of decades since the New Deal that faith has been painfully restored.

It is just as obvious that the huge growth in recent years of the financial community and its dependent institutions has bred a series of evils which are potentially cataclysmic. The banking industry has allowed these evils to proliferate, no matter what excuses they offer in justification. Already we have noted that they have resulted in financial loss to the public and abuse of the rights of the financial marketplace. Before they grow any worse, they must be curbed.

Further, it is worthy of note that small evils swiftly are compounded as they are adopted, perpetrated and spread by larger financial units. Today, the involvements have become so widespread and incestuous that in themselves they pose a danger. As the Penn Central case has shown, one involvement pulls several other units into and down with it.

In sum, interlocking directorates today are as bad if not worse in terms of the public interest as they were decades ago. They should be phased out in a minimal time. The bill I have joined in sponsoring allows for an adequate period of time. We must act as soon as possible.

FOOTNOTES

¹ See Edward S. Herman, "Conflicts of Interest in the Savings and Loan Industry." Study of the savings and loan industry, prepared for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., July, 1969, Vol. II, pp. 763-969, for this and other analyses of savings and loan conflicts of interest discussed below.

² "Commercial Banks and Their Trust Activities: Emerging Influence on the American Economy," Staff Report for the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, July 8, 1968, Vol. I, p. 3.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., p. 896.

⁵ Op. cit., Edward S. Herman.

BURIAL COSTS FOR THE SST

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House voted to kill the big bird, but we have not heard the end yet, because those who wanted to kill the big bird are now keeping it alive.

As we all know, the original request to continue the program was \$143 million for the two prototype planes. This was rejected by both bodies. We are now spending, to phase out the program, \$85.3 million for Boeing Co. and General Electric Co., and \$12 million to the Department of Transportation for administrative costs to cover the auditing and packaging for \$864 million in equipment already invested in the program, which total \$97.3 million.

There is another \$58.5 million that must be paid to the airlines for moneys that have been advanced to the program as an investment on their part: \$15 million by Pan American World Airways, \$11.5 million by Trans World Airlines, \$6 million each by American Airlines and United Air Lines, \$5.5 million by Northwest Airlines, \$4.250 million by Eastern Airlines, \$3 million each by Continental and Delta Airlines, \$2.250 million by KLM Royal Dutch Airlines, and \$2 million by Braniff Airways. This brings the grand total for phasing out the SST to \$155.8 million, and there are some of us who feel this is not the end of moneys to be requested for phasing out this program.

What a sorry sight it was for many Americans who were in the gallery, and especially for me, when the House of Representatives quibbled, as children do, to avoid their responsibilities of going along with the other body, which on this issue of paying back the airlines, acted much more maturely. We differed from the other body in not voting for the \$58.5 million for the airlines, but the proponents for the SST said come back later, hold hearings, and then we will appropriate the money, but not now. For some reason best known to their own consciences, they refused to let the big bird die after all.

In the meantime, hundreds upon hundreds of American technicians, skilled workers, and engineers, who are part of the great middle class of America, have now joined the growing ranks of the unemployed and the poor. These people are not paying taxes, as they

would be if they were employed. Our anticipated tax collections are behind, our deficits are becoming greater, and under the guise of economy, we are creating greater unemployment and we are allowing Russia and France to take the lead in the airline industry over American industry. Hurrah for those who want to protect the downtrodden and the poor by reducing the number of engineers, skilled workers, and technicians who are employed and by increasing the number of poor on welfare in this country. With friends like this, it is a miracle that the laboring people of America have gone as far as they have.

Mr. Speaker, the May 22 edition of the Chicago Daily News carried an editorial supporting the view that it is our responsibility to reimburse the airlines. The editorial follows, as well as an article from the May 22 edition of the Chicago Tribune, about the statement of William Magruder, director of supersonic transportation development for the Department of Transportation, that the \$500 million to \$1 billion cost estimate of William Allen, board chairman of Boeing Co., was not correct and that a figure closer to \$200 million would have been more accurate for restarting the program. Additionally, an editorial from the May 24, Chicago Tribune, follows, which comments on this inflated cost estimate.

Nevertheless, as this controversy continues the Soviets begin demonstrating their TU-144 supersonic transport at the Paris Air Show, we can be sure for the present that America is taking second place to France and Russia in the air.

The above-mentioned material follows: [From the Chicago Daily News, May 22-23, 1971]

BAD RAP FOR AIRLINES

We are pleased to see Congress scuttle the supersonic transport project, but the House in its final action did an injury to the U.S. airlines that should be rectified.

While voting to reimburse Boeing and General Electric \$97.3 million for certain accrued costs, it refused, 157-116, to repay the airlines \$58.5 million they had invested in the SST. This was in spite of prior Senate and joint committee action approving the repayment.

The Senate was right. If the SST had been abandoned for technical failure, the airlines would have no cause to complain. But Congress foreclosed the project by a political decision, leaving the airlines high and dry.

Since the airlines thus lost their \$58.5 million by act of Congress, Congress should compensate in full.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 22, 1971] MAGRUDER CALLS BOEING'S HIGH SST REVIVAL

ESTIMATE MYTH

(By John Maclean)

WASHINGTON, May 21.—William Magruder, director of supersonic transport development for the Department of Transportation, said today the Boeing Co. regarded the SST as a poor business venture and, as a result, estimated the cost of reviving it at \$500 million to \$1 billion.

Magruder declared that those figures are "just myth."

ENTHUSIASM AT FIRST

He said Boeing and General Electric Co. officials at first reacted enthusiastically when informed of the efforts to revive the project in Congress.

Therefore, Magruder said, it came as a great surprise to the Nixon administration when William Allen, board chairman of Boeing, gave his \$500 million to \$1 billion cost estimate.

Magruder, speaking at a luncheon with reporters, recounted a series of talks between Nixon administration aides and company officials which apparently led to some bitter misunderstandings.

NIXON AIDE PHONES

Magruder said he was in the Virgin Islands recuperating from a gall bladder operation when he was telephoned by William Timmons, assistant to the President for congressional relations. Timmons told him the administration was quietly trying to reactivate the SST project.

Magruder then telephoned officials of Boeing and G. E., the two prime SST contractors, and asked them for their reactions to the revival attempt.

Magruder said T. A. Wilson, president of Boeing, laid down 10 conditions, including a new contract, and some assurance the project would not be subject to annual votes by Congress.

Magruder said he told Wilson this was negotiable. Magruder said Wilson and Gerhart Neumann, head of the G. E. engineering division making the SST engine, both were enthusiastic.

Magruder said starting-up costs were estimated at \$200 million or less.

CREDITED FOR REJECTION

However, the day after the House voted to revive the SST, Allen made his estimate of starting costs.

The high figures quoted by Allen are generally credited by adversaries and proponents of the SST alike as having destroyed any chances for revival in the Senate.

"There were very strong feelings the Senate would pass it," Magruder said. "The only thing we can conclude is that G.E. and Boeing didn't want to get engaged in this thing and Bill Allen made his speech."

"There has been an eroding attractiveness to these companies of the program. When they bought into it in 1967 it was a great piece of business. In 1970 it wasn't."

Magruder said he was ordered to return to Washington as a result of Allen's estimate. Wilson was also asked to the White House for a discussion.

"No one could find any justification for the billion dollar figure," Magruder said today.

Magruder said he submitted a figure near \$200 million, but no agreement was reached.

"All these figures of \$500 million and \$1 billion are just myth," he said. "They didn't even negotiate with the subcontractors so they don't know how much it would have cost."

"It was unfortunate the way it was done—there could have been some indication beforehand."

Meanwhile today, Allen spoke at the National Defense Transportation Day luncheon of the Traffic Club of Washington after earlier receiving the National Transportation Award in recognition of Boeing's 747 jumbo jet. The award was presented to Allen by Vice President Agnew in Agnew's office. Allen dropped the award, a silver bowl, during the presentation ceremony.

Later, Allen told his luncheon audience he was convinced that any future American SST will require some form of public financial backing.

"Certainly, it will depend on public support in the form of good will," Allen said.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 24, 1971]

A LESSON FROM THE SST

The Boeing supersonic transport bounced into the air recently in the House of Representatives only to crash once again in the Senate, this time by the most decisive vote yet—58 to 37. Opponents were helped,

paradoxically, by the statement of the Boeing company itself that it might take as much as \$1 billion to get the project moving again after having been shut down by Congress last March.

With that announcement by Boeing, even the White House conceded that its battle for the SST was as good as lost.

Of course the corpse may come to life again; indeed it is safe to predict that sooner or later we are going to have an American SST no matter what Congress does or doesn't do.

Be that as it may, the painful experience of the SST has already taught us once again the incompatibility of politics and commercial ventures. Private enterprise can and must take risks. It can and must study every aspect of a proposed investment—its costs, its chances for making a profit, and its dangers—and when a decision is made, it is because management is pretty sure it is the right one.

Few members of Congress have the time or the inclination for this sort of study. Pitifully few of them knew enough about the issues, especially the economic factors, to make a sound judgment on the SST. Instead, they let themselves be buffeted about by gusts of conflicting hopes and fears, many of them arising out of public emotionalism.

Certainly the effect of the SST on the environment was a proper matter for Congress to consider. If Congress had done its homework, it would have considered this in 1969, when it first approved the SST. But almost nothing was said about ecology then. Later, when the environment became a subject of popular concern, the objections to the SST gushed forth in an outpouring of emotion, like the contents of Richard Armour's ketchup bottle: first none'll come and then a lot'll.

This isn't the way to run a business project. When there is complete unanimity about what to do (which is rare in politics), or when politicians are not let in on the secret (as with the development of atomic power during World War II), the vast resources of the government can be strikingly effective. But on other occasions, which is 99.9 per cent of the time, a political body can't muster the unanimity or the drive to see a project like the SST thru to an efficient and successful conclusion. Congressmen are more interested in doing what appeals at the moment to the folks back home—and if this means wasting some taxpayers money, so be it. In a democratic government, this is probably inevitable—which is why government should not meddle in industry any more than necessary. Maybe Boeing warned of the cost of reviving the SST deliberately to avoid going thru again what it already went thru. William Magruder, White House spokesman for the SST project, suggests this is what happened. If so, we wouldn't blame Boeing.

PRESERVING THE ATLANTIC SALMON—ELOQUENT TESTIMONY BY RICHARD BUCK, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ATLANTIC SALMON EMERGENCY

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the last year, conservationists and sportsmen have vigorously protested commercial fishing activities which threaten the existence of our remaining Atlantic salmon. After the wintering grounds of these majestic sportfish were first discovered off Greenland in the mid-1960's, commercial fishermen moved to exploit them. By 1970 the situation had become critical. Though conservationists

protested that high-seas fishing could mean extinction, these fishermen have continued to take large catches from the wintering grounds.

Because of the outcry of conservationists, every fishing nation except Denmark has agreed to stop taking salmon on the high seas. The refusal of the Danish Government has caused an outcry of concern for the fate of the Atlantic salmon.

One form of the concern is found in three bills which have been filed in the House providing that there shall be a ban on imports of fish from any country which does not agree to measures to conserve the Atlantic salmon. These bills, one of which I sponsored, are openly directed at the one country which refuses to practice necessary conservation measures, Denmark.

This morning, a public hearing on these bills was held before the Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I attended the hearing and testified myself. Among those testifying was Richard Buck, of Hancock, N.H., who is chairman of the Committee on the Atlantic Salmon Emergency—CASE. Mr. Buck gave excellent testimony on the background of the situation, and outlined the need for legislation to pressure the government of Denmark into conserving the Atlantic salmon. Also testifying was sportscaster Curt Gowdy, of Boston.

The Committee on the Atlantic Salmon Emergency deserves our sincere appreciation for its efforts to focus attention on the plight of our remaining Atlantic salmon. Thanks largely to its efforts, conservationists in the United States are aroused and are demanding action. These conservationists refuse to let the Atlantic salmon go the way of so many other species of animals, birds, and fish, which have become extinct as the result of unwise and unthinking exploitation. They refuse to let this superb game fish be taken in such numbers that it will not return to its native rivers to spawn.

A bitter irony of this situation is that this massive fishing on the high seas which now endangers the Atlantic salmon comes at a time when the United States is spending many millions of dollars to clean up our rivers and streams so that they will once again be able to support the Atlantic salmon. In addition, much money is being spent at this very time in fish hatcheries raising stock to restore salmon to the rivers of New England. Also, fish ladders are now being required on existing dams on the Connecticut and other rivers, so that the Atlantic salmon may again be able to make its run up those rivers to spawn. At the very time that all of this is being done to restore the Atlantic salmon, fishermen almost entirely from Denmark are threatening these fish where they are especially vulnerable, on the high seas.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of these remarks, I will place in the Record the eloquent comments of Richard A. Buck, chairman of the Committee on the Atlantic Salmon Emergency, and leader of the effort to conserve this valuable resource. His forceful testimony deserves to be read by all who care for the future of our Atlantic salmon.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT BY RICHARD A. BUCK

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished members of this Committee, it is a great privilege for the Committee on the Atlantic Salmon Emergency to come before you, for the purpose of making a Statement in support of House Bills 3304, 3305, and 3841.

The Committee on the Atlantic Salmon Emergency, popularly known as "CASE" was organized in 1970 to develop programs designed to increase worldwide stocks of Atlantic salmon, focusing particularly on the threat to conservation of the species on account of high seas fishing, principally by the Danes.

In 1965 the Danes moved in on a newly discovered major feeding grounds in the Davis Strait off West Greenland. Each year, they steeply escalated nettings, so that by 1970 they were taking an estimated four hundred thousand salmon, with many thousands more so damaged or lost in the nets that they would perish.

The principal salmon-producing countries, such as the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom and Ireland, and others, have repeatedly protested this ruthless plunder, in the proper international assemblies, and through diplomatic channels.

In the high seas feeding areas, salmon stocks are inextricably intermingled. They come from different spawning streams, different river systems, different nations, different hemispheres. No man, and no type of fishing gear yet known to man, no method of control, can separate them out. Thus high seas fishing takes indiscriminately from perhaps the very river runs needing particular protection, and results in absolutely no rational or effective means of conserving basic stocks or ensuring adequate escapements for spawning. Proper management techniques require that harvesting of salmon takes place only inshore, at the mouths of streams or in the streams themselves. In this fashion adequate stocks can be maintained for each particular river run. This is known to be the basic position held by the United States and other governments, by leading world biologists, conservationists, and commercial and sport fishermen.

Danish fisheries authorities and the Danish government profess great interests in conservation measures, and it is assumed therefore that they certainly understand this basic tenet of proper management of salmon stocks. Yet they never acknowledge this basic principle, probably because to do so would place them in an indefensible position.

In an attempt to quiet the rising tide of resentment against her unyielding position, Denmark now emits a new smokescreen. She states that she is helping to underwrite the conversion of some high seas salmon trawlers to other types of fishing. Yet she refuses to formalize this reduction. Denmark has further stated that she hopes to tax the high seas salmon fishermen in order to provide funds for a restoration of salmon rivers. Our reply to this has been that we would encourage such an undertaking, because Denmark, as a salmon-producer herself, would then subscribe to the modern management principle that indiscriminate high seas fishing is never justified. Also, we know that a Danish restoration could not be successful for many years, and we cannot condone the possibility of serious depletion of stocks in the meanwhile.

In short, the salmon-producing countries require proof of good intentions now, and not promises of future action.

There are other important reasons for supporting a total ban on this fishing. The Coastal States have substantial investments in propagating and managing the fish. Severe depletion would cause loss of livelihood to tens of thousands of commercial fishermen all around the North Atlantic shores. It would bring an end to sport fishing for Atlantic salmon.

The only international body set up to work towards conservation measures in this feeding area is the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF), but this convention lacks the authority to control dissenters. For three straight years, against the weight of world opinion, Denmark has refused to agree to cease high seas operations. There is no law that can stop her.

At the upcoming meeting next week in Halifax, of this International Commission (ICNAF), the Danes will probably propose an extension for 1972 of the one-year compromise amendment which applies in 1971. Few people realize that this amounts not to a 2-year freeze, but a 4-year license to over-exploit! As follows—in 1969 the high seas take was 1200 metric tons; in 1970 it was 940 tons (but could have been more); in 1971 it is fixed at 1200 tons, and an extension at ICNAF this June would permit 1200 tons.

Such a state of limbo represents no improvement whatsoever, so where do we go from here?

In the opinion of CASE, only political and economic pressure will cause Denmark to cease this ruthless plunder.

Our CASE Committee has not yet issued a Formal Call for an all-out Boycott by Americans of all Danish products, but we have it under active and serious consideration. No one wants a boycott, but people historically have arrived at this frame of mind as a last resort. Many Americans have already taken this route, and adopted their own informal family boycotts. This CASE Committee, with complete confidence that it enjoys the respect and following of leading conservation organizations and substantial numbers of private citizens, feels that the Atlantic salmon crisis today is either at, or very near, this point of determination.

A delegation representing our Committee has just returned from Copenhagen, where our mission was to inform the Danish government and the Danish public of the desire by many Americans for aggressive action. We appealed for a cessation of this reckless and uncivilized practice. We met with the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. We presented positions and statements from conservation organizations, including state governmental agencies, condemning the high seas fishery. We received no encouragement whatsoever.

Thus time is of the essence. For the present, the CASE Committee feels that the enacting into law of these salmon bills could act to postpone, and perhaps even to prevent, the probability of an all-out boycott of Danish products by the American public at large.

The corollary to this legislative action should be its implementation through certification by the Department of Commerce.

Such legislative, and subsequent executive, action by the United States government would clothe with dignity the forceful acts necessary to the conservation of a valuable national resource. Such a course is vastly preferable to an unofficial boycott which should be undertaken by the citizens only as the final persuader.

The Committee on the Atlantic Salmon Emergency strongly recommends that your Subcommittee take favorable action on these bills.

Thank you.

THE MUSEUM SERVICES ACT

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today of introducing on behalf of myself and my distinguished col-

league, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI), H.R. 8677, the Museum Services Act.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be joined in the introduction of this measure by my good friend, Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI has been deeply concerned with the future of museums in the great city of Chicago and recognizes the important role museums play in contributing to the vitality of America's cities. His leadership in sponsoring the Museum Services Act is clear evidence of his commitment to increasing the support necessary to the strength of America's museums.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill, I believe it appropriate to quote the words of that superb analysis of America's museums, the Belmont Report, which was prepared by a special committee of the American Association of Museums for the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities in response to a request in 1967 by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

A PRICELESS NATIONAL TREASURE

The Belmont Report was addressed to what it called "a priceless national treasure—the works of art, the historic objects and scientific collections in the custody of American museums."

Said the Belmont Report:

In scope and magnitude this treasure is unmatched by that of any great nation, and it has enriched the minds and lives of countless Americans. Once lost, it can never be replaced.

Today the institutions which have this treasure in their custody are in serious trouble. The totally unpredicted popular success of American museums has strained their financial resources to the breaking point, has compelled them to deny service to much of the public and will require many of them, unless help comes, to close their doors.

Museums have arrived at the point where they can no longer preserve and exhibit the national treasure without substantial national aid.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, the museums of today are victims of their own extraordinary success. Thirty years ago, attendance at America's 6,000 museums totaled some 50 million visits a year. That figure has now soared over 300 million, and is rapidly climbing higher.

The increase of our population, the growth in leisure time, and the rising interest among Americans of all ages in seeing works of art, objects of historical interest, and collections of scientific and technical artifacts—all these forces contribute to a popularity which is flattering for our museums but which thrusts them into financial crisis.

INCREASING EDUCATIONAL DEMAND

Mr. Speaker, what is particularly striking about this increase in the popularity of our museums is the extent to which there has been a rise in demand for their services as educational institutions. From the Anacostia branch of the Smithsonian Institution in the East to the new Oakland Museum and San Francisco's Exploratorium of the Arts and Sciences in the West, museums are reshaping themselves to serve both children and adults as learners. Hundreds of thousands of schoolchildren visit our

large museums daily, while there is hardly a city in America without a museum providing lecture series, guided tours, and other opportunities to make a classroom of the past and a center of learning for the future.

This increased attendance is of vast benefit to all Americans, yet for individual museums—museums of all shapes, sizes, and purposes—it means sharply heightened costs. More trained staff, guards, guides, acquisitions, exhibits, maintenance, buildings, insurance—all of these are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, no one suggests that the Federal Government should now assume the burden of supporting American museums. Museums have always been an example of voluntarism at its best, for they are supported in large part by gifts of money for expenses and valuable objects for collections.

But it is obvious that to the extent that museums are providing an educational service benefiting everyone, they should be considered eligible for public support. In this decade, when nonformal and extracurricular forms of education are assuming a new importance in the world of learning, it is appropriate that the Federal Government should consider making a significant increase in its present contribution to the support of our museums.

TINY FEDERAL AID

The amount of Federal support to our museums today is tiny; less than 1 percent of their operating costs comes from the Federal Government, this in the form of modest grants from the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities and specialized support for research in scientific museums.

Despite their role in education, museums have benefited little from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and they are excluded from benefits of the Library Services and Construction Act.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) and I are today introducing, is designed to act directly upon the needs of museums. It provides funds to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the renovation of museum facilities; to develop and improve services to the public; to preserve and maintain collections; for intermuseum cooperation, including traveling collections and training of personnel; and for specialized services to certain segments of the public such as programs for urban neighborhoods, rural areas, Indian reservations, and penal and other State institutions.

In all of these fields, where philanthropy and local funding have been so important, our bill authorizes Federal funds on a matching basis, with up to 50 percent of project costs available through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, the Museum Services Act also creates an Advisory Committee on Museums in the Office of the Secretary. Consisting of 15 persons representative of museums and their professional organizations, this committee will enable the

Secretary to set his priorities in keeping with the times and with the needs of museums and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a time of immense and growing pressures—of rapid urbanization, of war, of racial and social and economic conflict.

In such a case, we need all the more, if we are to make this land what it ought to be, generously to support those institutions that elevate the character and quality of our national life.

And among those institutions surely are the museums of America and the treasures of mind and spirit and history of which they are the keepers.

America's museums, therefore, need our assistance and merit our support. The Museum Services Act will mean a direct, effective, and long-overdue way of providing these institutions the assistance they need.

THE MUSEUM SERVICES ACT

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert the text of the Museum Services Act:

H.R. 8677

A bill to provide for the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the improvement and operation of museums

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Museum Services Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to ease the financial burden borne by museums as a result of their increasing popularity with the public; to assist museums in modernizing their methods and facilities so that they may better be able to preserve our cultural, historic and scientific heritage; and to encourage and assist museums in their educational role, in concert with formal systems of elementary, secondary, college and university education and in programs of nonformal education for all age groups.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") the sum of \$40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for the next two fiscal years, for carrying out this Act.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) The funds appropriated under section 3 for a fiscal year may be used by the Secretary for making grants to museums—

(1) to support projects assisting in the renovation of museum facilities,

(2) for projects to enable museums to construct or install displays, interpretations, and exhibitions in order to improve their services to the public,

(3) to assist them in developing and maintaining professionally trained or otherwise experienced staff to meet their needs,

(4) to assist them to meet their administrative costs in preserving and maintaining their collections, exhibiting them to the public, and providing educational programs to the public through the use of their collections,

(5) to assist museums to cooperate with each other in the development of traveling exhibitions, meeting transportation costs, and identifying and locating collections available for loan,

(6) to assist programs for improving intermuseum communications and the exchange of information and ideas relating to museum operations and problems,

(7) to develop and carry specialized programs for specific segments of the public such as programs for urban neighborhoods, rural areas, Indian reservations, penal and other State institutions.

(b) Grants under this section may not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of the program or project for which made.

Distribution of Grants Among the States

SEC. 5. Grants under this Act shall be distributed among the States in accordance with such equitable criteria as the Secretary shall prescribe, but the total of payments from the appropriations for any fiscal year under this Act made with respect to museums in any State may not exceed an amount equal to 12½ per centum of such appropriations.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MUSEUMS

SEC. 6. There is established in the Office of the Secretary an Advisory Committee on Museums consisting of fifteen persons representative of museums and their professional organizations. The members of the Committee shall be appointed by the President and shall hold office for three years, except that (1) the members first taking office shall serve, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, five for terms of one year, five for terms of two years, and three for terms of three years, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. The Advisory Committee shall provide information and advice to assist the Secretary in carrying out his duties under this Act.

DEFINITION

SEC. 7. For purposes of this Act, the term "museum" means a public or private nonprofit agency or institution organized on a permanent basis for essentially educational or aesthetic purposes, which, utilizing a professional staff, owns and utilizes tangible objects, cares for them, and exhibits them to the public on a regular basis.

THE MUSEUM SERVICES ACT

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, along with my good friend and colleague, John Brademas, the Museum Services Act of 1971. This bill, which would provide some long overdue financial relief to many of our Nation's museums, is the culmination of almost a year's work on the part of many dedicated people. I would, at this time, like to especially commend my colleague from Indiana, the chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, whose knowledge and understanding of the problems of the fine arts has made this measure possible.

As Mr. BRADEMAS has noted in his remarks, the chief purpose of this legislation is not so much to create and expand but to preserve and repair. America's museums are presently in a very critical period of their existence. Because of the extremely limited amount of money that has been available to them in recent years, most museums have had to forgo much needed repair and remodeling in an attempt to stay in existence. Many of these museums have reached the point where the essentials can be put off no longer. As the director of one of Chicago's leading museums recently remarked in describing the plight of his museum:

This is a solid, substantial, great structure. But buildings are like people. You can ignore your health for a long time, and hope whatever is bothering you will go away, but by and large it catches up with you. We have, in recent years, just been trying to hold the line. Now we must update our buildings.

And, Mr. Speaker, the problems of Chicago's museums are by no means unique. Since I first became involved in this situation last summer, I have talked to museum directors from many of our Nation's cities, both large and small, and their problems are quite similar. They are especially concerned that many of America's greatest treasures, treasures that in many cases predate the Revolution, will be lost for lack of adequate funds. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in our efforts to build a strong tomorrow, we in this Congress, will not turn our back on the keepers of the treasures of the mind and spirit of America that make up our distinguished past.

I feel that this legislation is, as my distinguished colleague has pointed out, "a direct, effective but an overdue way of giving those deserving institutions the aid that they need."

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAs, OF INDIANA, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, TRINITY COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 16, 1971

(Mr. BRADEMAs asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, on May 16, I had the privilege of delivering the address at commencement exercises at Trinity College in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of my remarks on that occasion:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAs

I count it a great privilege to have been invited to speak to you today on the occasion of commencement exercises at Trinity College.

As some of you may not know, I happen to be a member of both The Board of Overseers of Harvard and the Board of Trustees of Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame and last month, therefore, within the space of six days, I found myself voting in favor of the marriage of Harvard to Radcliffe and of Notre Dame to Saint Mary's.

That you should have invited someone with that kind of record to address you at Trinity today is testimony, I trust, to your courage and not to any similar marital aspirations for Trinity with some brother institution in the Nation's Capital.

As a Representative in Congress of the district which is the home of the University of Notre Dame and Saint Mary's College and as a former member of the Saint Mary's College faculty, I feel at home here today at Trinity.

But I feel at home for another reason, the one that brings us together, a common commitment to the enterprise of teaching and learning.

As a Member of Congress for over twelve years now and as one who serves on the committee with chief responsibility for education legislation and moreover, as one who, over a long period, has talked with both teachers and students in this country and abroad, I can say with much assurance that the future of nearly every society depends

in the most crucial way on the kind of investment which that society makes in the most valuable source any society has—educated men and women.

THE CHALLENGES THAT BESET US

And I should like, therefore, today to speak about some of the challenges that confront educated men and women as we seek to shape a truly civilized society.

I begin with the following quotation from an American political leader: "Almost everywhere we look, the story is the same. In Latin America, in Africa, in Asia . . . there is now renewed confidence in our country and our convictions."

I need not tell you that that was not Richard Nixon speaking in May of 1971.

For all the President's capacity to exploit the medium of television to get his message across, even Mr. Nixon would not today dare so confident a pronouncement about the esteem America enjoys in the eyes of other peoples.

Those words were prepared for delivery in Dallas, Texas in November 1963 by President John F. Kennedy, and listening to his words now should make clear to us all that the United States has travelled a long, long way—most of it down—since that flattering, almost jaunty, description of our standing before world opinion.

I shall not here attempt an analysis of what has gone wrong these last eight years.

As former Chief Justice Earl Warren has said, however, "We are . . . in a crisis. We have had many crises in prior years, but none within the memory of living Americans which compares with this one."

Let me only enumerate some of the challenges that beset the American society today, and not only recount but pass judgment.

It seems to me *scandalous*, that in the richest nation in human history, millions should remain poor:

outrageous that decent housing and education and health care are still beyond the reach of millions of our citizens;

alarming that inflation and unemployment are rising at one and the same time; and

shameful that we have not erased the sin of racial discrimination from our souls.

Nor can we find satisfaction in the state of our foreign relations.

That the war in Southeast Asia continues to claim the lives of our young men and sap our national strength must haunt us all.

Looking about America and our world today, we might be tempted to say, like the Old Testament prophet, Daniel, "There shall be a time of trouble such as never was . . ."

But we need not go all the way back to Daniel for this judgment. Only a year ago, a Cornell University scholar, Andrew Hacker, published a book entitled, *The End of the American Era*, which concludes, as one reviewer put it, not only "that America is going to Hell in a wheelbarrow, but what's worse, that it's much too late to alter the course."

Such pessimism should not surprise us, considering the variety and magnitude of the problems we face at home and abroad—only some of which I indicated.

THREE REACTIONS

And in fact we see signs of frustration and despair all about us.

There are several reactions to the afflictions of our society. Let me mention only three of the most obvious and compelling ones.

Some Americans would have us retreat into privatism—to live a life centered on the personal satisfactions of one's family and friends, and not to become involved with that world out there.

At the other end of the line from this new monasticism, which takes many forms, is the argument that we should smash the system which allowed such evils to occur—to destroy

the institutions of society in the hope that Phoenix-like, a new and better time will spring from the ashes of the old.

There is yet a third way in which some would respond to the convulsions of the 20th Century—and that is by choking off the freedoms and liberties which are the birthright of the American people.

I must tell you that I reject all these counsels.

To those who contend that our problems are too grave to handle and therefore would retreat to apathy, I cite Robert Kennedy's plea that we must ward off what he called "the danger of futility." We must, said Senator Kennedy, guard "against the belief that there is nothing one man or woman can do against the enormous array of the world's ills, against misery and ignorance, injustice and violence. . . ."

And I believe, too, as we consider the argument of others that the only way to save our society is to smash it, that we should listen to the question that Abraham Lincoln put in his first Inaugural Address. He said:

"Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it?"

"Will you [Lincoln asked of a nation that was also, if for different reasons, deeply divided] hazard so desperate a step while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to are greater than all the real ones you fly from, risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?"

What, then, am I saying?

I am saying that, caught up in the great multitude of troubles that engulf Americans today, we cannot turn to the paths either of despair, of violence or of repression. None of these courses is satisfactory in either pragmatic or moral terms.

SOME SIGNS OF HOPE

But beyond this, I should like to suggest to you that there are some signs of hope amid darkening gloom.

I say signs of hope because it is as yet too early to say with finality that these harbingers of a better day will prevail.

And I shall confine myself to discussing only three of them.

The first is the resurgence of Congress in our Constitutional system.

The second is the recovery of politics—especially among the students.

And the third is the beginning of a new effort to understand the role of women—and of men in relation to them—in our society.

Let me speak some words about each of these developments.

For a wide variety of reasons—two World Wars, a depression, the general acceptance of the welfare state—the last generation has seen in the United States as well as in other industrialized societies, a significant rise in the power of the executive branch of the government as distinguished from the legislative.

During the last few years, however, there has been—especially in the United States Senate, but also, to a lesser extent, in the House of Representatives, a sharp reaction to this increasing dominance of decision-making by the executive, especially, of course, in the field of foreign affairs.

In 1970, for the first time in the post-war period, Congress began to examine the huge military budget with some skepticism and serious scrutiny, and no longer can the President and the Pentagon assert that patriotism and national security require a rubber-stamp approval by Congress of the Administration's military spending plans.

And you all know that a new phrase has come into the lexicon of us Congressional

politicians, the "need to order our national priorities"—with Senators and Congressmen, both Democrats and Republicans, beginning to say—and to back their rhetoric with votes—"No, Mr. President, don't spend the money there, but here, on meeting some of our urgent needs here at home."

Of course, the fundamental cause of this new assertion of Congressional will is the war in Indochina and a feeling on the part of increasing numbers of Members of Congress that both Presidents Johnson and Nixon, especially, have, in their exercise of presidential prerogatives, with Cambodia and Laos only the most recent examples, gone too far.

A RENASCENT CONGRESS

Indeed, this past week saw fresh evidence of the renaissance Congress in the continuing drive on the part of both Democrats and Republicans in the United States Senate to recover for Congress a significant role in scrutinizing and shaping our foreign policy.

I refer, of course, to the confrontation between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Secretary of State Rogers with respect to the war-making powers of the President.

Or I could also cite the impact already being felt in the House of Representatives of a reform in voting procedures contained in the Congressional Reorganization Act passed last year largely as a result of the efforts of a bipartisan group of younger members of the House.

The reform of which I speak—I shall not take time now with the details—will make it far more difficult for Members of Congress to continue to conceal from the public their votes on such crucial issues as the SST.

These then are just a few examples of the developments that give promise in the years ahead of a resurgent and activist Congress ready and willing to struggle, as the Founding Fathers intended, with the Presidency—and especially with the more activist Presidency of the present day.

Indeed, even now it is Congress, not the executive, that is supplying many of the initiatives for new approaches to solving some of our most pressing problems:

- In education;
- In environmental protection;
- In housing and health care;
- In consumer protection; and
- In coping with unemployment and inflation.

In all these areas—and others—it has been the legislators, working often in bipartisan coalitions and against the opposition of a truculent Administration, that has been out in front, leading.

I for one, therefore, and you may call it self-serving and special pleading if you like—not ready to write off the Congress of the United States as an energizing, creative, force in the American political system.

THE RENAISSANCE OF POLITICS AMONG THE YOUNG

But there is a second development—not unrelated to the one I have just been discussing—that I believe is also a portent of hope for the American experiment in self-government.

I refer to what I would call, with John W. Gardner, the "renaissance of politics," particularly as it relates to American college students.

With the imminent passage of a Constitutional Amendment extending the right to vote in all elections to every American citizen over 18 years of age, I see a great potential force for changing our priorities in this country—young people.

It is a sad fact that an average of less than 60 per cent of the registered voters in America take part in national elections. I would certainly hope that this percentage will be boosted considerably by the full-scale participation of the young voters, and that they,

in turn, will generate a greater concern and interest in voting among older citizens.

It is up to you to undo this generally accepted finding of the authors of the book, *The Real Majority* that "the cold fact is that young people eligible to vote are far less likely to participate than their elders."

It is up to you, the newly enfranchised, to become an integral force within American political life, to work and vote for changes in our priorities; to dive into the fray, not drop out of it.

Indeed, I observed earlier that two of the several possible reactions on the part of young people to the trauma of our times in this country were, on the one hand, despair resulting in withdrawal from political and social action and, on the other, a radicalism and militancy that were intent on destroying the political system.

I think it fair to say that 13 years ago, when I first came to Congress, apathy was the accurate word to characterize the attitude toward politics of most American college students—and I recall visiting campuses all over this country exhorting students to become active in politics.

There have been times in recent years when I think I may have overdone it!

But to repeat—there is another attitude toward the many faceted crises of American life—that of the radical militant who will have none of working within the political system, but would rather smash it.

THE RADICAL MOVEMENT

Let me then here comment briefly on the radical movement in the United States today.

First—a word of admiration—as Michael Novak of the State University of New York at Old Westbury said in a recent issue of the journal, *Christianity & Crisis*, "The movement arises from the effectiveness of the teaching of Jewish, Christian—in a word, personalistic—morality to our young people."

"Many detest the war in Vietnam and, more than that, the bureaucratic, military, imperial, racist attitudes from which it, in part, springs."

"On the other hand," Novak warns, "the radical groups commonly share typical American middle-class deficiencies: impatience, a preference for sentiment and action over intelligence and endurance, a love for the confrontations of *High Noon*, a taste for violence, self-pity, a weakness for taking shortcuts and evading difficulties, anti-intellectualism, a tendency toward slogans and simple solutions, intense sectarianism, a fascination with personal moral purity, and a strange longing for death ('since I probably won't be alive 5 years from now')."

Isolated from other social classes in American life, ideologically confused and discouraged, the main strength of the radical movement derives not from any programs of their own, any new political vision or strategy, but rather from their capacity to point out the weaknesses of the system, and then to protect and resist to say "no" to it.

It must be clear, however, that saying "no" to the shortcomings, the injustices, the failures of American society is not enough.

And I believe that it is this awareness, coupled with some renewed confidence in the possibility that that most criticized and beleaguered of institutions in American life—Congress—may yet prove vital and vigorous enough to provide some alternatives for the nation's future, that has moved some of the country's ablest and most concerned young people to decide to involve themselves in national and local politics.

I regard this kind of attitude on the part of young Americans as enormously encouraging.

It is an attitude directly related to the observation of John Gardner that "many dissidents who resort to destructive tactics say, 'We tried working with the system, but

most have not in fact tried very hard, certainly not within the political system."

"And in this," Mr. Gardner added, "they reflect a failing of the American people generally."

"We have typically scorned politics and rejected the political process..."

"No wonder we're in trouble!"

And rather than dropping out in a fit of pique after he was refused the forum to speak these words at the Illinois State Constitutional Convention, Mr. Gardner went on to form a powerful citizens lobby for change, Common Cause, which has already enlisted more than 115,000 Americans to underwrite an effort to see that our government recognizes the proper priorities.

I said I would speak of three signs of constructive response to the challenges we face.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN

The third is the emergence of what may prove to be the most extensive and intensive dialogue about the role of women in our society and of their relationships to men and to each other.

Clearly this is a subject so vast, so subtle and so complex that it would be impossible, even if I were able, to cover it in one commencement address.

I say, "If I were able," because I remember well the admonition of John Stuart Mill: "We may safely assert that the knowledge men can acquire of women, even as they have been and are, without reference to what they might be, is wretchedly imperfect and superficial and will always be so until women themselves have told all that they have to tell."

So I am trying to educate myself, and if I tell you that I enjoy reading Germaine Greer rather more than I do Betty Friedan, I leave it to you to decide whether this makes me still a male chauvinist.

Let me then address myself briefly to just one aspect of the women's liberation movement—and that is the quite obvious discrimination against women in American colleges and universities and in the professions generally.

This pattern of discrimination is not confined, of course, to higher education, for the secondary status assigned to women in most of American higher education is a reflection of attitudes toward women in Western society generally.

We have not heeded Plato's challenge in the *Laws* that "Nothing can be more absurd than the practice which prevails in our own country of men and women not following the same pursuits with all their strength and with one mind, for thus the state instead of being a whole is reduced to a half."

For although women comprise one half the population in our nation, they make up only 18% of the faculties of our colleges and universities.

Yet even these figures are misleading, for only 9% of the women are full professors.

At Harvard, my own university, there are only two female tenured professors on the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and the pattern elsewhere is not much better.

At that citadel of forward-looking ideas, the University of California at Berkeley, one year ago, just 5% of all associate professors, 5% of all assistant professors, and only 2% of all full professors were women.

Or let us turn to the professions more generally.

Women account for only 8% of all scientists, 6.7% of all physicians, 3.5% of all lawyers, and 1% of all engineers.

And the proportion of women in both graduate and undergraduate education has actually fallen since 1920.

It is as if, with respect to all the professions, we have continued to observe the views of Thomas Jefferson on women in government. To a Mrs. William Bingham, Jefferson wrote in 1788: "Our good ladies, I trust, have

been to wise to wrinkle their foreheads with politics. They are contended to soothe and calm the minds of their husbands returning ruffled from political debate."

Well, I certainly propose no sweeping panacea for the many ways in which we discriminate against women, educated and uneducated, in American life.

SOME CONGRESSIONAL REACTIONS

But as a legislator, I can report to you that Members of Congress are now working on several legislative measures with great potential for expanding opportunities for women in this country.

I here cite only three.

One bill now under consideration would cut off Federal funds to colleges and universities that discriminate against women in student admission and faculty hiring practices.

Another bill, just reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor, would give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission new power to issue cease and desist orders in job discrimination cases, including discrimination on the basis of sex.

A third bill, of which I am a sponsor, would provide Comprehensive Child Development services for millions of preschool children and would also make possible new career opportunities for working mothers.

If you are interested, my subcommittee opens hearings on this bill tomorrow morning at nine o'clock, and the first witnesses scheduled are Congresswomen Shirley Chisholm and Bella Abzug.

BEYOND GOVERNMENTAL ACTION

Because I am a politician, I dwell on the contributions that public policy, through legislation and executive action, can make in assuring greater opportunities for women in our country.

I hasten to assure you, however, that I realize that this question is so profound that it will be necessary, if we are ever effectively to come to grips with discrimination against women in the United States, to go beyond governmental action. Clearly, it seems to me, it will be necessary for both men and women to reevaluate their attitudes toward themselves and each other.

And, if I may interject another cautionary note, I hope that the women's liberation movement will find a philosophical base that stresses the common humanity of both men and women, without denigrating either.

So for all of these reasons—and more—I find much to hope for, for both men and women and for constructive change in our society, in the women's liberation movement.

A SUMMARY

But now I must conclude.

Let me summarize what I have tried to say.

Looking across the wide spectrum of problems that afflict the United States today, I have offered three developments that afforded us some cause for optimism—

The resurgence of Congress;

A renaissance of politics; and

A new sensitivity about the role of women in our society.

When I say optimism, I do not mean a naive optimism that everything will come out all right in the end, but another, more resolute kind of optimism born of confidence that, again to quote John Gardner, "This country still harbors men and women courageous enough to commit themselves to the struggle for a better world."

And so I have urged you to make that commitment, too, and I remind you now of the words of Albert Camus shortly before he died: "My conclusion will be simple. It will consist of saying in the very midst of sound and fury of our history: 'Let us rejoice'. Let us rejoice at being faced with cruel truths. . . . Let us seek the respite where it is, in the very thick of the battle."

Just five years from now, we shall mark the 200th anniversary of our birth as a nation. I would suggest that it is not too soon to begin celebrating the extraordinary anniversary, not with the fireworks and the music and the dancing which I trust too will be on hand—but rather by beginning *now—today*—to work harder to make real the ideals of the great men of 1776—to the end that the United States of America will indeed be the land of hope and freedom which they envisaged—for all citizens—and once more a land of inspiration to all peoples everywhere who seek liberty and justice and peace.

FREE TRADE: A DEEPENING CRISIS: KENNETH DAVIS' ELOQUENT PLEA FOR REALISM

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Senate Finance Committee heard the testimony of Kenneth N. Davis, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, on America's critically serious trade situation. His statement should be read in full by all who care about America and its position in the world.

While all of Ken Davis' testimony deserves our attention, my remarks here at this time will be limited to one part of it, and are based on my experience with the ball bearing case cited by Ken Davis. A major reason for the present weakness of American industry in international trade is that the American Government refuses to do anything substantial to help American business. There is a built-in bias in the Federal bureaucracy which effectively prevents any assistance to American industry in combating unfair foreign competition, or even in protecting American industry from blatant protectionism abroad. A controlling majority of these Federal bureaucrats wears blinders to foreign protectionism, so that it either does not see or does not act on trade barriers erected by other countries. At the same time, this same set of bureaucrats, who are slaves to the theory of free trade, refuse to take any steps to help American industry lest there be a suggestion of protectionism. A classic case of this is in the Office of Emergency Preparedness. So feared a term is "protectionism" that these entrenched bureaucrats refuse to take steps to protect U.S. industry even when our national security is directly involved.

When the smokescreen of "free trade" is stripped away, the irrefutable fact is that the U.S. Government does not help American industry. It is equally irrefutable that American industry has to compete against foreign companies which receive massive support from their governments, and which are protected in their countries from American competition.

So pervasive is the devotion to "free trade" that these entrenched bureaucrats refuse to even admit that the terms of international trade are unfair, and that as a result we are taking a bad beating.

The eloquent and extremely important testimony of Ken Davis deserves attention. Unless we wake up we are going to be in even more serious trouble.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT BY KENNETH N. DAVIS, JR.

INTRODUCTION

America is in deep trouble in international trade—trouble far more severe and important to the nation than the public has realized. There is growing evidence that our trade difficulties are at the root of two of the most critical problems confronting the nation's policy makers today—persistent high unemployment in the United States and the threatened demise of the dollar as the foundation of the world monetary system.

After many years of balance of payments deficits, our country has reached a crucial turning point. We must make long overdue changes in our trade policy now if we are to continue as the world's leading industrial nation. Unfortunately, despite the crisis atmosphere, there is still no consensus that trade is the fundamental problem. Your hearings have demonstrated again that a basic disagreement continues to divide us. The corrosive and unproductive "free trade" vs. "protectionist" debate rages on. It is vital that your hearings mark the end of this debate. The time has finally come to act!

BACKGROUND

My chief duty at the Commerce Department was to work with American industry on its problems in international trade. Because of my previous business background, I had come to Washington convinced that the world was fast becoming a global marketplace. That the jet freighter and instant communications would inevitably result in a free flow of trade seemed to me to be a foregone conclusion. I am as convinced as ever that we will one day have such a world. But my experience in Commerce convinced me that much more than jets and communications satellites will be required to break down trade barriers and wipe out economic nationalism. I saw firsthand that our trade representatives have no real negotiating leverage to deal with such inequities as Japan's trade and investment restrictions against our companies. I became convinced that stronger action must be taken by the United States to assert its rights to fair and equitable treatment in world trade. New legislation is definitely needed, both to spur U.S. exports and also to prevent the wiping out of major American industries by extreme import penetration.

"MILLS BILL" AND THE "TRADE ACT 1970"

This was why I urged the Administration last June to back the so-called "Mills Bill" providing for quotas on textiles, apparel, and shoe imports to share in the growth of our market. In its limited original form, that legislation would have passed on a bipartisan basis, I believe. It would have given the long-needed signal to the rest of the world that the United States was not going to just talk about fair treatment, but would also act when it had to.

What happened is history. Instead of a limited "Mills Bill," the final Bill became something of a "Christmas Tree" in Committee. Part of the problem was that the Administration refused to back anything but textiles. Why the shoe industry, which had been much more severely impacted than textiles, could not be supported by the Administration was never very clear. But neither the Ways and Means Committee nor your Committee would agree to exclude shoes. The Administration's position has apparently not changed. Now, however, Mr. Mills is no longer backing even textile legislation and hasn't scheduled any hearings on trade in this session. The result of these confusing developments is that U.S. trade policy is sitting on dead center. Your hearings are the only hope in sight for stimulating early action. And the threat to the dollar shows that we must act now.

DETERIORATION OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE POSITION

Industry and labor are facing a rapidly deteriorating situation. Their plight is brought on both by intensive foreign competition and by American producers moving out to other countries to utilize low cost labor to compete in the U.S. What was once a trickle of plant closings and work cutbacks affecting only a few of our older, labor-intensive industries has now become a flood-tide of trouble for most of U.S. business. Even such modern bellwether industries as automobiles and electronics have been severely impacted. Automobile imports, which were only 2 or 3% of our market ten years ago reached 16% in April, up from 12.6% a year ago. Mr. Wright of Zenith told you the tragic story of the virtual elimination of America's radio and TV manufacturing industry. Radios are now practically 100% imported, black and white TV sets 50% imported, and color TV already 20% imported and rising fast. TV would seem to have been a prime example of the kind of new technology product to provide jobs for workers displaced from older industries like textiles. It is fair to ask, if not a giant new industry like electronics, what industry can provide jobs now and for the future? The first sign has been given that auto production jobs will be lost, too. Chrysler has announced that its "mini-car" to compete with the Vega and Pinto will be the Dodge Colt. The Colt will be manufactured completely in Japan by Mitsubishi for Chrysler to sell in the American market!

As of now, there is little hope that U.S. producers can make up for lost market shares at home by increasing export business. You may have noticed the lament of a Ford executive in a recent weekly newsmagazine: "The Japanese can land a Toyota here for \$50 in duty and taxes, while it costs \$450 to get a Pinto into Japan," he said. There will be very few Pintos sold in Japan while tens of thousands of Toyotas are coming here! Mr. Henry Ford spoke vehemently on the subject to his stockholders last week.

Are these just a few isolated examples, or does the claim stand up that there is an overall deterioration of our trade position? And, if true, is the trade problem the main cause of our balance of payments difficulties rather than currency exchange rates or other factors? Here are two charts, one of which I am sure you have seen before, and one of which you may not have seen. The first shows the U.S. balance of payments performance over the years. Note that with one exception, 1968, there has been a steadily growing deficit. From a deficit of about one billion dollars in 1965, the deficit grew to seven billion in 1969. The second chart shows the trade balance of some selected major U.S. industries that have been hurt most by foreign competition. The trade balances of five major industries have been combined in this chart. Automobiles, steel, textiles and apparel, consumer electronics, and shoes show more than a five billion dollar decline in their trade balances in the 1965-1970 period. From a steady surplus in the early 60's they dropped precipitously to a four and one-half billion dollar deficit in 1969, and a 5.7 billion dollar deficit in 1970. It could almost seem that they alone account for the whole U.S. balance of payments slump. There are, of course, other pluses and minuses, but these are among the most extreme problem cases. I do not propose that we attack the balance of payments problem merely by focusing on these industries. What I do suggest is that we cannot cure our balance of payments difficulties if our major industries' trade position continues to deteriorate as fast as this. The nation cannot afford to lose in such a short period the hundreds of thousands of jobs represented by such immense trade losses.

Some have said that adoption of flexible currency exchange rates will restore world

monetary stability. They say that no significant change in U.S. trade policy is needed. In view of these charts, I doubt that they are right. But, even if some type of monetary arrangement could be worked out to postpone facing up to our trade problem, we cannot afford the weakening of our whole industrial framework that a further decline in our trade position will cause. When production is transferred overseas or plants are dismantled, the loss is permanent and unrecoverable. It has been said that when inflation is brought under control all of our problems will be solved. This is just not so! For bringing inflation under control will not reduce imports' share of our market to former levels. And factories that have been dismantled will not be reopened, nor will the jobs which they once provided be restored. Although it may be easier to just wait calmly for better times, businesses all over the country know that the very real problems they are facing in the world of international competition will not be solved by waiting!

ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES AND WORLD REALITIES

Economists in government and in business have played a leading role, and perhaps the leading role, in establishing America's foreign trade policy. Where business and the Congress have been divided into "free trade" and "protectionist" camps, the nation's economists have been almost unanimous in their principles in this area. Across the whole spectrum from liberal to conservative they have strongly backed an extreme free trade posture for the United States, even in the face of restrictive practices by other leading nations. They can take much of the credit for the great achievements in world economic progress since World War II. It seems, though, that the U.S. balance of payments deficits and the world monetary problem also stem from their principles.

One striking recent example of the near unanimity of the economists was their petition against the Trade Act of 1970. Economists across the nation opposed that Bill, largely because of the provisions for quotas on textiles and other products. They likened the consequences of passage of that legislation to those of the infamous Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, although some key factors are actually quite different today. The problem of U.S. manufacturers moving out to low-wage countries to compete in the American market is one phenomenon that is very different from what happened in the 1930's.

Underlying the economists' stand is the principle of "comparative advantage"—each nation should sell that which it finds it can produce most efficiently. If a few nations make all of the textiles or shoes, all well and good. Others will build autos or airplanes or computers. The principle is fundamentally sound and unassailable on theoretical grounds. A corollary concept to "comparative advantage" is the idea of the "adjustment process." When one country cannot withstand foreign competition in a particular industry, that industry should go through an "adjustment" phase into some other field. Again, the principle is sound, particularly when government assistance is provided to help an industry "adjust" out of its traditional business into something else. Economists have put great stress on the Adjustment Assistance provisions of present and proposed U.S. trade laws as the answer for our own industries that are suffering from intense foreign competition. However, there are severe practical limitations to this concept. There are 35,000 textile and apparel companies, for example. They employ some 2.5 million workers, one out of nine of all American factory workers. It would not be feasible to assist even a small part of such a giant industry.

American economists have also generally not been much interested in U.S. exports. They note that exports constitute only 4% of our GNP (while in Europe figures of 15%

to 20% prevail, and in Japan 10%). In these times of fiscal stringency, they are unsympathetic to export-expansion measures that require additional budgetary support, such as improved export credit or more liberal tax treatment for exports.

It is in the practical application of economic theory that difficulty arises. To be truly effective, the principles should be applied evenly in all countries. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Economic nationalism is pursued vigorously in virtually every country except the United States. Where many of our economists consider the balance of payments to be of secondary importance, in other countries the payments position is a matter of top priority. As a matter of basic national policy, they adopt trade rules for their own benefit, often to the serious detriment of the United States' balance of payments and of the business interests of our companies. Our international companies know only too well about foreign governments' activities in matters affecting their vital business interests. There is no comparable U.S. Government intervention in their behalf.

It is necessary to give due weight to the economic principles which, along with foreign relations considerations, have influenced American trade policy so strongly. No major change in trade policy can be effective without the strong support of the nation's economists. Now may be just the opportune moment for this influential group to broaden its view to recognize the practical problems confronting the U.S. in world trade today. It may be that one result of the monetary crisis will be a receptivity both here and abroad to new proposals to save America's trade position at long last.

THE BUREAUCRACY'S BIAS ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Because of my background, your staff asked that I comment on the functioning of "The Bureaucracy."

Foreign trade and economic matters probably involve more government agencies, bureaus, and commissions than any other policy area in government. State, Treasury, Commerce, Defense, Agriculture, Justice, the Special Trade Representative, CIA, USIA, the Tariff Commission, and many others take positions on the important trade issues. The number of problems that come before the interagency working committees or are handled within the individual agencies is simply incredible. Never in business did I encounter the number or variety of problems that people in the trade field in government must handle. With every industry and every country a possible candidate for some problem on any given day, one can appreciate the complex and heavy workload carried by agency personnel.

I was greatly impressed by the knowledge, thoroughness and dedication of the people I worked with, both in Commerce and in other agencies. But I was disappointed by the inefficiency of the decision process and the inflexibility of agency positions. Of greatest concern was the "built-in bias," in nearly every agency, against helping U.S. business if any sort of action against foreign competition might be needed.

I will try to give you an example of what I mean. I want to describe briefly an almost unbelievable case of uncertainty, delay, and a "built-in bias" against assisting U.S. business. It is a still-active matter that shows how lacking in responsiveness our government agencies are, even today.

This is the application of the Miniature and Precision Ball Bearing Industry for Import Relief under the National Security Provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Miniature precision ball bearings are required in thousands of critical products ranging from space and medical science to the most advanced weaponry. The techniques for making these tiny bearings were a United States

exclusive until a few years ago. Now there are only two companies left in this country that are able to make these essential devices. These are the finest, most precise mechanical parts in use today.

The date of this application is January 31, 1969. The decision from the Office of Emergency Preparedness (ruling against the industry) was issued on May 5, 1971, over 27 months after the original filing! It is of interest that since this provision (Section 232) became law, there has been only one decision in favor of import relief—for petroleum—and more than twenty-five decisions against relief. Section 232 originated in the Senate Finance Committee back in 1955. Your Committee has time and again asked that it be made operative, but the bureaucratic resistance persists.

Experienced Commerce staff people told me that this was the best National Security case they had ever seen. The Commerce Department, and after some months of delay, the Defense Department as well, recommended that import relief be granted. The Labor Department attested to the critical skills that would disappear if our two sole remaining producers were lost. The Defense Department has become truly alarmed and has issued orders that all defense procurement of these bearings must be from the U.S. or Canada. It is ironic, however, that within a few days after Defense's announcement in late April, the newspapers carried this item: "New Hampshire Ball Bearings, Inc. announced today that it is closing its Laconia, New Hampshire, plant on May 1. Richard Chervin, the company's president, said that 'The Defense Department's action last week was a constructive step but it was too little and too late.'" The company will transfer what business it has left to its remaining facility. Unfortunately, defense business alone is not sufficient to sustain the industry's capability.

It is not possible to go into all of the details of the case here today, of course! But in a minute or two you can get a feel for it as a clear-cut example of just how impossible it is for an American industry to obtain relief from import competition, despite Congress' intent.

Both of these companies happen to be located in New Hampshire. There are other ball bearing manufacturers, of course, but none with the unique capabilities possessed by these two companies. Each successive lay-off of workers has caused considerable public concern. Their employment is now only half what it was four years ago. Both Senators and Congressmen have actively supported the companies' case with the Executive Branch. It is doubtful that there would even be a decision yet if Congressman James Cleveland had not made a personal crusade of this matter. And yet, after all of these months, a negative decision has been rendered, blaming general business conditions rather than foreign competitors. Paradoxically, existence of significant Japanese competition is acknowledged in the rejection. Can anyone remotely imagine that the Japanese government would have so accommodated one of our industries if a reverse situation existed? It seems obvious that your Committee and the Congress did not expect this kind of decision when Section 232 was put into law. That this and so many other cases have been decided adversely indicates something is seriously wrong!

This is just one example, of course, involving only a few million dollars and several thousand jobs. The National Security implications are alarming in themselves. But this week you are concentrating on much broader economic implications. It is our major industries that must concern you more than smaller cases like this. However, this case does show that our current attitudes are wrong! If we cannot help a vital, small U.S. industry when no significant foreign relations or economic harm could result to

another nation, how can we face the much bigger problems? We must change our attitudes and biases from hindering American business to help it thrive in world competition!

CONCLUSION

I have attempted to make two principal points today. First, America's world trade position is a critically important matter, far more important than is understood by the public. And, second, the United States trade position is in a very grave condition.

I am convinced that meaningful steps to improve our trade position would make a major contribution toward relieving unemployment—hundreds of thousands of jobs are at stake. From the standpoint of the rest of the world, an improvement in the U.S. trade position is essential. Only in that way can we effectively restore U.S. balance of payments stability and preserve the international monetary system.

It will be no easy matter to find a common platform for trade policy that will satisfy all of the diverse elements of business and government. But a common platform must be found, and the futile "free trade" vs. "protectionist" debate stopped.

The Congress, the nation's economists, and the bureaucracy hold the keys to achieving a new direction for U.S. trade policy. Business and labor must change too, but the leadership can only come from Washington. Mr. Chairman, you and your fellow committee members are to be congratulated on bringing the international trade issue to the fore at this critical time. We have been woefully slow to recognize the crisis proportions of the nation's world competitive problems. The painful job of converting entrenched attitudes in the bureaucracy and forging new legislation in the Congress must be accomplished quickly. There is still time to preserve the nation's vital industries by adopting new trade policies now. At stake is nothing less than the fundamental soundness of the American economy. In turn, the stability of the world's economy lies in the balance as well. To have far too much to lose to permit our actions to be "Too little, too late!"

HOUSE RESOLUTION 411

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of Chairman HOLIFIELD of the Government Operations Committee and myself, I would like to address the House briefly with regard to the unique procedure we shall be following tomorrow when the House considers House Resolution 411, a resolution to disapprove the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971.

This procedure is fully explained in a "Dear Colleague" letter sent out over Chairman HOLIFIELD's and my signature today. I submit a copy of this letter at this point in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Tuesday, May 25, 1971, the House will vote on H. Res. 411, a resolution to disapprove the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971. Under this Plan, a new agency named ACTION would be established to administer a number of volunteer programs now located in several different agencies. The pro and con arguments are thoroughly discussed in the Committee Report (House Report 92-222).

Since this will be the first time in the 92nd Congress that the House will consider a resolution to disapprove a Presidential reorganization plan, we wish to remind you of the

unusual procedure involved. Under the reorganization law, a reorganization plan sent to Congress by the President goes into effect unless either the House or the Senate adopts a resolution disapproving the plan within sixty calendar days (with additional time allowed for formal recesses).

If a Member is in favor of the President's Plan, he should vote NO on the resolution to disapprove the Plan. If a Member is opposed to the President's Plan, he should vote AYE on the resolution.

In reporting the resolution, the Committee on Government Operations, by a vote of 22-16, recommended that the President's Plan be allowed to go into effect and that the Members vote NO on the resolution.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman.

FRANK HORTON,
Ranking Minority Member, Legislation
and Military Operations Subcommittee.

PROBLEMS OF RAISING MONEY TO SUPPORT PARTY ORGANIZATIONS AND PAY COST OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems under our system of government has always been how best to raise the money to support party organizations and pay the cost of election campaigns. Today, this problem because of spiraling costs is more acute than ever.

Many thoughtful citizens are concerned over the magnitude of the sums involved—to pay for time on television and radio stations, advertisements in the newspapers, billboards, campaign literature, political rallies, and all other means by which our two major parties present their candidates and platforms to the electorate.

The late Everett McKinley Dirksen, distinguished Senator from Illinois and Republican statesman, wrote of this problem:

The objective of all of us is to preserve our two-party system and to strengthen it. The continuing struggle between the two parties enables our people to know both sides of every issue. That each party, through its candidates, may present its program, large sums of money are required to finance television programs, radio programs, for literature, for advertising, for maintaining headquarters and staffs, and for all the various media through which debate is conducted and the people obtain the facts to make their decision.

It is my opinion that the funds for this purpose should come from private sources. . . . It is for us to find ways and means . . . to encourage all the people to contribute to the party and to the candidates of their choice.

Senator Dirksen went on to cite the United Republican Fund as an outstanding example of success in enrolling large numbers of voters as dues-paying members—an idea which originated with the fund and has since been adopted by other Republican Party organizations and by the Democrats as well.

This year the United Republican Fund of Illinois will mark its 37th year of service as the official money-raising organization of the Republican Party in our State.

During these 36 years the fund has raised more than \$26 million for the support of party organizations, at the National, State, and local levels. The fund has been an innovator. It has developed effective means of political fundraising that have been widely copied, both within our party and among the Democrats.

It was the United Republican Fund of Illinois which originated the \$100-a-plate dinner as an effective means of raising money and rallying support for the party. Another distinguished Republican Senator and party leader, Bob Taft, of Ohio, addressed that first \$100-a-plate dinner in Chicago. It is worthy of note that his son, Bob Taft, Jr., now in his turn representing Ohio in the U.S. Senate, addressed this year's \$100-a-plate Lincoln Day event in Chicago—20 years after his father spoke to the first such affair.

The United Republican Fund of Illinois has been fortunate in the caliber of men who have volunteered to serve as its presidents—among them, in more recent years, Edward L. Ryerson, Charles H. Percy, James C. Worthy, and Fred M. Gillies.

Now, with William Harrison Fetridge as president, the fund is well launched on a program to collect \$2 million in contributions for the support of party organizations through the crucial 1972 elections.

In our two-party system by which opposing policies are presented to the people the role of Republican Party is indeed an essential one under our Constitution and our form of government. The responsibility of the United Republican Fund of Illinois is to raise money needed to keep the party strong.

"AFTER PING-PONG, WHAT?"

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it has occurred to me, as one Member particularly interested in the relationship between the United States and the Pacific Basin, that the recent series of comments following the important break in the Chinese curtain has raised as many doubts as hopes and posed more problems than promise at this point in time. I am impressed that the invitation to the ping pong participants opened a new period in terms of our relationship with China. I am also aware that it provides a new dimension for interpretation of the so-called Nixon policy in the Pacific.

What concerns me is that the U.S. posture not be either misread nor misdirected following the incidents of the recent past. Let me clarify my meaning. As one who has kept rather close contact with our allies in the Pacific, I am very sensitive to the fact that none of these countries really feels that they have a comfortable and solid understanding of what the Nixon policy really means. Given that premise, it can be assumed and can be demonstrated that everything that is said and done presently by the leadership of America

strikes with a most important impact on these countries where they are still trying to discover what the new articulation of policy really means. For this reason, I think we should be particularly careful as to who is speaking and what is being said and understand the sensitivities of our allies and their present problem of determining precisely what the new posture in Asia for America will become.

Now let us look at this matter of the so-called new China policy and potential. It would appear to me that as our pronouncements and our proposals pose the possibility that the United States is proceeding along a path of improved relationships with China, we may promulgate a rash of activities on behalf of our friends in the Pacific to get on the bandwagon. As a matter of fact, some of these may feel that they ought to be out ahead of us in terms of improved relations or new involvements. Certainly anyone looking at the recent occurrences out of the Philippines, Canada, Japan, Thailand, Malaysia, to name a few, would have to read out that where the United States is ready to walk a block, they may be prepared to run a mile. This kind of reaction, I would warn you, could very well upset the delicate balance of power which is important in the making of the future.

So, out of these observations, I conclude that, first, the United States should very early and through the right person, make a constructive statement indicating that the United States intends to stay as a power in the Pacific. But, more than that, that our actions and our activities are geared more to shift the confrontation from the arena of violent and military confrontations to those in the economic and cultural fields. Then, we should take some steps to demonstrate the meaning of this position.

The second area where I think we need some very thoughtful enunciations is in regards to the whole trade posture between China and the United States or any other component in the free world. This understanding should commence with a candid assessment of the Chinese economic and trade picture. First of all, China must be seen at the present moment as something other than a consumer's society. Its present capacity for international trade is slightly over \$4 billion. Furthermore, and most importantly, the control over both the expansion and application of this \$4 billion in trade is in the hands of one single agency. Anyone who now looks at the Chinese market in terms of 600 million Chinese has got to be either uninformed or immensely naive. What must be anticipated and expected and is clearly predictable is that Chinese trade will be a political weapon for the present Communist leaders; and it will be used to benefit the political posture of those leaders, not to enhance the living standards or affect the consuming patterns of the Chinese people. Let me give you an example of what can be expected. If the Chinese have a capability of absorbing 400,000 tons of wheat, then they will take that capability to Canada and indicate that for political concessions and for what will turn out to be either an

economic balance or preferably a surplus, the Chinese will make that market available to Canada. If the Canadians go willingly along, then the next year the Chinese will take the same market potential to Australia and try to make an entirely new deal on the same terms with the Australians. This pattern of using the market condition in China as a lever for Chinese international politics is just as surely the future of Chinese action as is the fact that the sun will come up in the morning. Japanese, the Americans, or anyone else who sees anytime in the near future a level of consumer oriented market with diversified buyers is headed for deep disillusionment.

So, I suggest that although we should definitely and certainly move our confrontation into the economic and cultural area, we must exercise the caution and the concern that is dictated by the Communist Chinese mentality and methodology in these fields. Unless we have this kind of thinking and preparation in our policies, then many things may go awry and will require substantial effort to make straight.

So, what I conclude finally, Mr. Speaker, is that, after ping-pong, we may very well, and I think hopefully will, move into an arena of confrontation more economic and cultural than military and violent, even though these latter two will not go away. But we will have all the trouble in these two new arenas that we had in those areas of confrontation we have been used to over the last 20 years. And, if we show our friends in the Pacific that we know and understand this, they are going to be greatly comforted and will be far more able to understand the emergence of our new policy and posture.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the attached article which appeared in today's Washington Post. It is comforting to know that the above thesis has the agreement of the conference of Asian experts.

The article follows:

ASIA EXPERTS URGE U.S. TO CLARIFY POLICY
WARRENTON, VA., May 23.—Asia scholars and diplomats called today for a clarification of the Nixon Doctrine, particularly because of what they see as growing isolationism in the United States.

Some 180 scholars, government representatives and labor and business specialists on Asia attended a three-day conference on Asia's prospects for peace, development and security in the 1970s.

Attention was focused on the new balance of power developing in Asia as a result of the reduced U.S. military presence on the mainland and the withdrawal of British forces east of Suez.

In a concluding statement, the scholars said the question now is how to evaluate U.S. commitments for defense and security in an Asian situation where China, the Soviet Union and Japan all serve as power centers.

A second major impact on the region is the spectacular rise of Japan to world economic power.

Prof. Richard L. Walker of the University of South Carolina, who presided at the conference, called for Asian countries to become aware that their future depends on reinvolved with the West, not with disengagement. He listed among other problems the encouragement to guerrilla violence from Peking.

ADMINISTRATION FLAUNTS WILL OF CONGRESS—REFUSES TO IMPLEMENT RYAN MITCHELL-LAMA AMENDMENT TO 1970 HOUSING ACT

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there is an old and familiar expression—where there is a will there is a way. Unfortunately, the current relationship of the Congress and the executive seems not to abide by that *modus operandi*. The Congress appropriates funds. The administration refuses to release \$12 billion of these moneys. The Congress passes the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695, authorizing \$10 million for fiscal year 1971. The administration refuses to request any funding for the programs authorized by this new, and extremely important, law.

A like fate has befallen section 118 of the 1970 Housing and Urban Development Act, which incorporates my bill in the 91st Congress—H.R. 49—making State and locally financed limited profit housing projects constructed prior to 1969 eligible for section 236 rental assistance subsidies.

Section 118 builds on a previous bill of mine which was incorporated in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. That bill made State and locally financed limited profit housing projects eligible for section 236 interest subsidies. Probably the best known of the programs thereby made eligible are the New York State and New York City Mitchell-Lama programs.

The first bill of mine, incorporated in the 1968 Act, was limited to projects constructed or rehabilitated following the enactment of the act. Consequently, my endeavors following its becoming law were directed at expanding coverage to include projects built prior to the 1968 act's becoming public law. We succeeded in achieving this end with the incorporation of my bill in the 91st Congress into the 1970 act.

The result of the 1970 legislation, combined with that of the 1968 legislation, is that Mitchell-Lamas can receive Federal subsidies to help meet the interest payments on the mortgages covering the projects. These subsidies may cover the difference between the interest being paid, and the expenditures which would be made were the interest rate 1 percent. This sounds complicated, but when translated into terms of rental costs, this subsidy's importance becomes crystal clear.

The rule of thumb is that each percentage point of interest being paid on a mortgage translates into \$4.50 per room per month in rental or carrying charges. Thus, if a Mitchell-Lama project is covered by a mortgage whose interest rate is 7 percent, and the section 236 subsidy is used to bring that rate down, in effect, to 1 percent, the renter of a four room apartment can experience a rental reduction of 6 times \$4.50 times 4, or \$108. Of course, because of soaring maintenance expenses, and other costs, the renter, or cooperator, may not ex-

perience such a large drop. But the subsidy at least helps him to hold the line against increases, the increases due to maintenance being offset by the subsidy for the interest rate.

In New York City, this section 236 subsidy is of crucial importance. New Mitchell-Lama buildings are now coming in with rentals and carrying charges of as high as \$75 or \$80 per room per month. Moderate income families simply cannot afford these massive expenditures for what is a basic necessity—shelter. That is why the section 236 subsidy is so important—it can significantly lower these costs.

Older Mitchell-Lamas are in the same straits. Buildings which at one time had reasonable rentals are now being hit with enormous increases. One reason for this is increased maintenance expenses. Taxes also account for the rise. And, in addition, buildings which have to go into permanent financing have to pay current high interest rates, much in excess of the rates being paid while they remained on temporary financing.

Section 118 of the 1970 Housing and Urban Development Act is aimed at providing some relief for projects under temporary financing, by making them eligible for section 236 subsidies.

I want to stress—also—that, while I have spoken particularly of the Mitchell-Lama programs, because they are the programs with which I am most familiar, similar programs exist in several other States, including Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Illinois, Delaware, Michigan, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and West Virginia.

Despite the manifest need for implementation of section 118—the expression of Congress will—the administration refuses, in fact, to implement it. By letter of May 10, 1971, Assistant Secretary-Commissioner Eugene A. Gulledge, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Administration, has informed me:

Due to the limited amount of Section 236 funds available, we feel that efficient utilization of contract authority precludes this Department from subsidizing existing dwelling units financed under State and local programs as permitted by Section 118(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970.

Assistant Secretary-Commissioner went on to add:

If additional funds are made available to provide for implementation of Section 118, we will be pleased to reevaluate our position on this matter.

Implementation of section 118 is essential, and references to lack of funds are totally inadequate. They are particularly inadequate in light of the administration's posture regarding funding for section 236. The 1970 Housing Act provides an additional \$25 million of contract authority for section 236 for fiscal year 1971. The administration refused to request any funding for that. The authorization for fiscal year 1972 is \$200 million; the administration has only requested \$175 million.

If all that stands between section 118 of the 1970 act and its implementation is lack of funds, then the administration should request the full authorized funding for section 236.

The administration continues to flaunt the will of the Congress, as expressed by clear legislation. So long as it does so, it flaunts the will of the people.

Following is a copy of Assistant Secretary-Commissioner Eugene A. Gulledge's letter to me of May 10, informing me of the administration's refusal to implement section 118 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RYAN: This is in reply to your inquiry of March 19, 1971 concerning the implementation of Section 118 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970.

Due to the limited amount of Section 236 funds available, we feel that efficient utilization of contract authority precludes this Department from subsidizing existing dwelling units financed under State and local programs as permitted by Section 118(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970.

Congress has recently reaffirmed the national goal of providing a decent home and living environment for every American family. It is the intention of the Administration to increase the supply of decent, safe housing. Priority, therefore, must be given to new or substantially rehabilitated housing.

If additional funds are made available to provide for implementation of Section 118, we will be pleased to re-evaluate our position on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
EUGENE A. GULLEDGE,
Assistant Secretary-Commissioner.

TRIBUTE TO CARROLL W. PARCHER

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fiftieth anniversary that Carroll W. Parcher, publisher and editor of the Glendale News-Press, Glendale, Calif., has been in the newspaper profession. Affairs are being held in his honor in the district during this week, and I particularly wanted to express my comments in the Record.

Ever since I first met Carroll back in 1948 when I was a candidate for the 43d assembly district to the California legislature, he has been 100 percent cooperative, fair, and honest with me, and of tremendous assistance. Of course, everybody does not always agree on all positions another person takes. I have not always agreed with his positions anymore than he has agreed with me on all of mine. But in setting forth his positions, his reasoning has been on the basis of Americanism, always in support of the Constitution and the freedoms.

He has been completely fair with me at all times. Even though he did not agree with me, he never tore me apart. His position was explained in a straightforward, fair and cooperative manner.

Covering the span of a half-century of reporting, Carroll Parcher has led a busy and active life. Many honors and awards have come his way in recognition of his outstanding career. These include the Service to Mankind Award of Sertoma International, Certificate of Distin-

guished Service from the American Legion, Lions International Achievement Award, Liberty Bell Award of the Glendale Bar Association, Award of Merit—Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Theta Sigma Psi Printer's Devil Award.

He has served as president of the California Press Association as well as the California Newspaper Publishers' Association. He is past president of the Los Angeles Professional Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, the California Newspaperboy Foundation, Inc., and the Verdugo Club of Glendale, Calif. Also, he is a past lieutenant governor of the California-Nevada District, Kiwanis International. His activities include being a director of the Southern California Visitors Council and of Copley Press, Inc. He has also served as chairman of the board, Verdugo Savings and Loan Association, Sunland-La Canada, Calif.

Membership in various organizations includes American Newspaper Publishers' Association, American Society of Newspaper Editors, Glendale Kiwanis Club, Jonathan Club of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Press Club, National Press Club, Washington, D.C. as well as Native Sons of the Golden West and the Verdugo Club.

Carroll Parcher is the most outstanding publisher and editor that I have had the privilege of knowing during my entire political career. It is a distinct honor and a great privilege for me to bring to your attention the fiftieth anniversary of one of our all-time greats in the journalism profession.

MINING ENGINEERING GRADUATES LAUNCHED INTO "SNAKE PIT OF PUBLIC CONTROVERSY"

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one does not expect the director of an old-line Federal establishment to enter the forensic lists clad with the armor of the now generation. Nevertheless, that is exactly what happened on May 20, when the Honorable Elbert F. Osborn, Director of the United States Bureau of Mines, addressed the 1971 graduating class of the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology at Socorro, N. Mex.

Dr. Osborn's remarks were not, thankfully, from the traditional mold for commencement speeches. One could even go so far as to say his was a hard line address. For example, he told the class—

You, at least most of you, have chosen careers in fields related to mineral resources. And this choice, whether you know it or not, is going to land you in a snake pit of public controversy over some of the most monumental problems to bedevil Americans in the twentieth century.

The Director was obviously referring to the tremendous, complex, and often frustrating problems associated with the use of our natural mineral resources. Now that the public is becoming aroused over environmental problems, Dr. Osborn's warning about the future came not a minute too soon. It is a surely a truism of the first rank that if any of the

present crises surrounding the mining and/or use of minerals are to be solved, a new breed of mining engineer is needed; the training of such an engineer is one of the primary concerns of our society.

Unfortunately, there are all too few of us in the United States concerned with the long-range future of the academic disciplines and sciences connected with mineral resources engineering. Dr. Osborn cited the dismal statistics which show a crisis proportion decline in the number of schools and graduates in the mineral sciences. He cited the brain drain away from these disciplines and I can only add that I am relieved to learn that the extent of the national problem is felt at the highest levels of the Federal Government.

Concern at the highest levels of government is not sufficient if we are to do something about the problem of our decreasing brain power in the mineral sciences. There is, however, a vehicle upon which the Nation could ride to a renewed preeminence in this field. I refer of course to my bill, H.R. 6788, which will establish mining and mineral research centers throughout the country. The bill's sponsors—Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. McCLEURE of Idaho, Mr. DENT and Mr. McDADE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WYATT of Oregon—are convinced, as is Dr. Osborn, that the logical way to prevent a complete and irreversible disaster in mineral sciences education is to attack the problem now. Our bill will accomplish this.

The need for a strong, progressive, and environmentally aware U.S. mineral industry is obvious. But that segment of America's economic strength cannot grow, cannot develop new techniques of extraction and processing, cannot attract new talent, cannot develop methods of environmental protection unless there is a commitment to improvement. The Congress of the United States is the one place where such a commitment can be made.

I feel confident that Dr. Osborn will support the concept embodied in our bill as he is in a unique position as Director of the Bureau of Mines to appreciate the seriousness of the current lag in minerals education.

The director did not devote all of his excellent commencement address to the subject of mining education; in fact, he succinctly covered the total field of problems facing the industry. As a summary of the mining/mineral situation throughout the country and as a call to action to improve the future of the industry, his speech is well worth reading. I have appended his address to my remarks:

REMARKS OF DR. ELBERT F. OSBORN

Being here today is a special pleasure for me. I am an academic by profession, and a bureaucrat by circumstance only. Leaving the pressures of Washington behind for the relative serenity of the academic community is a kind of holiday.

Therefore, it is with reluctance that I find I cannot fully play the role assigned to me today. As a commencement speaker I feel I should be programmed to utter traditional phrases and sentiments that seem in no way adequate to this particular occasion.

For example, it is customary to congratulate the graduates on their achievement,

and I will: congratulations. It is also customary to claim that the graduates are "setting out on the great journey of life," and so you are. But today—here in the Spring of 1971—there is an exceedingly important consideration that I want to bring before you.

You, at least most of you, have chosen careers in fields related to mineral resources. And this choice, whether you know it or not, is going to land you in a snake pit of public controversy over some of the most monumental problems to bedevil Americans in the twentieth century.

That may not sound much like the careers you had in mind for yourselves. After all, geology, mining engineering, and metallurgy are sober, respectable, decidedly unspectacular disciplines, are they not? If you wanted to be a social activist you wouldn't have majored in geophysics, right? If you were out seeking conflict and controversy you wouldn't be a ceramic engineer, would you?

If that's how you've been thinking about your future careers, I'm afraid I'm going to have to disillusion you. You are heading into rough waters—every one of you. For very soon—it is already beginning to happen—the disciplines you represent will be getting far more than their traditional share of public attention . . . and public opinion.

Perhaps the biggest single reason for your rapidly increasing visibility is the issue of environmental quality. As a people, we have only recently discovered how shamefully our environment has been degraded in America. Recovering from the first shock of dismay, people all over the country are now starting to look for the underlying causes of this abuse. And the truth is beginning to dawn: most of America's environmental problems are related, in one way or another, to the production and use of minerals and fuels. I spoke earlier of the "pressures of Washington;" this growing public concern is responsible for many of them. There is also a growing public awareness that the people who must be relied on to turn the environmental situation around are the people who control the way fuels are produced and used, those who decide how metals and minerals are to be won and refined. In short, the public is zeroing in on your profession, even before you have had a chance to practice it.

Air pollution—stemming mainly from our expanding use of fuels—is a prime target of public antipathy. Water pollution is another. Municipal sewage-treatment plants and detergent manufacturers get their share of the blame, but responsibility for polluting thousands of lakes and streams with acid drainage, silt, and tailings is laid on the doorstep of deficient mining and mineral-processing technology. And you know which generation of specialists will be expected to mend the shortcomings: yours.

Surface mining is one of the most emotion-laden issues before the public today, and the implications that issue holds for our mineral technology are truly challenging. Over 3,000 square miles of the country already needs repairing because of the damage done by surface mining. Almost every State in the Union bears some of its scars. Each year, more mine operators are finding out that it is harder and harder to start breaking the topsoil without generating bitter opposition on environmental grounds.

The public has already demonstrated its willingness, in more than a score of mining States, to regulate surface mining activities. Now it seems increasingly willing to banish strip mines totally, if that's what it takes to protect the land. Total abolition may be impractical, all right. But who is going to come up with a practical alternative to surface mining, or practical ways to do right by the environment, if not your profession? No one else has the technical ability.

The public is also on the verge of identifying the mineral industry as the biggest single culprit in the solid waste explosion. Because of technology's limitations, better than a

billion tons of mineral wastes a year goes conspicuously on display—all over the country. Mill tailings, slag, processing plant wastes, culm banks . . . all of these offenses and more that can't be hidden. The public is saying it won't tolerate this anymore, and we'd better believe them.

Even just plain trash—incinerator residue, junk cars, fly ash, and urban refuse—has become a problem that only an advanced minerals technology seems capable of dealing with. Only the metallurgists, the ceramics engineers, the mining engineers, and the mineral economists are professionally and technologically equipped to make a dent in the problem. Yet, today, tonnage and volume of solid wastes are swelling faster than new technological approaches for handling them can be tested.

Finally, subsurface waste disposal, despite all its promising possibilities, is surrounded with many unknowns . . . so many, in fact, that it has become the subject of dramatic speculation as to possibly calamitous environmental side-effects—everything from water pollution to earthquakes. Such speculation alone could destroy its promise. Clearly, it is up to the geophysicists, geochemists, and petroleum engineers to replace the unknowns with facts . . . to combat speculation with information. Nobody else is in a position to make such an evaluation.

All these tasks may be unconventional enough, for the traditional minerals engineer or scientist. No matter. They must be accomplished anyway. If you chose your professions on the basis of what they used to be like, ten or even five years ago, you are in for a surprise. But the environmental problems aren't the only ones that will revolutionize your disciplines. Even if it were possible to disregard environmental considerations—as a majority of your colleagues of a generation ago did—you will still be pressed beyond the traditional limits of your disciplines to satisfy America's soaring requirements for minerals.

"Well, now," you say, "that sounds more like it. That's what we were trained for—supplying minerals." But it isn't going to be that easy. Let's face it—up to now America has been blessed with a relative abundance of mineral resources. Conventional mineral technology was the response to that abundance. But conventional technology just can't hack it anymore.

Look at the trends. The best deposits are mostly used up. New high-grade deposits—assuming there are any—will be harder to find, harder to get to. The lower-grade deposits you turn to out of necessity will be harder to process, more expensive to work with. Abundance is coming to an end. And simultaneously, our minerals-hungry society is making plans for an even more affluent tomorrow, as if our resources were inexhaustible.

The year 2000 no doubt sounds to you like some time far in the future and perhaps of not much direct concern to you. The contrary is the case. You will then be in your fifties, and in the age group managing the country's institutions, and responsible for solving its problems.

In the year 2000, annual copper demand is projected to more than triple the demand of just two years ago. Projected world demand for copper between 1969 and the beginning of the 21st century amounts to 375 million tons of the red metal. Meeting this demand would require the discovery in the next 30 years of 300 new copper deposits, each of a size and grade now considered median. One deposit like this is now under development in Arizona. The ore averages less than 0.4 percent copper, so only the presence of molybdenum makes it commercially attractive. Ask any geologist what he thinks of the chances for finding 10 new copper deposits like that one every year from now on into the 21st century, and don't be surprised when he laughs at you. But that's the situa-

tion, and it is much the same for other minerals we now consider conventional.

For iron, the increase in annual demand by 2000, compared with 1969, forecast at 60 percent. For potash, it's 300 percent; sulfur, over 300 percent; aluminum, over 700 percent.

The truth is that America's capability to consume materials is growing much faster than its ability to supply them . . . with today's technology.

It's the same story for energy. Annual demand in the United States is expected to double by 1985 and triple by the turn of the century. Yet—except for coal—fuels are getting hard to find. We are using up domestic oil and gas reserves faster than we can replace them; each year the reserves-to-production ratios get a little lower. Nuclear power development is behind schedule; the "breeder" reactor that will make available additional energy resources is still on the drawing boards. Coal, our most plentiful energy resource, is increasingly being kept out of powerplants and furnaces because its sulfur content conflicts with clean air regulations.

These prodigious problems—a damaged environment, impending mineral shortages—are your problems. In taking your degrees you are staking a claim to them. They can be solved only by scientists and engineers oriented toward mineral resource technology. And that fact brings us to another problem, one that will make the other two much harder to solve: the growing shortage of mineral scientists and engineers.

The Nation's system for educating engineers and scientists in mineral resource disciplines is dangerously weak. The system that ought to be gearing up for tomorrow's challenges is breaking down . . . all over the country. Nationwide, the mineral-resource disciplines have failed to attract the number of students and the financial resources needed to sustain vigorous, high-quality academic programs. Many institutions have greatly reduced their programs in mineral science and technology, or even eliminated them. Mining engineering departments, for example, have been dropped in recent years at Lafayette, Lehigh, Pittsburgh, Ohio State, Illinois, Washington, Minnesota, Kentucky, and the University of California.

Because of the severe brain-drain away from mineral-resource disciplines, your work to meet the country's ever-growing material and energy demands, in the context of the new environmental ethic, is going to be handicapped.

The situation regarding skilled manpower is just as bleak, but for different reasons—health and safety. The unacceptably high injury and fatality rates in the mining industry today cannot help but keep men away from jobs in the mining industry. Until the toll of death and injury in mining jobs is radically cut, the industry will be unable to attract the employees it needs. And that could conceivably limit the country's access to its minerals and fuels.

Now, you've been thoroughly warned—and perhaps intimidated—about the situation you've gotten yourselves into, through no fault of your own, by successfully completing the requirements for your degrees. I owe it to you to identify, as well as I can, the best way out of the mess. Very well. As far as I can see, today's approaches to these problems are proving bankrupt. I'm speaking mainly of conventional technology, but also of the philosophic base on which that technology rests. What we need, from the bottom up, is innovation.

Up to now, the innovators in technology have been found mostly among the mineral consumers—the space-probe builders, the computer designers, the nuclear power experts. The scientists and engineers responsible for providing minerals have, for the most part, been content to extend the limits of their disciplines in an orderly and deliberate fashion. But those were the good old

days. Mineral resource technology, which has not changed basically in a century, is next in line to be shaken up by a revolution.

Time and circumstance have combined to give you the chance to lead that revolution. You can help give us the mineral resource systems that will supply all of society's needs.

The "systems" concept, I believe, is the best example of the kind of new technology that is needed . . . the kind that your generation of professionals is going to have to create.

The success of the systems concept has been conspicuously demonstrated by the Nation's manned spaceflight program. The systems approach worked because it viewed the technology not merely in terms of what it was, but in terms of what it had to become.

Using the systems approach, the mining, processing, and use of minerals would be viewed as a continuum, in which each operation is judged in part by its effects on all the others. The system's goal would be to produce desirable quantities of low-cost materials or fuels, while minimizing hazards to the health and safety of the employees as well as to the environment at large. Every operation in the system would be designed to achieve that goal. For example, mining methods would be selected not just to maximize productivity, but to minimize mine health and safety hazards as well. By contrast, with today's "add-on" technology many hazards are actually caused by the mining methods used, and techniques have had to be developed and added onto the operation solely to cope with problems that need never have arisen.

Likewise, systems technology could provide, as integral parts of a unified whole, methods for eliminating the environmental pollution problems now associated with production and use of minerals, from acid mine drainage to the solid wastes of mines and municipalities.

Research toward this particular goal is underway in the laboratories of the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines, where mine-systems research actually aims at reversing the trend toward surface operations in mining. In another field, work on solid waste has yielded promising techniques for conserving millions of dollars' worth of needed mineral materials, by recycling incinerator residues, while at the same time helping to protect the environment from the ecologically destructive practices used in conventional solid waste disposal. More success by the Bureau, and by the other public and private agencies working in this field, could lead to the evolution of a recycling "sub-system" that will serve the twin goals of environmental protection and mineral supply.

In Bureau of Mines energy research, work is moving ahead toward practical ways for converting coal to man-made natural gas of pipeline quality. Such technologic work itself represents one "systems" approach to solving some of the problems inherent in the ways we transport and use coal. Coal energy is easier to transport to markets, and cleaner to burn, as a gas. Perhaps we have here the beginnings of a total energy system, with gas conversion plants located near coal supplies, and tied in with existing gas transmission and distribution lines.

But our requirements don't begin or end with the development of systems for extracting, processing, and using minerals. We also need radically new and better ways to find them. We should be able to chart our mineral resources in such great detail that it will be possible to compile a new kind of "whole earth catalog," one representing a complete inventory of the materials in our planet's crust . . . on dry land and in the beds of the oceans.

To supplement a superior mineral location technology, far better demand-forecasting systems are needed. For greatest flexibility and value, developers of such systems may find they have to depart from the strict "commodities" orientation that characterizes our thinking today. Instead, we might be-

come "materials" oriented. For example, as markets are seen developing for a structural material with given optical and chemical properties, demand could be gaged in terms of materials that could be custom-made to the specifications—metals, ceramics, organic polymers, composites, or whatever will serve. Under such a system, the ability to draw on the greatest range of candidate materials would represent the strongest possible material-resources position.

Such a response to changing social goals is the philosophic basis of the systems approach to mineral exploration, mineral recovery, and mineral use. Mineral technologists have traditionally considered themselves isolated from the public's view, if only by the relatively obscure nature of their work. But now you will be in the limelight, and you must not resent it. You must be the first generation of mineral experts to learn to communicate with the public, and to accept in good faith what it says. Only then can you expect the public to accept your professional judgments in good faith. Today, by contrast, we see too much cynicism and suspicion on both sides.

I've tried to sketch a picture of the future I see for you, and the problems you're going to be met with. I want you to know, however, that the present generation isn't sitting on its hands, leaving the whole burden to you. There is innovation in the mineral industry, although not enough. The Government is doing something about the situation, although few would deny that it needs to do more.

An important step in the direction of a coordinated minerals development policy was taken by the 91st Congress in its passage of the Administration-supported Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970. Among its provisions, this law requires the Secretary of the Interior to inform the Congress each year, as part of the Secretary's annual report, on the state of the domestic minerals and fuels industries. Thus, the Act sets up a mandatory annual review of all mineral sources and forces us to consider them all in conjunction with one another—as a unified system.

In an effort to protect the environment in mining areas on a more equitable total approach basis, the Administration has introduced the Mined Area Protection Act of 1971 in the current session of Congress. The criteria set forth in this proposed legislation will provide for cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in developing environmental regulations for both surface and underground mining operations. The States will be required to develop mined area protection regulations within two years. In case of default by a State or inadequacy of proposed State regulations, Federal regulations will be developed for that particular State. The philosophy of this proposed legislation is the control of land, air, and water resources adjacent to mining operations; elimination of regulatory inconsistencies between the States; and establishment of equitable mined area protection regulations consistent with variations in topographic, geologic, and climatic conditions. A key provision of this legislation provides for research on mind-area environmental protection techniques and for training programs to develop the skills required in this important field of endeavor.

The Bureau of Mines has recently established an Office of University Relations, and with certain research funds available to it, is hoping to be an important factor in building up the departments of mining engineering and related fields in our educational institutions.

President Nixon has focused public attention on the need for a unified and systematic approach to all of our natural resources problems. In his State of the Union message of this year, the President proposed a sweeping reorganization of the entire Executive Branch of the Federal Government. Embod-

ied in his proposal is the concept of a United States Department of Natural Resources, which would consolidate the scattered responsibilities for managing our natural resources into a single Cabinet-level Department. Of direct importance to your profession is the grouping of all responsibilities for energy and mineral resources within the proposed Department of Natural Resources. The plan calls for Federal energy and mineral resource policy to be fully integrated . . . for national policy to be developed with a clear view of its national implications. Broader scope and greater balance will be given to nationally supported research and development works in the minerals field—work in which you and your colleagues will find challenges and opportunities. A coherent Federal mineral resource organization will help assure more effective and economic use of our National mineral wealth. Of particular importance is the idea of a team effort, with the Federal Government undertaking to share some of the costs of bringing to fruition some of the important, high-cost projects aimed at enhancing our long-term mineral supply and improving the efficiency of the country's mineral utilization.

These are beginning steps. The machinery of Government has the ability to start some of them, to encourage them, to pay for them, to explain them to the public whose interest it is dedicated to serving. But the Government alone cannot keep them going, or guarantee that they will succeed. Nor can it initiate all of the new programs that will be needed. Power of this kind . . . and the responsibility that goes with it . . . is mostly in the hands of the minerals scientists, technologists, and educators who will be practicing their profession during the last decades of this century. This is the group you are about to join . . . you and a few score of your colleagues taking degrees at other campuses.

You have succeeded in your studies, and are about to enter a tough and challenging field. The future will demand the very best that you have. In your efforts toward success I know that you will heed that challenge.

Good luck.

SUPPORT FOR AN INCREASED MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. BEGICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate and to make other adjustments in low wage areas. This is the same bill introduced earlier by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) who has shown such inspiring leadership in this and other areas. I am pleased that those who rose in immediate support of this bill included both the Speaker and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS). By my action today, I am joining a number of my most able colleagues in stating unequivocally that it is time that we took action on the minimum wage.

This bill seeks to raise the minimum wage gradually over a period of 2½ years to \$2 per hour for agricultural workers, and to \$2 per hour for nonagricultural and public employees over 1½ years. It is straight forward legislation which must be enacted without delay.

It may be that even more of a raise in the minimum wage is necessary. Five years has passed since the minimum wage

was raised to \$1.60. At that prevailing rate, as the Speaker has pointed out on several occasions, a man who is working full time all year makes only \$3,200. This is about \$50 under the presently accepted poverty level for a family of four, and I do not believe our society should allow a man who is fully employed year round to remain below the poverty level at a time when we should be reducing the ranks of the poor.

At \$2 an hour minimum wage, the same worker will make \$4,000 per year, a figure which by the slightest of margins will enable a man or woman to raise their family above the poverty level. Once this figure is reached, there will be no time for delay in going even further, if the experience of the past 5 years is to be considered. During the 5 years since the last increase, the purchasing power of the dollar fell rapidly, and the real gains of the minimum wage increase were substantially mitigated.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to support this bill, and perhaps go further. I am also prepared to support innovative reforms of the welfare system. It is my feeling, however, that at the time the welfare system is reformed, we must be certain to protect those in our society who are fortunate enough to find work, and capable and healthy enough to keep the job. I thank the gentlemen who originated this legislation, and offer them my support.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SLACK (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Monday, May 24, through Thursday, May 27, on account of illness.

Mr. ROE (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Monday, May 24, through Thursday, May 27, on account of committee official business.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 18 through May 27, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. MONAGAN, on Wednesday, May 26, for 60 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

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

Mr. HARVEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ESCH, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. McCLODY, during consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 29 today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, immediately following the remarks of Mr. BRADENAS today.

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

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. McCLODY.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in four instances.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. GOLDWATER in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. SCOTT.

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

Mr. BURTON.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. BEGICH in four instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in four instances.

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. DANIELSON.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in eight instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 7. An act to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 255. An act for the relief of Leonora Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 306. An act for the relief of Eddie Troy Jaynes, Jr., and Rosa Elena Jaynes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 441. An act for the relief of Blandina Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 442. An act for the relief of Cristina Bangawayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 559. An act for the relief of Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 617. An act for the relief of Siu-Kei-Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 708. An act for the relief of the village of Orleans, Vt.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 898. An act for the relief of Angelo DiStefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 997. An act for the relief of Dr. Dionisio Teng Libi and Dr. Bernadette Libi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Luana Gaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1269. An act for the relief of Miriam Lazarowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1271. An act for the relief of Wong Wah Sin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1538. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1810. An act for the relief of Dorothy G. McCarty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1811. An act for the relief of Erma P. Curry and Margaret Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1905. An act to clarify and extend the authority of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5765. An act to extend for 6 months the time for filing the comprehensive report of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia; and

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution designating the last full week in July of 1971 as "National Star Route Mail Carriers Week."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1399. An act to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DRINAN, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 25, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

754. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the fifth annual report of the Commission, covering fiscal year 1970, pursuant to section 705(d) of the Civil Rights

Act of 1964 (H. Doc. No. 92-98); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

755. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 57th annual report of the Board of Governors, covering calendar year 1970, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

756. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a set of the public laws enacted by the 10th Guam Legislature in its 1970 sessions, pursuant to section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

757. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of two publications entitled, "World Power Data, 1968," and "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1969"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

758. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

759. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 212(B) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

760. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a report of a building project survey for Odessa, Tex., pursuant to a resolution of the House Public Works Committee on May 5, 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 8652. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to undertake a loan guarantee and interest assistance program to aid unemployed scientists, technicians, and engineers in the conversion from defense related to civilian, socially oriented research, development, and engineering activities; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 8653. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the University of North Dakota, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 8654. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage under that act, to extend its coverage, to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr.

ARENS) (by request):

H.R. 8655. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8656. A bill to amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, relating to promotion of members of the uniformed services who are in a missing status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 8657. A bill to amend title 38 to provide that service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be considered active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 8658. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8659. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to require that the mail label or other cover of any publication having periodical publication mail privileges, when mailed to a subscriber, shall bear readily intelligible information regarding the name and address of the subscriber and the expiration date of the current subscription, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 8660. A bill to provide a procedure for the exercise of congressional and executive powers over the use of Armed Forces of the United States in military hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8661. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to prevent the imposition thereunder of any prohibition on the importation into the United States of any strategic and critical material from any free world country for so long as the importation of like material from any Communist country is not prohibited by law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 8662. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans' educational assistance payments to be applied to the repayment of educational loans under Federal programs entered into by veterans before commencing active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for licensing of income tax return preparers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS (for herself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 8664. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. KYROS, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. MYERS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. KOCH, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. VANIK, Mr. RYAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. BRADEMAs):

H.R. 8665. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish health and welfare standards which must be met by all synthetic detergents and to ban from detergents all phosphates and those synthetics which fail to meet the standards by June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 8666. A bill to exempt certain user transactions from the definition of "consumer reporting agency"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 8667. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 in order to exempt private aircraft owners from payment of customs inspection charges at border

airports in certain instances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 8668. A bill to provide for a limited Federal income tax credit for political contributions, to limit the amount of contributions in Federal elections, and to provide for more stringent reporting requirements in such elections; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8669. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include cost-of-living allowances as a part of basic pay of employees moving from prevailing rate pay systems to the general schedule pay system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 8670. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labels on all foods to disclose each of their ingredients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. HARVEY, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mr. SKUBITZ):

H.R. 8671. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. MILLS, Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. SCHWENGLER):

H.R. 8672. A bill to establish an American Folklife Foundation within the Library of Congress to develop, promote, and implement a broadly conceived national policy of support for American folklife; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8673. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 8674. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 8675. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation of a plan to rehabilitate the distribution system of the Red Bluff project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 8676. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit Federal judges from receiving compensation other than for the performance of their judicial duties, except in certain instances, and to provide for the disclosure of certain financial information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAs (for himself and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI):

H.R. 8677. A bill to provide for the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the improvement and operation of museums; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to direct the National Railroad Passenger Corp. to make a study with respect to expanding the basic national rail passenger system to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BERGLAND, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr.

FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 317. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed "proportional repatriation" plan for obtaining the release of American prisoners held in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LINK, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. POBELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Con. Res. 318. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed "proportional repatriation" plan for obtaining the release of American prisoners held in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

184. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to funding for the upstream watershed protection and flood prevention program of the Soil Conservation Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

185. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to withdrawal of military personnel from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

186. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to a nonvoting delegate in Congress from Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

187. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

188. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, commending the President on his handling of public demonstrations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

189. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

190. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to designating the Kennedy Space Center as the site for construction of the space shuttle; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

191. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to the Federal highway trust fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

192. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Federal assumption of the costs of welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia:

H.R. 8678. A bill for the relief of Isham G. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8679. A bill for the relief of James H. Davidson, Vincent W. S. Hee, and Kay M. Mochizuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.