

purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10705. A bill to amend Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to authorize the establishment of a class of limited air carriers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. GRAY, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. YATES):

H.J. Res. 869. Joint resolution recognizing the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago as hosts in 1992 of the official quinquennial celebration of the discovery of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.J. Res. 870. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 871. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 872. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States redefining the "advice and consent" of the Senate, for purposes of the President's treaty-making power, so that two-thirds of the full Senate must concur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. STEELE):

H. Con. Res. 399. Concurrent resolution to relieve the oppression of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H. Con. Res. 400. Concurrent resolution to request that the President call a conference on anadromous fish in preparation for U.S.

participation in the 1973 United Nations Law of the Sea Conference; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Con. Res. 401. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the designation of the year 1973 through 1978 as the World Environmental Quinquennium to involve all nations of the world in a global environmental research program of both national and international scope; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H. Con. Res. 402. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. NIX, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. GUDE):

H. Res. 596. Resolution disapproving the alternative plan, dated August 31, 1971, for pay adjustments for Federal employees under statutory pay systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H. Res. 597. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to make studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. Res. 598. Resolution to create a House Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 599. Resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar month of October of each year as "Drug Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. NEDZI, Mr.

YATES, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. MCCORMACK):

H. Res. 600. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 10706. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sammartino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 10707. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Theodore Dake, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 10708. A bill to provide that a gold medal be presented to the widow of the late Louis Armstrong; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 10709. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to August Sobotka and Joseph J. Tomalino of Intake, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 10710. A bill for the relief of Arnold D. Crain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 10711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Purita Paningbatan Bohannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 10712. A bill for the relief of Flora Dantes Tabayo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10713. A bill for the relief of Wilma Juguilon Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TENNESSEE GROUP HEALTH FOUNDATION

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there is a new health care program underway in middle Tennessee which I feel worthy of mention to my House colleagues. I am referring to the Tennessee Group Health Foundation—TGHF—the South's first prepaid group health "alternative" to high medical insurance costs.

Funded in part by a \$250,000 Federal Health, Education, and Welfare Department grant and in part by a \$36—estimated—monthly family membership fee, the program is expected to initially enroll some 10,000 middle Tennesseans. Since early sponsorship of the program came from State labor leaders, first memberships will be granted through labor organizations. Enrollment was expected to begin September 1.

The foundation is unique in the way it provides medical services and arranges

for payment of monthly dues. Treatment is provided at local health maintenance organization clinics, with doctors provided under contract to the HMO. Payment is made in person to the HMO, and since services are prepaid, there is no delayed mail billing and no insurance tie-up.

Medical service at the HMO clinics is provided on an unlimited visit basis. Members can receive treatment whenever it is required. Included for coverage are laboratory and diagnostic work, prenatal delivery and postpartum care, well baby care, immunization, casts, dressings, eye exams, chronic care, home visits, and hospital stays longer than 30 days. The program serves its members, cradle to grave.

The TGHF concept was authorized under the Tennessee Health Maintenance Organization Act, a measure made law this past May. It marks Tennessee as a leader in the progressive health care field.

The article follows:

PREPAID HEALTH PROGRAM, SOUTH'S FIRST,
GETS GRANT

(By Keel Hunt)

A \$250,105 federal grant was announced

here yesterday to establish the South's first prepaid group health program—a plan designed to offer consumers an "alternative" to high medical insurance costs.

The grant is to help finance development of a system of medical care under the new Tennessee Group Health Foundation. The foundation would contract with doctors who would organize and direct a group practice.

Citizens who form the foundation—to be called a Health Maintenance Organization (HMO)—would pay dues or premiums to cover the cost of a range of medical care services.

Dexter Kimsey, HMO regional coordinator for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said the TGHF grant was the largest of six awarded in Southern states and totaling more than a half million dollars.

The foundation plan differs from health insurance policies, E. L. Collins, foundation vice president said, since members visit HMO health clinics each time they make monthly payments. And since the health care would be prepaid, the member would receive no bill for the service, he said.

Rep. Richard Fulton attended the TGHF press conference yesterday and called the foundation "a real step forward in providing a real health program for all our citizens."

TGHF plans call for an initial membership of 10,000 in Middle Tennessee. The health plan was first sponsored in the area by state labor leaders, and a foundation spokesman

said yesterday memberships will be open first to the labor organizations which contributed to the program.

Enrollment is not expected to begin before Sept. 1.

"The HMO is not a panacea," Kimsey said, "but rather an alternative in health care delivery." He added that the program would emphasize "preventive" treatment so the member could avoid the high cost of hospital care.

Kimsey noted that although HMO legislation has passed the House of Representatives, it has not gained approval of the U.S. Senate. And he said federal HMO assistance currently is being financed from existing HEW revenues. President Nixon outlined the HMO concept for the Congress Feb. 18 as part of his "national health strategy," Collins said.

The Tennessee Health Maintenance Organization Act became law May 21. It was the first state-level legislation to permit organization of a prepaid health delivery system. Kimsey, calling it a "landmark piece of legislation," said copies of the act had been distributed to eight other states where similar programs are being developed.

Collins said monthly payments to the foundation had not been determined, but he explained the figure would be "competitive" with health insurance programs. The monthly cost has been estimated at about \$36 per family.

The payment, according to TGHF plans, would entitle the member to unlimited office visits at the center, laboratory and diagnostic work, prenatal delivery and postpartum care, well baby care, immunization, casts and dressings, eye exams, chronic care and home visits.

Also, if a group member goes to the hospital for 30 days, the hospital bills the foundation.

ECONOMIC UNITY

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is widespread support in the country for President Nixon's economic plans as enumerated in his speech before the Congress last week.

Evidence of that support is an editorial entitled "Nixon Seeks Economic Unity" which appeared in the September 11, 1971, issue of the Columbia Record newspaper in Columbia, S.C.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NIXON SEEKS ECONOMIC UNITY

Partisan and personal interests must be put aside, as President Nixon has suggested, as all Americans cooperate in placing "national interests above special interests" to brake inflation, increase employment and make American goods competitive here and abroad.

The goal is a nation that will not again be afflicted by the virus of runaway inflation—without massive, dictatorial governmental controls.

To this end, the President wisely is listening to leaders of labor, government and business. He collects their ideas and support through a persuasive rather than a coercive procedure. Labor leaders who have conferred with the President wisely recognized that, in advance of the conversations, Mr. Nixon isn't

going to let any vested interest group "write the ticket."

To be sure, the President already has some idea of a broad outline of a continuing program beyond the end of the present freeze, November 12. Those who criticize Mr. Nixon for announcing an end to the 90-day freeze without standby plans are nitwits. Of course the President has a bundle of alternatives.

Most probably he will establish a wage-price stabilization and review board to set guidelines for salary and cost increases. Quite possibly, the board would include representatives of business, labor and the public.

He will listen to all who visit him in the interim, giving them an attentive ear. But the labor barons who have declaimed mightily about "excess profits" should charitably recognize a truth—corporate profits have fallen and grown ill.

A \$13 billion to \$14 billion decline in Federal tax revenues is blamed directly on disappointingly low corporate profits. Labor leaders know this economic reality and unless they are prepared to accept obligatory bargaining, under governmental aegis, then they must act and speak with greater restraint than they have in the past.

To help create new jobs, the President told Congress he will propose tax reforms next year. Such proposals, he indicated, would help the U.S. in its foreign trade dilemma.

With the Japanese, the Nixon Administration should and must bargain very hard, indeed. Congress should cooperate and allow no repetitions of Wilbur Mills' private textile deal with the Japanese that cut the ground from under the serious negotiations of two successive Presidents—Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon.

"The time has come," said the President, "to give a new attention to America's own interests."

A cooperative leadership in the executive and legislative branches of government, labor and management, and the public at large will be essential. Decisions will not be easy and cannot be universally popular. But they can set the American socio-industrial engine back on the tracks.

AMERICA'S BOOMING WATERWAYS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our inland waterways are a vital and essential part of our national transportation system.

The U.S. News & World Report, in its current issue, points out in an excellent article that the use of our internal water transportation network has increased to the point that traffic jams are occurring—and a further 50-percent increase in traffic is expected within the next 10 years.

As new waterway projects by the U.S. Corps of Engineers become available, they ease the pressure to some extent by improving our rivers for navigation and opening up new areas to water transportation. Obviously, this basic program of internal improvements must continue.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject I place the article from U.S. News & World Report in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

NOW: TRAFFIC JAMS ON U.S. RIVERS

St. LOUIS, Mo.—At this historic hub of river transportation, the Mississippi looks more like a busy freeway than the slow-moving Old Man River of the past.

Huge flotillas of barges—as many as 40 of them lashed together to form a single tow, longer and with greater capacity than the Queen Elizabeth II—are pushed by powerful towboats past the city's gleaming Gateway Arch.

Here, as elsewhere along the 26,000 miles of U.S. inland and coastal waterways, barge traffic is booming. Low-cost transportation is the key to this upsurge. Charges for waterborne freight are less today than in 1960, and are considerably lower than for any other form of transportation.

LURE FOR SHIPPERS

For \$1, a ton of freight moves 330 miles by barge, compared with 70 miles by railroad and 14 miles by truck.

One reason for lower rates on water transportation, say railroad men and truck operators, is that the Government levies no user charges to pay for construction of waterways.

Rivermen say that today's sluggish economy actually is helping their business, because, according to Thomas J. Barta, an official of the Valley Line:

"Shippers are much more cost conscious, and when something can move by water, they save money by sending it that way."

A visitor to the St. Louis waterfront finds himself caught up in the excitement that is coursing along U.S. waterways.

Out in the river, the banks are lined with waiting barges. Some are freshly painted, others are rusty from tours in the brackish waters near the Gulf of Mexico. Some are empty and riding high, others are loaded and waiting to be lashed into a tow.

Inside the harbor, 17 miles in length, general commodities are handled at the municipally owned dock. But most freight moves across nearly 50 private docks, variously providing scoops, cranes, conveyor belts, storage tanks and warehouses to handle such bulk items as grain, coal and oil.

St. Louis is a major "fleeting area"—a drop-off point for barges that are not unloaded, but are picked up for towing to other ports.

Trucks and railroad cars rumble onto the St. Louis docks, delivering and picking up freight.

The city is served by four interstate highways, 21 railroads, and some 200 trucking firms.

SWARMING TRAFFIC

From upriver barge flotillas come in swarms. Just above St. Louis, traffic from the Missouri and Illinois Rivers joins in with that moving on the Mississippi.

Downriver to the south, it is 185 miles to the confluence of the Ohio at Cairo, Ill. In the past decade, river traffic between St. Louis and Cairo has nearly doubled, increasing from about 30 million tons in 1960 to more than 58 million tons in 1970.

It is the same story along the Tennessee River, which enters the Ohio at Paducah, Ky. There, waterborne freight has doubled since 1962. In the first six months of 1971, nearly 3 million tons of cargo moved on the Tennessee. This was a rise of 12 per cent over the first half of 1970.

Nationally, a record of close to 200 billion ton-miles of freight was transported along U.S. inland and coastal waterways in 1970. That is an increase of 58 per cent over 1960.

BIGGER SHARE OF BUSINESS

Rivermen point with pride to the fact that their share of intercity freight shipments also is greater today than in 1960—increasing from 9.2 to 10 per cent.

During the same period, the railroads'

share of intercity freight dropped from 44.1 to 40.1 per cent, and the truckers' share eased downward slightly from 21.8 to 21.4 per cent. However, pipelines, which move growing amounts of petroleum and gas, and air freight, which transports higher-value goods, have outstripped the barges in growth since 1960.

Rivermen still wheel and deal. Theirs is the least-regulated form of transportation. Only 10 per cent of the cargo that moves on water is under federal regulation, compared with 39 per cent in trucks and 100 per cent on railroads.

Barge operators nail down deals by telephone. Decisions on cargoes often turn on less than a penny per ton.

RIVALRY AMONG CARRIERS

A battle is brewing between the "common carriers," who are licensed by the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry regulated commodities, such as steel, and "exempt carriers," who transport unregulated commodities such as oil, coal and grain.

The common carriers, represented by the Water Transport Association, are backing a bill in Congress that would, among other things, require publication of all dry-bulk waterway rates. This measure, the Surface Transportation Act of 1971, is strongly opposed by many exempt carriers, who met in Chicago September 3 to gather their forces. W. R. Murphy, president of Rose Barge Line, Inc., in St. Louis, calls the proposal "creeping regulation that will keep the least-efficient operator in business."

John A. Creedy, president of the Water Transport Association, says rate publication would end "discriminatory pricing" that, he believes, benefits big shippers.

MOUNTING CAPACITY

Meanwhile, new developments are helping hold down increases in rates, even though the trend is turning upward. For example—

On the West Coast, one freight firm now tows two huge barges in tandem—capable of carrying 112 railroad freight cars—on a regular schedule between Seattle and Alaska, at well under the ocean freight rates of the 1960s.

In Florida, another company is using 26-, 000-ton, self-unloading barges, together with a modern bulk terminal, to cut the cost of transporting phosphate rock by 30 per cent.

Co-ordination between barge, rail and truck transport is cutting rates in some areas. At Ashtabula, Ohio, for instance, a coal "transloader" has been developed that permits shuttle-unit trains to bring their cargoes of coal to the docks and dump them without stopping. The coal is loaded into barges as they become available, cutting back waiting time in both operations. This arrangement is being considered now for Chicago's port.

BOTTLENECKS

With business booming along waterways, massive traffic tie-ups sometimes develop.

Says E. Thomas Drennan, president of the Slouss City and New Orleans Barge Lines, Inc.:

"We're starting to run out of river. On the open river, traffic jams are not too serious. Of our three boats operating between St. Louis and New Orleans, one a day will report a two or three-hour delay waiting for south-bound traffic.

"But where we do encounter extremely costly delays is at the lockages. Dams built several decades ago to help maintain a nine-foot channel often have locks that are just not big enough to handle the barge flotillas of today."

PETROLEUM LEADS

Raw materials for industry comprise the main part of barge cargoes. Biggest share consists of petroleum and its products, carried by 41 per cent of today's barges. Coal and coke comprise another 16 per cent of waterway freight; sand and gravel, 13 per

cent; iron ore and steel, 10 per cent; chemicals, 4 per cent; logs and lumber, 3 per cent; grains, 2 per cent; sea shells, 2 per cent; and other commodities, including sugar and molasses, 9 per cent.

Major cities on the rivers, such as New Orleans, Memphis, Louisville, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh, are benefiting most from the increased shipments by water. In the past five years, typical figures show that river freight has increased by 31 per cent at Natchez, 21 per cent at Greenville, Miss., 20 per cent at Louisville, and 68 per cent at Minneapolis.

Now Tulsa, Little Rock and other cities along the new Arkansas River Navigation Project are added to those served by large-scale barge transportation. With the opening of this project early this year, ports in Arkansas and Oklahoma are linked with the Mississippi 450 miles away.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates that 13.2 million tons of cargo—mostly petroleum, iron, steel, wheat, coal and fertilizer—will be carried by barge along this channel each year, at an annual saving to shippers of some 40 million dollars.

New factories and mills, built or planned along the just-opened waterway, are expected to bring some 200,000 additional jobs to this area in the next five years.

Another major project costing about the same amount—1.2 billion dollars—is under way now to modernize the Ohio River, with 686 million already spent by the Army Engineers.

To date, public outlays for such improvements in America's inland waterways have totaled more than 5 billion dollars. The rate of federal spending on added navigational facilities is running at about 200 million dollars a year, plus 50 million to operate and maintain them.

Looking to the future, Mr. Creedy, of the Water Transport Association, makes this prediction:

"We expect at least a 50 per cent increase in traffic over the next 10 years. This is a conservative figure, with the present rate of growth greater than that.

"New equipment, larger towboats, bigger barges, deeper channels and new technology all are contributing to this prospect."

THE JACKSON FIVE

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a family from Gary, Ind., and five brothers who have jumped to the No. 1 ranking in the music industry, both in this country and abroad, in a very short time.

In a matter of months the Jackson Five, who will star in their first ABC television special, "Goin' Back to Indiana," on September 19, have become the fastest selling group in the history of Motown Records, a company that boasts such stars as Diana Ross, The Temptations, and The Supremes.

In addition to the "Goin' Back to Indiana" special, the group will be the focal point of TV's first animated series starring black youths. As well, they recently concluded a 60-day, 40-city tour of the country, from New York to Hawaii—a tour that entrenched them, according to Time magazine, as "the biggest thing to hit Pop Capitalism since the Beatles."

But the real story behind the Jackson

Five is that of a home environment in which they were encouraged to develop their God-given talents. It was natural for them to join in family songfests.

Their father, a man who worked hard as a crane operator in Gary, played the guitar and wrote songs for relaxation, while their mother sang good country and western with a trace of the blues, a treat for the nine Jackson children. It was no accident, then, that the kids in the Jackson family was singing, and enjoying it.

The idea of forming a singing group first cropped up when Tito Jackson, now 17, started playing with his father's guitar, and singing along with the radio. Before long he was joined by his brothers, and a singing group had been formed that was winning talent contests. Soon there were trips to Chicago, Arizona, New York, and Boston—trips in a jam-packed Volkswagen bus over school holidays and weekends, as the family traveled to concert performances, always returning to Gary for school during the week.

Getting started was not easy. Jermaine, for example, learned bass on brother Tito's guitar, because there was no money for a bass. The big break came when singing star Diana Ross heard them at a benefit for Gary Mayor Richard Hatcher, and mentioned their talents to Motown management. The rest has been fantastic.

These show biz giants, five of the nine children of Joe and Katherine Jackson, are superstars by every standard. Their hit, "I'll Be There," has been No. 1 on all national record survey charts in both the United States and Great Britain, and to date has sold more than 3.5 million copies. "The Jackson 5 Third Album" has already approached the million mark in sales.

But success has not spoiled the Jackson Five. Although they "made it," they still combine a rigorous practice and performance schedule while remaining in school, a model for thousands of young people. Everything they do, their concert and recording schedules, TV appearances and the new animated cartoon series is worked around school and homework.

The Jackson Five has "made it" through a combination of love, hard work, and loyalty to one another and the total family, and those qualities serve as a marvelous example for society at large. It is not only their success, but the reason for that success that is such a magnificent story. I join the proud State of Indiana, and the rest of the country, in saluting the Jackson Five and the determination and hard work that have made them No. 1, clear across the land.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about the Jackson Five be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE JACKSON FIVE

Saturday morning television—in case Friday night's excesses have left you too hung-over to realize it—isn't what it used to be.

Once strictly from Kildaville, with characters like Popeye, Casper the Friendly Ghost and some old loony birds from antique movie

cartoons, today's Saturday morning viewing is now mostly mod, pop and slightly sexy. There have been the Beatles, the Monkees, Josie and the Pussycats and now, this fall, TV's first animated series starring black youths will appear, featuring The Jackson Five.

Produced by the U.S.-based Motown Corp. and Video Craft of England, and a caricature of the Jackson Five, the new cartoon series is apparently the main superstructure around which ABC-TV is basing its thrust to capture its share of young Saturday morning TV watchers.

Except for providing the musical portion—based on their hit records—of the cartoon series (each of the half-hour shows will feature two songs) the real Jackson Five will have nothing to do with the animated strip. The non-musical speaking voices for the group are provided by five unknown black youths, and all of the animation is being done in London because "London has the best animation pool in the world," according to Jim White, vice president in charge of production at Motown. Japan's top animator has been brought in to work on the series, says White, and the entire animation project is being directed by Robert Balsar, who was responsible for the Beatles' highly successful *Yellow Submarine* movie.

Although the real Jackie, 20; Tito, 18; Jermaine, 16; Michael, 13, and Marlon, 12, will be portrayed in the animated strip, the drawings will, of course, be caricatures of the Jackson brothers. A woman artist drew sketches of the boys at work in a recording studio to capture some realism. "The one thing we didn't want was just white kids washed black," White explains, "and while some of the boys may have some physical characteristics normally considered Negroid, some of the others don't. We had to get the animators to know the boys, one way or another. We wanted them to see how they move around. We didn't want them to shuffle around like Stepin Fetchit."

To ensure quality in the series and to preserve the stature of what is now one of Motown's hottest properties (along with Diana Ross, now a solo star. The Supremes, and Smokey Robinson and the Miracles), Motown officials approve every aspect of the series. The first few scripts offered by writers were rejected with the caustic comment: "These are garbage and we don't want them," says White. "Since then the quality of the scripts has been very good. We've been told by people in the business that the current scripts are nighttime quality."

Although some of the shows will be centered around such current themes as ecology, White says the Jackson Five cartoon strip will not be used to convey any messages. "The Jackson Five are the message," he declares. "The fact that these kids made it out of the ghetto says it. The audience, black and white, is going to see black kids on Saturday morning. It isn't going to be all white faces."

White, who is Caucasian, feels that as an animated series based on blacks, the Jackson Five will have to be more of a success than most other shows to make it. "It will be the best animated series in the business," he says flatly. "We just won't settle for second best."

Although the producers have a firm two-year contract with ABC-TV for the cartoon series, White believes that "the first four shows will make or break it. Either you get them then or you don't."

As for the real-life Jackson Five, they have their first television special, called *Going Back To Indiana*, airing on ABC-TV September 19, just eight days after the cartoon show debut. Taped last July with athletes Elgin Baylor, Ben Davidson, Rosey Grier, Elvin Hayes and Bill Russell and comics Tom Smothers and Bill Cosby as their guests, the hour-long Jackson Five show centers around some of the group's own interests—racing cars and basketball—and an actual concert performed in their home state.

The taping of the TV special was followed

by a two-month, 50-city concert tour stretching from New York to Hawaii. The day after the tour ended, the boys were all back in school (the oldest, Jackie, began college study this fall as a business administration major; the others attend a private school).

Although their record sales are now in the millions (60 per cent of the buyers are estimated to be white), and they have been submerged in the mind-blowing world of entertainment stardom, the five brothers from Indiana have not changed much in their personalities, those close to them report. While the brothers are much more aware of themselves, according to their road manager, Tony Jones. "They're very well organized. They are very much aware of their responsibility to the Jackson Five as a group. They are very professional, and yet they are able to be themselves as individuals. They're six-dimensional; they're five different people and then they are the group."

Away from the group, Jackie likes to zip around Los Angeles in his new Datsun 240Z sports car, while Tito gets to drive his mother's German-made Audi. For the younger boys, Michael and Marlon, being away from the work of performing means just fun and games around the house, or talking with fans, which they enjoy doing. But perhaps these four had better be careful: the youngster in the middle, Jermaine, is planning to write it all down in a book, the total Jackson Five Experience, and have it published a couple of years from now.

RESOLUTION TO ABOLISH THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution with the cosponsorship of 22 colleagues which provides for the dissolution of the House Committee on Internal Security.

When I first became a Member of Congress in 1966, I was among those who supported the continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

At that time, I felt that the committee had a legitimate legislative function, but that the controversies that involved the committee stemmed from a leadership problem that resulted in abuses of private dignity and the rights of those who appeared before it.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the committee has changed along with the name of the committee and greater attention is now directed to a semblance of dignity and concern for individual rights.

However, Mr. Speaker, the problem involving this committee is much deeper than my initial superficial analysis.

Since 1945, the committee has issued 174 contempt citations. Of these, 142 have failed in the courts. In that same period, a total of 14 contempt of Congress citations were issued by all the other committees of the House combined.

The committee all too frequently is engaged in constitutional battles in the courts, the last of which involved the 1970 case where a blacklist of campus speakers was prohibited from being published by the committee.

In the 91st Congress, the committee spent more money than the combined

budgets of the Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Interior, and the Ways and Means Committees. Surely, the legislative product of the House Internal Security Committee is not commensurate with that huge expenditure.

But of greatest concern to me, Mr. Speaker, and indicative of the basic problem inherent in such a thought-monitoring committee, is the huge number of secret files and dossiers it maintains on thousands of individuals and organizations. I am advised there are over 754,000 cards containing unverified information on individual Americans. I am also advised that there is a special, highly secret file wherein are kept the dossiers of Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like this Big Brother apparatus. I would like to point out this resolution does not evolve from any disagreement with the integrity of the chairman or members of the committee.

I am motivated by the fear of big government, of secret files and thought control, concepts that are embraced by the committee.

I further believe that the legitimate legislative objective of curtailing activities of those disloyal to our Nation can and should be performed by the House Committee on the Judiciary. That responsibility can be carried out without the trappings of totalitarianism that have historically had such appeal to HUAC and its successor, the Committee on Internal Security.

DELAWARE'S COASTAL ZONE

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, earlier this year the State of Delaware, under the leadership of Gov. Russell W. Peterson, adopted landmark legislation in the field of environmental control.

This legislation, known as the coastal zone bill, establishes an area along Delaware's shoreline in which heavy industry will not be permitted to locate. Governor Peterson and the legislature have been praised from many quarters for their action in this matter.

Recently the New Castle (Del.), Gazette published an editorial praising the Governor's ecological stand and included in it editorial comment from other newspapers across the country.

Mrs. Dorothy Clayton Travers is the editor of the New Castle Gazette, an old and historic Delaware newspaper. I believe she is to be congratulated for recognizing the merits of Governor Peterson's legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THREE CHEERS FOR US

Russell W. Peterson, Governor of the State of Delaware, departs Saturday for the Governor's Conference in Puerto Rico (going at his own expense) where he will prepare the

report, as committee chairman, on Crime Reduction and Public Safety.

Gov. Peterson has gained a wide reputation nationally not only in this particular endeavor but also in the field of Vocational-Education and Coastal Zoning. Throughout the country recently he has been widely praised for his strong stand against heavy industry and his devotion to the quality of life in his state.

William D. Ruckleshaus, administrator of the Federal Environmental Agency recently wrote Peterson, "Delaware has set an example for the rest of the states" . . . and "the struggle to bring the people of this country to their 'environmental senses' is not an easy one."

OTHER QUOTES FROM ACROSS THE COUNTRY

The New York Times (7/5/71): "(Confronted by a \$27-million deficit, Delaware could undoubtedly use the wealth represented by oil refineries, steel and paper mills, etc. . . . the Delaware action seeks to put 'bigness' and essential industry in proper perspective, to weigh their values against equally strong claims for air to breathe, water to swim in and lands to sustain the balance of nature."

The Washington Evening Star (7/16/71): "The little state of Delaware has taken an historic step aimed at ensuring its future against the onslaughts of our dirty world. Delaware's shore is to be reserved for, of all things, people."

Miami Herald (6/30/71): "While Florida's Cabinet was debating permits for oil drilling in Big Cypress Swamp, the people of Delaware were congratulating their legislature and governor for a law that will keep heavy industry away from the state's bay and ocean coastlines. This means Delaware's beaches and wetlands will be preserved for recreation and tourism."

Houston Post (7/7/71): "The State of Delaware has forced upon all other states a sudden question: Is it possible to be overdeveloped?"

Wichita Eagle (7/1/71): "The bill passed despite strong opposition by the state chamber of commerce, the oil and natural gas industries, international cargo shippers and the U.S. Commerce and Treasury Departments. . . . To preserve a good life and prevent a retreat to bare survival will call for revision of earlier beliefs . . . Delaware appears to be ahead of the game."

Sunday Post-Intelligencer (Seattle, Wash.) (7/4/71): "Delaware did right. The governor and the legislature refused to put a price tag on nature."

The Cleveland Plain Dealer (6/29/71): "It was a courageous decision. We think Delaware chose wisely."

Buffalo Courier Express (7/6/71): "We give Delaware a lot of credit for deciding that a rapidly growing industrial complex could create more problems than it would solve."

The country has reverberated with the news that Delaware leads the way and the courageous leadership has been commended editorially throughout the land in newspapers and magazines.

It should fill the hearts of Delawareans with pride.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE U.S. AUTO INDUSTRY

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an article entitled "They May Pollute, But They Pay," appeared in the August 29, 1971, issue of the Augusta Chronicle-Herald newspaper under the byline of Louis C. Harris, vice president and editor.

Mr. Harris points out the importance of the automobile industry to the U.S. economy. He takes note of the raw materials which go into automobiles, the production plants, the sales centers, the repair garages, the auto parts industry, the gas stations, and the impact of vacation travel or other industries which benefit when folks "hit the road."

This article is interesting and informative. Members of Congress should be interested in knowing that gas taxes alone last year brought \$6½ billion into the purses of various government bodies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THEY MAY POLLUTE, BUT THEY PAY

(By Louis C. Harris)

If you are ever inclined to question the importance of the automobile industry to the American economy, take a few minutes to read the 50th edition of "Automobile Facts and Figures" which this year commemorates the 75th anniversary of motor vehicle production in this country.

Among other data contained in the statistic-laden booklet is that which reveals that 82 per cent of the families in the United States own at least one car, a fact, incidentally, of which I become well aware every morning on my way to work.

What all these motor vehicles mean to the country is of even greater significance. The "highway transport industries" provide employment for 13.3 million persons, which includes nearly nine million who are engaged in trucking and approximately 2.7 million men and women concerned with automotive sales and servicing. The statistical booklet didn't say so, but it is easily possible that the remaining 1.6 million workers either are building automobiles or straightening banged-in fenders.

Be that as it may, retail sales of passenger cars in the U.S. last year came to 8.4 million units, only 1.3 million of which were foreign imports. And, interestingly enough, the whooping boost to the economy that the automotive industry provides is well illustrated by the fact that \$13 billion worth of parts are produced by other industries to help make and service America's motor vehicles.

A study of the booklet also will show you that approximately 20 per cent of the Nation's steel production and about 65 per

cent of its rubber is consumed by the automobile business. Out of the Nation's total businesses, about 823,000 are related to automobiles and trucks, and automotive retailers—the folks from whom you buy your car—enjoyed sales of \$89 billion in 1970. That, you also may be interested to know, was one of every four retail sales dollars in the land!

The money that goes into normal trade channels from auto production, sales and servicing is not the only revenue for which the industry accounts. Motor vehicles provided the average State last year more than 19 per cent of all its tax take, the grand total of state and federal taxes coming to some \$17 billion, or \$938 million more than the year before.

In addition, I learned from the booklet that out of \$40 billion expected to be spent for domestic and vacation travel this year, about \$37 billion will be shelled out by the automobile-traveling public.

The statistics contained in the booklet are not all dollar-oriented.

For instance, I learned that in 1969 there were 62,341,000 male licensed drivers in the U.S. and only 45,954,000 females, a ratio whose significance—if any—will get no comment from me.

The greatest number of licensed drivers were in the 20-24 age bracket (about 13,800,000) and the fewest (3,900,000) in the 16-17 groups. There was no age group in which women numbered more than men, although the closest was in the 19-year-old category where there were 1,600,000 boys and 1,100,000 girls.

As might be expected, California had the largest number of licensed drivers of any State, with 11,425,000, with New York more than three million behind. Georgia listed 2,470,000 in 1969 and South Carolina 1,377,000.

All told, motor vehicles traveled approximately 1,125,000,000,000 (that's trillion) miles in this country last year, which accounts for the six-and-a-half billion dollars worth of gasoline taxes the various government's enjoyed, the deterioration of thousands of miles of roadways, and, probably, for the loss of 12 million, 800 thousand tempers.

And lastly, automobiles—not of themselves, mind you, but from inexperienced, irresponsible or inebriated operators—accounted for 56,400 deaths in this country in 1969.

Even that figure, however, as awesomely tragic as it is, was just about the lowest death rate—on the basis of the number of cars on the highways and miles traveled—the United States has recorded in more than 30 years.

THE LIFE OF A PAGE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Russell M. Biggs, now a legal clerk with the 1st Battalion, 26th Infantry, stationed in Augsburg, Germany, once served in a different corps. According to the division newspaper, the American Traveler, Specialist Russell spent his last 2 years of high school as a Capitol page under the patronage of the late Honorable Ben F. Jensen, who represented the Seventh District of Iowa in Congress for 26 years. The following article, reprinted in full from the August 6 edition of the Traveler, gives some interesting insights into the special life of a congressional page:

AS CONGRESSIONAL PAGE, LEGAL CLERK RAN
FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(By Sp4 Ken Powers)

AUGSBURG.—Tourists and critics, to a large extent, make up a congressional audience.

At every congressional session, however, an elite corps of students watch and wait, ready to spring into action at a moments notice.

They're the pages who run errands around the capital city.

Specialist 4 Russell M. Biggs, a legal clerk assigned to the 1st Battalion, 26th Infantry, spent his last two years of high school as a congressional page.

A native of Washington, D.C., he said "Most pages become one through connections." He was appointed under the Republican patronage of the late Honorable Ben F. Jensen, an Iowa congressional representative for 28 years.

SP4 Biggs had to get up early enough every morning to be at the Capitol Page School, which is part of the District of Columbia school system and located above the Library of Congress, by 6:30 a.m. Classes ran until 10:30.

Then it was off to the Republican cloakroom in the House of Representatives. SP4 Biggs explained that "The cloakroom is located under the visitors gallery and contains about 15 phones, a snack bar and a lounge."

"I worked at directing phone calls to and from the different congressmen. We also had to keep track of what was happening on the floor so that if a congressman called we could tell him."

SP4 Biggs usually got off work around 5 or 6 in the afternoon, but he could recall working until midnight on occasions.

It sounds hectic but SP4 Biggs said "It was just like a normal high school except that our teachers were professors from nearby colleges. They knew how our schedule was run so they took that into consideration on homework and exams."

"It was quite an experience and it did help to finance college." As a page, SP4 Biggs earned about \$400 a month.

The event he remembers most was when President Kennedy was assassinated. He said "The place panicked. It was just like a tomb after the announcement was made, but within weeks everything was back to normal."

SP4 Biggs, who holds a double major in Political Science and American History, revealed that he definitely plans to go into politics because "somebody has to straighten this mess out." And is he a Republican or Democrat? "Independent."

CBS PROGRAM "THE SELLING OF
THE PENTAGON"

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a column entitled, "CBS Cons the Public" appeared in the August 31, 1971, issue of the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle.

The column, by Jeffrey Hart, comments on the findings of a nonpartisan group which judged that the famous CBS program violated many rules of journalism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

CBS CONS THE PUBLIC

(By Jeffrey Hart)

Not long ago, after viewing the CBS documentary "The Selling of the Pentagon," I wrote a column pointing out the obvious: that the production used the "rhetoric of the image"—juxtaposition, closeups, rigged sequences, etc.—to mount a full-scale, propagandistic assault upon the Defense Department. What I did not know at the time was the extent to which CBS, through trick editing, had actually created synthetic statements which had never been made and which completely misrepresented the individual depicted as making them and entirely misled the television audience. Compared with what CBS did with the text, the propagandistic manipulation of images was innocent child's play.

Reed J. Irvine, board chairman of Accuracy in Media, a nonpartisan organization, goes into all this in some detail in the current issue of National Review, showing that what comes out at your end of the TV set may never have actually happened in front of a TV camera.

At one point in the production, for example, Roger Mudd asked Assistant Secretary of Defense Daniel Henkin about displays of military equipment at state fairs and shopping centers. Henkin replied:

"Well, I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their armed forces. It also has the ancillary benefit, I would hope, of stimulating interest in recruiting as we move, or try to move, to zero draft calls and increased reliance on volunteers for our armed forces. I think it is very important that American youth have an opportunity to learn about the armed forces."

Not bad. In fact, too good. CBS therefore excised from the tape all except the first sentence, and wove in other material taken from 15 paragraphs farther on in the transcript, where Henkin was commenting on another matter. This made his reply seem irrelevant and silly, and at the same time deleted his plausible rationale for the exhibits at state fairs. Henkin was the victim of other examples of this kind of "editing" for "pace" and "smoothness." The points he was making were carefully excised, and the statements coming across on the screen were in reality replies to completely different questions.

Another example. A Col. MacNeil was shown making the following statement:

"Well, now we're coming to the heart of the problem—Vietnam (55). Now the Chinese have clearly and repeatedly stated that Thailand is next on their list after Vietnam (36). If South Vietnam becomes Communist it will be difficult for Laos to exist (48). The same goes for Cambodia and the other countries of Southeast Asia (48). I think if the Communists were to win in South Vietnam, the record of the North—what happened in Tet of 1968—makes it clear that there would be a bloodbath in store for a lot of the population of the South (73). The United States is still going to remain an Asian power (88)."

Though all this came over the tube as a consecutive series of statements by Col. MacNeil, the number after each sentence indicates the page on which the sentence is actually found in the transcript of the speech. The second and third sentences are quotes from Souvanna Phouma of Laos, and were so described by MacNeil in the speech he actually made.

What CBS was doing here, concludes Reed Irvine, was creating a synthetic speech out of fragments of the real one through the use of electronic cut-and-paste techniques. Pre-recorded televised statements, he concludes, even when presented as part of a "documentary," should be viewed with extreme skepticism, for "we know now that they may be an inaccurate representation of what was

said even when the words are seen to be coming from the lips of the speaker."

"The Selling of the Pentagon" is usually referred to as the "prize-winning CBS documentary." I hereby nominate it for the Leni Reifensahl Award for political propaganda.

THE JAWS OF THE TIGER

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in attempting to explain the manner in which America and Western civilization are being methodically assaulted and undermined in the 20th century, I have sometimes used the analogy of a man in the grip of a hungry tiger. If we can imagine his situation in a kind of slow motion, during which he is not quite sure of what is happening to him, we can visualize the jaws of the tiger periodically closing and opening on the man, who tells himself each time they open that the beast has suddenly become friendly. When they close, he decides that he must try to stop the tiger's upper jaw with the lower, or the lower jaw with the upper—not realizing that all the time he is being steadily chewed up.

Americans who love their country and would defend its soundest values are not immune from the tendency to try to fight one jaw of the tiger with the other. When an immoral and unjust policy of government has produced its inevitable crop of evils, in sheer frustration and anger they may be prevailed upon to endorse a different kind of immoral and unjust policy in the name of counteracting the first one—even a policy which in the long run will vastly increase the power of government.

The most striking current example of this tendency concerns our notorious welfare abuses. Our present welfare system is without a doubt one of the worst monstrosities of big government, deliberately encouraging refusal to work, fostering welfare dependency, rewarding fraud, and through the aid program for mothers with dependent children, providing an economic incentive for promiscuity and illegitimacy. This system, and all evils flowing from it, is like the upper jaw of the tiger, closing on us.

But now many of those who denounce the present welfare system for mostly the right reasons, are beginning to favor government policies which would encourage the mutilation of men and women or the killing of unborn children, simply to prevent the welfare rolls from growing larger. To give government new powers for deciding who shall be born and who shall not, is to sharpen the teeth of the tiger's lower jaw with a vengeance. Surely, it should give us a clue to see how many of the big welfare advocates also favor massive contraception, sterilization, and abortion programs for their charges. It is all part of the power structure they are building.

In the 1930's, many Americans were told they must choose between fascism

and communism to solve their problems and the world's. Those who would have us believe that we must either make persons on welfare permanently dependent or eliminate them are offering the same kind of false and loaded choice. We must get outside this cage into which they are trying to put us: we must transcend their Marxist dialectic, reasserting the principles of personal responsibility and the sacred foundations of the family which have been cornerstones of the American way of life.

It is tragic to hear decent Americans endorsing offenses against nature and the sacredness of human life in the name of trimming welfare budgets. It can never be right to "fight fire with fire," or evil with evil, where human beings are concerned.

COMPUTER IN COURT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as American business and the Congress go more and more to the use of computers, I thought this article from the February 13, 1963, issue of *Punch* by A. P. Herbert might be instructive as to our legal rights.

The article follows:

COMPUTER IN COURT

(By A. P. H.)

Before Mr. Justice Squirrel in the High Court to-day Sir Cyril Tart, QC, opened for the plaintiff in this fascinating action, which is regarded as a test-case on some novel points of law.

Sir CYRIL said. My lord, this is an action for defamation, and the principal defendant is, perhaps, a computer—

The COURT. Perhaps, Sir Cyril? But haven't you made up your mind?

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord. With great respect, we hope that the Court will do that: for here is a new field of life and litigation, and I am unable to find any precedents with which to assist the Court, as I generally do.

The COURT. You are always very helpful, Sir Cyril. Could we now have some approximate outline of the facts?

Sir CYRIL. If your Lordship pleases—as, may I add, your Lordship habitually does. My lord, for many years my client, the plaintiff, has been a client of Generous Bank Limited. In recent years the Bank has been employing a computer.

The COURT. I never quite understand what they do.

Sir CYRIL. My lord, I am instructed, if they are accurately fed with the requisite information they will answer almost any question that is put to them. Moreover, they will answer instantly a question which might occupy twenty expert men for many days. The defendant Computer is also capable of certain mechanical actions, the addressing, sealing and stamping of envelopes, for example.

The COURT. Bless me! Can it predict the weather?

Sir CYRIL. Given the relevant facts and records, I believe it could. But the machine has, in exceptional circumstances, one possible weakness.

The COURT. I am glad to hear that they are human after all.

Sir CYRIL. Yes, my lord. They are run by electricity, and if for any reason the voltage falls below a certain level some error may creep into the answers. My lord, in January last my client was proposing to take a lease of a London flat, modest in quality but not in rent. Asked for references which would show that he was a good and proper tenant, able to meet his obligations, the plaintiff referred the property-owners to his Bank. The Bank, as their custom now is, put certain questions to the Computer, which issued, immediately, a type-written slip, being a carbon copy of its answer, as follows:

"Mr. Haddock's account is overdrawn in the sum of £51,000 7s. 3d."

There followed a second slip:

"The market value of the securities he holds at current price is £2 0s. 8½d."

A third slip said:

"What is more he owes the Inland Revenue £159,000 6s. 2d."

The COURT. Were these assertions correct?

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord. Later, by painful man-conducted researches with which few of the bank staff are now familiar, it was established that at that moment my client had a credit balance of £1 9s. 4d., and his indebtedness to the Inland Revenue had been cruelly exaggerated.

The COURT. What went wrong, then?

Sir CYRIL. My lord, it was shortly before the mid-day meal. A number of citizens in the neighbourhood had incautiously decided to use their electrical cooking appliances: and the astonished Electricity Board was compelled to reduce the voltage to a level not far above the Computer's dangerline. For a few minutes, it is believed, perhaps less, it must have crossed the line, unobserved by the attendants who had had no warning, and in that brief space of time the questions concerning the plaintiff chanced to be presented.

The COURT. Yes, but the Bank, surely, did not pass the erroneous information on?

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord: but the Computer did. The "top copies" of the answers were placed by it in a sealed, addressed envelope and despatched by chute to the ground floor, where the express messengers waited. The property-owning-company received the message about 3.0 p.m. and at once declined to let their flat to the plaintiff. Moreover, one of the directors of the Company was on the committee of the Royal Yacht Squadron, which has an old-fashioned prejudice against bankruptcy, and at that evening's election my client was blackballed.

The COURT. Dear, dear. But, Sir Cyril, the case seems clear enough. The Bank, by its servant, the Computer, has published a libel, and is responsible.

Sir CYRIL. So, at first, it seemed to the plaintiff—and, I believe, to the Bank. But, having unbounded faith in the powers of the machine, they fed the necessary facts into it and put the question: "What's the answer?" The Computer replied, my lord:

"I am not—repeat not—your servant—for you cannot control me."

The COURT. I see the point. A good point.

Sir CYRIL. It is the point, I am sorry to say, on which the Bank relies. This is a machine, they say, having superhuman powers, and it would be presumptuous and unreal for any association of ordinary men, even a joint stock bank, to pretend to such a domination as is implicit in the relation of master and servant.

The COURT. Yes, but it is their machine.

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord, it is not. It is on hire from Magical Electronic Contrivances Limited.

The COURT. What do they say?

Sir CYRIL. They say that they have leased a perfect, infallible machine to the Bank, and they are not responsible for the blunders or negligence of the Bank or the Central Electricity Board.

The COURT. Oh, yes. What about the Board?

Sir CYRIL. They are protected, they say, my lord, by a section in the original Electricity Act.

The COURT. Do they? They would.

Sir CYRIL. At this point in the preliminary argument, my lord, the Bank put a further question to the Computer. "You see the dilemma, don't you? What do you advise?" The Computer replied:

"Try 'The Act of God.'"

The COURT. The Act of God? "Something that no reasonable man could have been expected to foresee." Lord Mildew, wasn't it? Something in that, perhaps. But, Sir Cyril, as these superhuman instruments increase in number and power the outlook is grave, is it not, if every mischief they cause is to be dismissed as an Act of God for which no man is responsible?

Sir CYRIL. Yes, my lord. This is, as I intimated, in the nature of a test-case.

The COURT. So you may be reduced, you fear, to a single defendant, the Computer? What is the attitude adopted there?

Sir CYRIL. Satisfactory, my lord. On receipt of the writ, the Computer replied:

"Gladly accept service. My solicitors are Bull Stableford and Brown but I shall require legal aid." And, in fact, legal aid has been granted.

The COURT. Interesting, is it not, Sir Cyril, that the only one of these parties to behave with human decency is the machine? But where will this get you? It is a machine of straw.

Sir CYRIL. My lord, the Bank having refused consent, by order of Master Richards an interrogatory on that point was administered to the Computer. It replied:

"Am earning heavy money. Why not attach my earnings?"

The COURT. But would not that be unjust to Magical Contrivances Limited?

Sir CYRIL. Possibly, my lord. But they did construct and distribute the monster. For the injustice suffered by my client he is not remotely responsible.

The COURT. True. Perhaps, before these instruments go into operation, they should put in a capital sum, like a gentleman seeking to do business at Lloyd's, to ensure that they can meet any unforeseen indebtedness?

Sir CYRIL. That is a question, my lord, which might well be put to the Computer.

The COURT. Perhaps it would care to come up here and try the case?

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord. It is not, I think, a British subject.

The COURT. Do you know, Sir Cyril, I think I shall go into a home for a fortnight and think about this case. One of those fruit-juice places.

Sir CYRIL. If your Lordship pleases.

The hearing was adjourned.

U.S. TROOPS IN EUROPE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, in the recurring talk of U.S. domestic economic problems and the reminder of a deficit balance of payments, many solutions have been suggested. I am today introducing a resolution which I believe, and I hope my colleagues will concur, would greatly achieve some success toward alleviating our deficit balance of payments.

We spend approximately \$14 billion a

year to keep our U.S. troops, their dependents, and materiel in Europe 25 years after the end of World War II. Keeping the present level of troops in Europe to protect countries in better financial condition than the United States is, to me, sheer folly. Not only are we paying the upkeep of these troops, the countries in which they are quartered are levying special taxes on us for the privilege of keeping these troops there for their protection.

Our NATO allies have continuously demonstrated their reluctance to take over any major part of the heavy U.S. burden in NATO long after the Western Europeans have gained the capacity to play the dominant part in their own defense.

With our dollar in danger, slow business at home, constantly rising taxes, and a budget deficit, we cannot afford the luxury of quartering our Armed Forces in Europe. A decrease in the force strength would not only cut down on expenses, it would probably prove to be more efficient as well. These now well-to-do countries should, and can reasonably be expected to, increase their financial commitments for their own defense and not depend so heavily on the United States.

**SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT
FIGHT: HINGE IS INTERPRETA-
TION**

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the essence of the effort the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) is making in bringing the prayer amendment to the floor of the House of Representatives is captured in an article which appeared in the September 12 edition of the Columbus Dispatch.

As one of those who has signed the discharge petition, I am pleased to call attention to this analytical news report as a means of putting this issue in perspective. I wish to commend my colleague for all that he has done to advance this cause in this session of Congress.

I can appreciate the reluctance of some Members to associate themselves with discharge petitions, but I think all of us must recognize that this is an established procedure for handling controversial issues when there is little or no disposition to take committee action.

It is my considered judgment we must respond to the overwhelming desires of the people and thus avail ourselves of the discharge petition mechanism. In taking this approach, it should be made clear that we do not cast reflection upon the committee chairman from whose committee the resolution would be discharged. We respect his point of view as well.

I ask that the Columbus Dispatch article appear in the RECORD:

SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT FIGHT: HINGE IS INTERPRETATION

(By Roulhac Hamilton)

WASHINGTON.—The fight in Congress over a so-called "school prayers" amendment to

the Constitution rests not so much in what the Supreme Court held on the subject as in what many lawmakers, judges, school officials and the public believe it said.

There is no question in the minds of those who have read its 1962-63 rulings that the Supreme Court did not outlaw prayer in public schools. What it did do was to outlaw any official requirement for prayers, Bible readings or religious services.

There is a vast difference in a ruling by the Supreme Court (and the 1962-63 rulings were only two of nine holding that the Constitution bars any official requirement for religious observance in schools) and in saying (as the court has never done) that no one, on his own initiative, may pray or participate in prayer in school.

But if that difference is (to officials who must enforce the law as enunciated by the high court and to lower court judges who must interpret their actions) so obscure as to generate a belief that the court actually has said that no prayer can be tolerated in public schools, what happens then?

The answer to that question, at least in the minds of members of Congress who have been fighting since 1962 to nullify what they believe to be either the court's ruling or what they believe that ruling to be, is a constitutional amendment to "clarify" the court's ruling that would, in effect, limit the meaning of the separation of church and state clauses of the Constitution's First Amendment.

It is over one of those resolutions—introduced by Rep. Chalmers P. Wylie, R-Columbus—that the current battle to permit prayers in public schools is being waged in the House. Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler, D-N.Y., is Wylie's major opponent.

The House, because of Celler's opposition, has never acted on the proposal to amend the Constitution to offset the Supreme Court decision. The Senate, in 1966, took up a proposed amendment by the late Sen. Everett M. Dirksen, R-Ill.—identical language to Wylie's—but while a majority approved it, it did not poll the required two-thirds margin.

Wylie is struggling with Celler over a proposal to take the prayer amendment resolution out of the Judiciary Committee's hands and bring it directly to the floor by a vote of the whole House. Wylie has assembled, despite Celler's opposition, 190 of the 218 members' signatures required to discharge the resolution from the Judiciary Committee. He has, at least, hope of gaining the remaining 28 signatures he needs and thus topple the major hurdle to full House consideration of the amendment.

There is, of course, more to getting the proposed amendment into the Constitution than getting it to the House floor. Once there it would require a two-thirds majority for approval. If it made that score, it still would need a two-thirds majority of the Senate.

But, assuming it wins in both houses, the amendment still would require the ratification of three-fourths of the states—or 38—to become a part of the nation's basic law.

None of this will be easy. Despite the support for the proposition in Congress and despite public clamor for it, the amendment has powerful and sincere opposition from church groups.

The Rev. John W. Thomas of the American Baptist Convention's Department of Christian Social Concern says "Baptists are opposed traditionally to any attempt to make prayer compulsory."

W. Hubert Porter, associate general secretary of the Baptist organization, charges that "crusaders for an amendment to cut the heart out of the First Amendment by making constitutional the legislation of religion can make their case sound deeply religious and superbly patriotic."

He continues:

"They at times make it appear that the steadfast friends of the First Amendment are

against God, country and motherhood, but such an impression is a deception and a delusion. The truest friends of religion and the most constructive citizens of the state are those who support the First Amendment guarantees that have made possible in the United States a fuller measure of religious freedom than was previously known in the world."

Many religious authorities contend it is "clearly impossible for government to legislate religion without violating the rights of many citizens." They ask if prayers in schools are required, "whose religion will it be? Buddhism in Hawaii, Mormonism in Utah, a Baptist-oriented Protestantism in Georgia, Roman Catholicism in Massachusetts, Judaism in New York?"

If non-denominational prayer, as in the Wylie amendment, is involved, they ask, "who determines the content in a school—the school board, the superintendent, the principal, the teacher? If so, such a prayer becomes a government-prescribed prayer."

But the amendment has its organized backing—such as Citizens for National Prayer, National Parents for Prayer, the National Federation Association of Republican Women, the National Grange, and the Back to God movement—as well as that of Mrs. Ben Ruhlin of Cuyahoma Falls, who is a one-woman organization having collected 170,000 signatures on a petition backing the Wylie discharge petition.

If Wylie can seize the prayer amendment from Celler's tight grasp, the matter could shape up into as hot a floor battle as this Congress has seen so far.

**THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTERS—WHERE
SHOULD THEY REGISTER?**

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during the debate here on the House floor when we were considering the constitutional amendment granting 18-year-old citizens the right to vote, I raised some questions as to where college students would be allowed to register—at home or in their college community. I was concerned then, and am still very concerned, that we were cooking up some tremendous problems for the hundreds of small cities and towns around the country which might happen to be the location of a college or a university. In many of these communities, the student population is much larger than that of the permanent residents and the students could easily elect public officials and approve programs which might not be in the best interest of the community and, in fact, could be harmful to the community and its permanent residents.

In yesterday's Chicago Tribune I noticed an article with a Hartford, Conn., dateline to the effect that a U.S. district judge had ruled in favor of some students at Yale who had filed suit against the city of New Haven's registrars when those officials refused to register students carrying out-of-State drivers' licenses.

A recent Gallup poll reported that 67 percent of the American people feel that students should be required to register in their own permanent home communities rather than in their college community and it is my understanding

that a number of State legislatures around the country are planning to consider legislation to accomplish that objective. I hope they will move with dispatch.

I include the Tribune article as well as an editorial from the September 10, 1971, edition of the Peoria Journal Star, entitled "College Town Vote Confusing" in the RECORD at this point:

STUDENTS AT YALE WIN VOTE RIGHTS

HARTFORD, CONN., Sept. 13.—Yale students denied the right to register as voters in New Haven won their suit against the city's registrars today.

United States District Judge M. Joseph Blumenfeld, pointing out that there is a mayoral primary on Sept. 22 and an election on Nov. 2, ordered the registrars to treat students, former students and spouses of students exactly the same as other applicants.

The students claimed they were discriminated against as a class, being required to answer more questions and produce more proof of residency than other applicants.

Blumenfeld said any applicant must be presumed to be a bona fide resident of New Haven if he is at least 18 years old, is a U.S. citizen, has lived in New Haven for at least six months before applying to become a voter, regards New Haven and no place else as his home. Also that he has not registered to vote anywhere else in the last six months, has no intention of voting anywhere else he may have registered during the preceding two years, and has claimed no other place as his residence during the preceding six months.

New Haven officials laid great emphasis on the drivers' licenses of student applicants and rejected some of them largely because they held licenses in other states, according to testimony at last week's hearing before Judge Blumenfeld.

The effect of Judge Blumenfeld's ruling on other "college towns" in Connecticut was not immediately clear.

COLLEGE TOWN VOTE CONFUSING

Some may remember that we forecast the fuss over students voting under the new 18-year-old law in the college towns. It took no special insight to make that forecast, and the fuss is already occurring.

The reasons are obvious because of age-old questions as to what constitutes a bona fide residency, and because of the basic function of registration laws in the first place.

Registration laws were created to make elections honest. They were urgently needed to avoid organized practices of multiple-voting—and they still aren't perfect.

The effectiveness of registration laws in terms of large elections, especially, depends entirely on the systems for cross-checking, and making sure only the latest registration stands.

If organized bodies of students, for example, were to register in their own home towns and also register in their college towns, it would be very difficult to check—and would obviously open the door to voting absentee at "home" and voting in person at the campus.

It is all very well to take a liberal view of establishing residency, but it is certainly a perversion of the process if such an approach and such free-wheeling standards open the door to a non-refusable claim to registration in two or more places at the same time.

Such problems are the traditional ones that flare up in this situation, and it does seem that the logical place for most students to vote is in their traditional "home" especially if they occupy manifestly temporary housing at school.

That is hardly an unreasonable interpretation and many clerks are making it.

The problem is given a real surge from the spectre in some towns of transients with no local responsibilities or taxes overwhelm-

ing the actual continuous residents and taxpayers at the polls in voting on tax referenda and local officials.

Probably all of these fears are exaggerated.

When it comes to the showdown, most students between 18 and 21 will probably prefer to vote in their original home towns, anyway, for a variety of reasons, associations, and because most of them probably feel more honest that way.

This is said to be a generation that hates hypocrisy, and it would be a shame if their first political act was an immediate sell-out.

Many will not vote at all, certainly, for a variety of reasons such as affect all of us, but on the record of "new voters" in particular. Too often such do not really get interested until the last moment and only then discover that it is too late and that there are such things as registration, etc.

Few, indeed, will go to all the trouble involved to register in the campus town and in the home town, both, plus the additional nuisance of the absentee vote procedure.

That is small consolation, however, to any town that might become the isolated victim of a big organized "fun" drive that "caught on" with a sizable campus crowd.

And those responsible to keep elections honest cannot be expected to say, "probably not" and "it doesn't matter."

What we really need, and may someday have is an effective computer system that can interchange with other computers and instantly spot the double-registration.

It is now a laborious mail process at best.

The chances of cleaning up a registration double-up by an out-of-state student would be just about nil—plus the question of whether the out-of-state student is STILL an out-of-state student if he is allowed to register at campus.

At that moment, his whole status, tuition-and-all, is scrambled.

A bit of common sense is going to be required on the part of both election officials and students.

It isn't really a simple "right or wrong" situation.

SPARKS FROM THE OZARKS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, while pursuing my daily ritual of perusing my hometown newspaper, the Springfield, Mo., Daily News, I happened across a poem that was submitted to the "Over the Ozarks," column, edited by Jean Davies.

The poem, written by my neighbor, Mr. George V. Hennessey, was entitled "Sparks From the Ozarks." I was so taken by it, and enjoyed the verse so much, that I share it with my colleagues:

SPARKS FROM THE OZARKS

(By George V. Hennessey)

Pappy he was happy in the Ozarks hills,
Didn't labor like his neighbor, owned two
moonshine stills;

Pappy raised three youngsters, each a burly
boy,

Named 'em Herman, Sherman, Verman . . .
they're his pride and joy.

Pappy didn't make 'em work or even go to
school.

Said that if he made 'em go, 'twould break
the Golden Rule;

When they weren't on the river catchin' gars,
They'd sit around the house all day, astrum-
min' on git-tars.

Plinkin', plankin', plunkin' on them old git-
tars,

They played by ear because they couldn't
read no music bars.

Folks said, "Pappy, don't you know in life
they'll be afunkin'?"

Pappy said, "So what? I love to hear them
git-tars plunkin'!"

Pappy's kids are grown up now, they live
down Nashville way;

And people call 'em artists . . . pay to hear
'em sing and play;

When they visit pappy's home they pass the
neighbors' shacks

Asportin' slinkin' Lincolns and gold-plated
cadillacs.

Pappy's days are happy, he has sold his stills,
His boys have built a snazzy home for pappy
in the hills.

Herman, Sherman, Verman on the world have
left their marks;

Shows shirkin' sure beats workin' in the old
Ozarks.

ADVERTISING IS A BASIC RIGHT

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, it is not very popular to speak out about the tobacco industry. There are those who are intolerant of any statement that might possibly cause them to have the slightest doubt about their preconceived notions.

My purpose today is not to defend or attack the tobacco industry. It is rather to add another voice of concern to what I feel is an infringement on the basic rights of an industry and that the precedent is dangerous.

Simply stated, tobacco and its products have not been outlawed and those who have managed to legislate against this industry having the basic freedom that other industries have—advertising—are unfair and discriminatory.

It amazes me sometimes to see people who advocate liberties and freedom for some segments, suddenly become the final arbitrators of whether an American citizen wants to smoke or not.

Certainly, misleading advertising should not be allowed. In this case I believe in another basic principle and that is calling the guilty to account in a court of law after the fact—not before.

The freedom of all is only as strong as that one individual who is treated differently before the bar of justice. My friends and colleagues, what has happened to the tobacco industry may well be a forewarning for others.

Others sit idly by because they are not affected. They do so at their own peril.

In this regard, I want to have printed here an article in the Florida Farm Bureau magazine of August 1971. Their article, written by Al Alsbrook, makes the same point I want to make—the banning of cigarette advertising endangers a basic constitutional right.

The article follows:

THE NEW TOBACCO CONTROVERSY

On Friday, June 18, 1971, Congressman Bob Wilson of California rose to his feet on the floor of Congress and said, ". . . the time has come for all members to take a fresh look at the cigarette controversy to see just exactly what is in danger of going up in smoke.

"More is burning," he said, "than tobacco. More is threatened than the special interests of members from North Carolina, Virginia, and Kentucky and their constituents . . . the bell is tolling right now, for the cigarette industry.

"The assault on the right of legal products to legally advertise is an assault on the fundamental function of the American enterprise system," the Congressman warned.

Congressman Wilson is one of many who are taking a closer look at the "new cigarette controversy."

This article does not attempt to question the health hazard or non-hazard of smoking. It is a person's individual right to decide whether he wishes to smoke or not to smoke.

But even if you don't smoke, never did or never will, whether you're a farmer or a non-farmer, you have a vital, multi-faceted interest in tobacco because there are other factors besides health which come into play and should be considered.

The economics of tobacco, and the problems to which Congressman Wilson referred (i.e., the fundamental right to advertise a legal product) are two of the most important factors to be questioned.

Let's talk about economics.

According to Horace R. Kornegay, president of the Tobacco Institute, if the government is successful in what seems to be an attempt to outlaw cigarettes—by outlawing cigarette advertising—vast numbers of Americans who owe all or part of their living to tobacco will be out of jobs.

About three million members of farm families earn their principal livelihood from tobacco. They live in 22 states and earn about \$1.4 billion a year from the leaf.

More than 100 thousand workers are gainfully employed in tobacco manufacturing and collect an annual payroll of more than half a billion dollars.

There are more than 4,500 wholesale firms that distribute the product to literally hundreds of thousands of retail outlets that depend on cigarette sales for a substantial part of their income.

There are nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars realized from the export of tobacco and tobacco products.

Federal and state governments receive \$4.6 billion in taxes from the sale of tobacco products.

In all, there are 329 industries directly or indirectly involved in selling their products to the tobacco industry, ranging from cellophane and advertising to transportation and steel.

Do these "economic factors" mean anything to the citrus grower, cotton or corn producer, vegetable or soybean farmer or to the non-farmer?

If there were no tobacco sales, the \$4.6 billion in taxes generated by tobacco would have to come from somewhere else, perhaps from taxes on other farm or general consumer products.

And what would happen if tobacco acreage was shifted to other crops—cotton, corn, vegetables, or soybeans? What would the impact be to suddenly have over 900 thousand acres of land in 22 states diverted to the production of those commodities?

To go a step further, let's look at foreign trade upon which American agriculture—all American agriculture—depends so heavily.

Sales abroad of manufactured and unmanufactured tobacco in fiscal 1970-71 came to \$717 million, more than 95 per cent of which were straight, commercial, hard-cash sales, as opposed to government aid programs. They accounted for more than 10 per cent of all our agricultural exports.

Where would this revenue come from if we lost our tobacco exports?

In Florida, during 1970, the state collected \$115,224,000 in tobacco taxes.

The cities of Florida also benefited to the tune of \$68,207,331 with major shares going to Jacksonville, over \$6 million; Miami/Dade, \$11 million; and Tampa, \$5 million.

It should be kept in mind that the tax on cigarettes was raised by the 1971 Legislature by two more cents with the bulk of the \$12 to \$15 million prospective increases returning to the cities.

So from a practical dollars and cents standpoint, farmers who do not grow tobacco have a very definite interest in the future of tobacco in the United States.

Non-farmers should consider answering some of the same questions posed for farmers concerning the tax yield of tobacco.

But, as Mr. Kornegay pointed out, we should not balance or equate health against dollars.

We should, however, he suggested, look at the principle of the right or lack of it to advertise a legal product and then decide what course is just.

Kornegay and Congressman Wilson make the same point.

"Shall we, as a nation, scrap the historical principle that anybody—an industry as well as an individual—is innocent until proven guilty?" Kornegay asked.

Tobacco, they say, has not been found "guilty" and is not, in fact, outlawed; its advertising should not be outlawed.

He continues: "If this new standard is imposed on business, then we can say goodbye to the economic system as we know it. We will really see a domino theory in action. First, the tobacco industry, then the auto industry, the drug industry and the food industry. Banking, oil, air travel, advertising will also succumb," he warned.

The point Kornegay and Wilson and others make is fairly simple.

Unless tobacco itself is outlawed, simple logic dictates it should be permitted to advertise. If discrimination is allowed against one individual or industry, the door is open for discrimination against all.

If the government, in apparent defiance of first amendment guarantees, bars the advertising of a legally grown and marketed product, what is to prevent it from also banning advertising of other products and services which can be shown to be dangerous under some circumstances?

One of the biggest opponents of tobacco, its advertising and/or its use in Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah.

The Senator has charged the tobacco industry with "unconscionable hucksterism," and accused the industry of "callous disregard for expressed congressional intent and public opinion. . . ."

He has also made statements on the floor of the Senate and at public gatherings about further limits of cigarette advertising in printed media.

Moss has called for banning tobacco companies from sponsoring televised sports events or any commercial undertaking that might lead to any product identification on the air.

Senator Moss has come under extreme fire from congressmen and fellow senators alike who represent tobacco growing and non-tobacco growing states. In December 1970, Senator Marlow Cook of Kentucky—a tobacco growing state—charged fellow Senator Moss with providing the Senate with an example of what he termed a "shocking attack" against the tobacco industry, the tobacco farmer and the workers and manufacturers.

"Quite obviously, the Senator from Utah believes he is engaged in a war against this perfectly legal product. And equally obviously, he believes that all is fair in war and that the ends justify the means," Senator Cook said. What all of these "pro" tobacco forces seem to be saying is that there is a bigger danger in outlawing cigarette advertising as such.

Perhaps the editors of *Advertising Age* summed it up best in an editorial entitled, "It's Everybody's Fight" when they declared, "make no mistake about it: the government is out to ban cigarette advertising in any

shape or form, and if they can get away with that they can get away with banning ads of any other product category."

The editorial continued, "the last time around, non-tobacco advertisers pretty much washed their hands of the drive to force cigarette ads off the air. But they no longer have the luxury of standing aside and watching cigarette ads shoved out of magazines, newspapers and, finally, out of advertising altogether. Can toy makers be far behind if the government is successful in their anti-cigarette crusade?" The editorial continues to point out that Senator Moss—successful in leading the fight against radio and television cigarette advertising—now has his sights aimed at the printed media.

"It can be argued that Congress has some obligation to police the air waves, since broadcasters are required to operate in the public interest," the editorial states.

"But the structures of magazines and TV are entirely different. Magazines present a more selected, less intrusive medium, where readers can more easily ignore an ad that doesn't interest them, or even offends them.

"Congress doesn't have any business trying to ride herd on the advertising of a legitimate product, legitimately sold," the editorial says.

"It's about time non-cigarette advertisers made it clear that they think Senator Moss' action is a patent and grossly unfair infringement on their right to market a product without undue government harassment."

Does the "domino" theory Mr. Kornegay refers to exist?

Is there a basic danger that printed cigarette advertisements will be outlawed?

Are first amendment guarantees in the Constitution to the right of free speech being violated?

An editorial from the Salt Lake City Tribune in 1969 put it this way.

"It is obvious anti-smoking forces do not intend to stop with their initial victory. Already plans are being shaped to bring pressure on other media to severely restrict or eliminate cigarette advertising. After that what?

"For more than 50 years the automobile has been killing and injuring people and, unlike the cigarette, there is not the slightest doubt about the motor vehicles' capacity for dealing death. Will the same people who worry so much for cigarette smokers have equal concern for drivers and pedestrians?

"Will aspirin, swimming pools, razor blades, step ladders, high fat foods and any number of other products that can and do cause death and injury follow the cigarette into advertising limbo? . . ."

As Congressman Wilson put it, "Mr. Speaker, the bell is tolling right now, for the cigarette industry. But tomorrow who knows? The automobile industry, the food industry, the drug industry, and, above all, the advertising industry are all vulnerable. The assault on the right of legal products to legally advertise is an assault on a fundamental function of the American enterprise system."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WINSTON PROUTY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of our former colleague, Senator Winston L. Prouty, of Vermont, and I want to take this means of paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory.

Senator Prouty served with distinction

in the House before becoming a Senator and was a fellow "classmate" in the 80th Congress. We were longtime friends and served together in our first committee assignments as members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

As a Member of the House and later as a Senator from Vermont, Winston Prouty was a tireless, dedicated public servant. He was a quiet, studious, hard-working legislator who made outstanding contributions to the preparation of vital and important legislation in the public interest. He was well-informed, and he did his homework. He was especially interested in assisting the Nation's older Americans and contributed much in this area and otherwise in the public interest.

Senator Prouty served his beloved State and the Nation faithfully and well, and he will be greatly missed.

My wife, Ann, joins me in extending to Mrs. Prouty and other members of the family an expression of our deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the recently concluded Minnesota health hearings, Mr. Otto Janke, MHA, JD, the executive director and superintendent of the St. Paul-Ramsey Hospital and Medical Center in St. Paul, discussed in very concise terms the need for better organization and improved quality in the delivery of health services in the United States. Mr. Janke represented the Council of Teaching Hospitals which is affiliated with the Association of American Medical Colleges. In his statement Mr. Janke also presented the position of the Council of Teaching Hospitals on the various national health insurance plans that have already been introduced into Congress.

As Mr. Janke pointed out, general hospitals provide the majority of curative and preventive care in areas of our society which lack the health pluralism of richer sections of the country. These hospitals, because of their central role are vitally concerned with the social aspects of medicine as well as the strictly medical aspects of health care.

Very properly Mr. Janke pointed out that if health care is to be a guaranteed right for all citizens, it must be treated like other existing services which already protect citizens in their daily lives. For this reason, Mr. Janke supports a system of health care that is not based on the present fee structure.

As Mr. Janke points out in his statement, the Council of Teaching Hospitals supports the "concept of adequate health care as the right of all citizens." During their recent meeting the council decided to delete any reference of the right "to access" to health care and broadens the statement to include the right to adequate health care.

Finally, Mr. Janke points out the

need to better understand the term "health information." According to a recently completed survey, there are 132 community mental health facilities in Ramsey County alone. This vast proliferation of facilities taxes even the most intelligent professional in his attempts to provide access to patients to the facilities. Added to this problem is the one of failure of many in poor communities to use institutions because they are identified with the establishment. Mr. Janke stated that one of the great problems will be to keep what is good in the neighborhood facilities and at the same time attract those people in the community needing service. This will require removing the stigma that is presently attached to many facilities endeavoring to serve the needs of their immediate community.

THE CRISIS IN MEDICAL CARE

1. The funding of medical research is so deeply intertwined with the financing of medical education that it warps the financing of medical education programs.

2. While steadily adding specialties and various subspecialties, medical schools and hospitals have failed to undertake a careful restructuring of their educational activities.

3. It is apparent that in health care services, no less than in other basic services, our low income and minority citizens have been the victims of the lack of medical care or substandard care.

4. Systems of health services are sporadic, unpredictable, widely variable in quality and quantity, unplanned and often not readily reproducible from one community to another.

5. Financial reimbursement programs are equally disorganized and not consistent with economic goals of a comprehensive delivery system.

a. The two government programs (Title XVIII & XIX) provide different ranges of benefits, with different controls over quality, ranges of benefits, and different and extensive mechanisms adding to the cost of health delivery programs.

b. Non-governmental insurance arrangements lack cohesion, efficiency, clarity and economies resulting from uniform reporting procedures with an emphasis on marketability rather than fundamental needs or coordination of comprehensive health care programs. Consequently, health services offered match benefits rather than the needs of the patient.

6. In summary, we recognize that we have attained unprecedented heights in health care in scientific and technologic capabilities, but find ourselves confronted by a growing crisis because of complicated financing arrangements and a failure to organize a delivery system which meets the needs of the sick and infirmed at the lowest cost and most expedient manner.

REQUIREMENTS TO MEET THE CRISIS

1. Access to health care.

A. Sources of health care within reasonable geographic proximity.

B. Access to clinics, health centers and physicians' offices at hours that are reasonably convenient for patients.

C. Adequate public transportation.

D. Access to emergency care at any time of day or night.

E. Provision for prompt referral of patients from any initial source of care to progressively more sophisticated care in accordance with each patient's individual needs.

F. Certain key ancillary resources (example: day care services for the children of patients represent vital elements in access to health services).

G. A less complex method by which the patient enters the health care system.

2. Comprehensiveness of Care.

A. The system must provide for promotion and maintenance of health and for preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic and rehabilitative services.

B. These elements of health traditionally isolated from the mainstream care such as tuberculosis, alcoholism, drug addiction, other forms of mental illness and long term illness must be integrated into a comprehensive health care delivery system.

3. Coordination of Clinical Data. Accurate, timely exchange of pertinent clinical information about each patient among different types of professional health care personnel and health care institutions to which the patient may apply for health care.

4. Absence of financial barriers.

5. Improved and expanded health information programs designed to educate the general public.

6. Dignified and humane care.

The attitudes of personnel and the physical surroundings in which care is rendered must be geared to patients' dignity.

7. Economy and efficiency.

Under current programs of health care, patients are hospitalized for procedures that could be done more quickly and less expensively on an ambulatory basis. This phenomenon makes a restructuring of current financing mandatory.

8. Self-scrutiny and receptivity to change.

The development of incentive programs to encourage new and innovative health care delivery models.

9. Continuing Education

Monitoring by requiring periodic relicensure and recertification of health care personnel on a national level rather than state licensure programs.

10. Manpower

A. Many of the tasks traditionally carried out by physicians and dentists can be performed as well or better by other technically trained personnel. The education and training of such personnel can be accomplished in fewer years and at less expense. Models should be established and evaluated.

B. Programs should be developed to encourage lateral and vertical mobility.

C. Focus attention on the barriers which still confront members of minority groups in their efforts to secure useful roles in the health field.

11. Financing

(The mechanisms by which health services are paid for in this country are incredibly complex.)

Nothing short of some type of universal health insurance can restore a reasonable degree of efficiency and fairness to the system.

This does not necessarily require a federally operated program with government ownership of facilities and government salaries for health care personnel. However, a system of universal nationwide standards with federally sponsored monitoring of the system is indicated.

The most appropriate way to secure financing for health services may be a combination of federally coordinated insurance programs subsidized from federal tax programs.

12. Scientific medicine

Scientific research is a fundamental element of our entire health care effort, and must be supported but not at the expense of professional education or the delivery of health services. The burden of financing health educational programs must be underwritten from federal sources rather than the inadequate private, local and state tax sources.

POSITION OF THE COUNCIL OF TEACHING HOSPITALS ON NATIONAL HEALTH PLANS

The Council of Teaching Hospitals of the Association of American Medical Colleges supports the concept that adequate health care is a right of all citizens. This right can be best served by means of health in-

insurance and progressive change in the health care delivery system. The system must be a national one with adequate provision for varying regional requirements. Financing should be based on prepayment both public and private. Control of the system and fixing of national health goals and priorities requires appropriate balance between public and provider inputs.

Any such system must assure access to primary care and prompt referral, in accordance with individual patients' needs to progressively more sophisticated facilities and personnel. It must also provide for, and emphasize, preventive as well as curative care on an ambulatory basis.

The system should optimize quality of care and economy; and should utilize incentives as an aid in cost control and in developing a more effective and responsive national mechanism for delivery of health services. It must include a continuing and dynamic method for evaluating overall operation and performance of providers.

POSITION ON THE SPECIAL ROLE OF ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTERS

The education of health manpower must take place within the system for providing health services. In those settings where both health services and education are provided, the costs will be greater than in those settings in which care alone is provided. This fact should be reflected in reimbursement policies under any health care plan.

Because of their special role in educating health professionals, conducting research and in developing new methods, academic health centers must be recognized as national resources. Within the Centers, biomedical research and those elements of educational cost not directly related to provisions of patient services should be separately funded from multiple sources, including the Federal Government.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF WEST HAVEN, CONN.

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the golden anniversary of the city of West Haven, Conn. Although the citizens of this scenic New England community are celebrating only the 50th anniversary of self-government in West Haven, this city is one of the oldest settled communities in the United States as well as the youngest of Connecticut's 169 towns. The story behind this ironic circumstance is one of tribute to independence of spirit and community destiny.

In the mid-17th century, adventurous citizens of the New Haven colony took to grazing their cattle and sheep in the fertile grassland to the west of the settlement across the West River. Motivated by the desire to be free, some colonists built their homes and settled in the area known as the West Farms District of New Haven. As the number of West Farms residents grew, the demands for political independence was heard. In the early 1700's, the landowners of West Farms established their own government under the auspices of the Congregational Church on the "square" in the center of their community, and they petitioned the New Haven Colony for their independence. Although their request was denied, a church of this denomination still re-

mains on the center "green," a tribute to the early position of the church in colonial government.

The same spirit of independence which induced the settlement of West Farms inspired the residents of the community to join forces with other colonists to ward off a British invasion of New Haven during the Revolutionary War. British forces led by Adjutant Campbell landed along the shoreline of West Farms and stormed through the small community, only to be turned back at the river crossing into New Haven. There, colonial forces overwhelmed the British and thwarted the invasion attempt.

The valiant defense of their settlement heightened the townsfolk's movement for independence. This movement reached a zenith in the days following the American Revolution, and by the early 19th century, partition was a dream which had clearly arrived.

In 1822, the Connecticut General Assembly considered the petitions for separation presented by two areas, the West Farms Section of New Haven and the North Milford section of Milford, a community to the west of West Farms. Since the chief argument against separation of either town was that each section was too small in population and size to sustain an independent town, the problem was resolved by granting township status upon the condition that the two sections join together as one community. The new town comprised of West Farms and North Milford was named Orange, in honor of William III, Prince of Orange.

It was apparent from the start that the union of the two sections into the community of Orange was a compromise which failed the townspeople of both districts. Commercial and industrial enterprises became the dominant trades of the West Haven Village section of Orange, while the upper section of the community retained its agrarian economy. By 1841, a movement was already under foot to divide the two districts. In 1873, the West Haven Village was granted legislative recognition as a borough within the town of Orange. West Haven grew as an industrial center including shipbuilding, manufacturing, and industrial development, while the upper section was agriculturally oriented.

The conflict was finally resolved in 1921, when State Senator Charles Treat, of Orange, presented legislation to the State general assembly to divide the two districts. This measure was adopted, and the town of West Haven was incorporated as a separate community, the last of the 169 towns to be established by the State general assembly.

Fifty years ago marked the end of the struggle for independence for the citizens of West Haven; however, it did not dampen the spirit of freedom nor the sense of community destiny maintained by the townspeople. The past 50 years have seen the amazing growth of West Haven from a small town to a city of over 50,000 citizens. The rapid growth of population and the subsequent increase in demands on governmental services led to the abandonment in 1963 of the classic selectmen-town meeting form of government to the more modernistic mayor-council system. The change of govern-

mental structure was in keeping with the tradition of the community, always striving for the most efficient and effective system of self-government.

As the population grew, so did the commercial offerings of this city. The community has become known for its principal industries—automobile tires, textiles, chemicals, manufacture of buckles, artificial stone products, and numerous technical and engineering skills. West Haven continues to attract new enterprises with its forward-looking policies.

The tradition of valor and determination which first led the early residents to overcome the British invasion during the Revolutionary War has been carried on by the thousands of native sons who have fought in our Nation's struggles during the past 50 years. Hundreds of West Haveners have given their lives in these conflicts.

Mr. Speaker, the golden anniversary of West Haven on one hand points to a long and glorious past, but on the other hand a brilliant and progressive future. We, here in our Nation's Capital, are familiar with the quotation on the Archives Building—"What is past, is prologue." The truth of this saying is illustrated by the steady growth and achievement of the citizens of West Haven. Tradition has set a firm foundation for future prosperity in this community.

QUALITY EDUCATION

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 days I have submitted for the RECORD letters from constituents relating to the misdirected, so-called educational efforts of busing for the sole purpose of achieving racial balances in our schools. Those letters demonstrate good citizenship and an attitude of fair play and good will toward other citizens of the opposite race. They rightly challenge the courts as racists since it is that system which takes into account the color of a child's skin in determining the school which he or she must attend.

For today's RECORD I am submitting three letters which help to complete the picture and show the hardships and inequities which are so typical.

Busing for the purpose of integration makes no positive contribution to the cause of education. As shown by the following Joseph Alsop column, which I also submit for the RECORD, the integration goal has only resulted in sapping and diluting the quality of education in America.

[Attachment No. 1]

COLUMBUS, GA.
September 9, 1971.

President RICHARD NIXON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: The following letter was written by my son after he received a letter transferring him to another school. The day before school started we called to find out the transfer did not go through. How-

ever, the boy was willing to go to the new school if only it could be arranged that he go back to the other school for this one subject, that means so much to his education.

Because of the fact that the school he has been transferred to does not teach any course in the subject he was majoring in he is willing to drive back and forth, school to school so that he will be able to take this course and still attend the school he was transferred to.

Is this the type of freedom that this boy's father and big brother fought for in Viet Nam? He is willing to go along with the transfer to a different school. Can't it be arranged, please, that he continue this course that means so much to him?

Your attention to this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MARY TERRY.

[Attachment Number 2]

SEPTEMBER 9, 1971.

DEAR SIR: I have been advised by Mr. Carl Sasser to write this letter requesting a transfer from Spencer High School back to Jordan High School, so that I may continue the vocational program that I was taking there.

My name is Bill Terry, and I will be a junior in this school year. There are few students, today, in our High Schools who have already chosen a profession for their adult life. Helping the student choose a career, is one of the most difficult tasks that the school and faculty must accomplish, but once this bridge is crossed it is only a simple matter of scheduling the student in the classes that will best prepare the student for further education or for the student to go directly to work after completing High School.

Since the eighth grade, I have prepared myself for a career in architectural designing. When the time came, after Junior High School, to choose the High School that I believed would best prepare me in this field, I found that Jordan was the *only* school that offered a course in both mechanical and architectural drafting. I was very determined to take full advantage of these classes offered.

As a Freshman at Jordan, I excelled rapidly from the other students in the mechanical drawing class and I was anxious to go into a higher level in the drafting field. At that time the architectural classes were restricted to Seniors and some Juniors. I was allowed on a trial basis to be admitted as a Sophomore, to take this highly advanced class. I was the first Sophomore in the history of Jordan to take this class. Before the end of that year, I had worked on more than seven actual plans of remodeling the roofs of Columbus schools. My drawings were actually used by the carpenters and technicians working on these projects. I was, of course very proud of this accomplishment, but beyond the pride of this, I realized the high degree of education I received that year.

Mr. Bill Meadows, the teacher of this class, set up a special program for me so that by the time I completed High School I would be highly advanced in the drafting classes at the University that I have chosen to go to.

I have purchased out of my own savings that I have been working at for the last two years, a professional set of drawing instruments and a complete inking set which totals more than \$30.00.

This summer I have attended on my own time, an evening class in which I have been preparing a complete set of house plans which I plan to enter in national competition through the Vocational-Industrial Clubs of America of which I am a member. The goal that I hope to obtain is a scholarship which is first prize in this competition. To enter these plans, I must be a student of Jordan High School.

I have talked with Mr. Nathan Patterson and he has assured me that the best possible solution for "Hardship Cases," as he referred to them, in cases like mine will be obtained.

I have been informed that Spencer High School offers *no* classes in drafting. I would sincerely appreciate it if at all possible for me to go back to Jordan High School in the afternoons for this particular class.

Thank you,

BILL TERRY.

[Attachment Number 3]

SEPTEMBER 10, 1971.

Re: Victoria Ann Owens, 5348 Burbank Street, Columbus, Georgia

DR. WILLIAM H. SHAW,
Superintendent, Muscogee County School District, Columbus, Georgia

DEAR SIR: Vicky was sent a letter, assigning her to Spencer High School. I took her Tuesday morning and told her to find out the bus schedule. She stayed out of classes off and on all day, trying to. When school was out, a friend of hers called her mother, Mrs. Dowling, to come get them, as they still didn't have a bus.

Wednesday morning, Mrs. Dowling took them to school and they were told they would just have to go to Carver High, because they have buses coming out our way and we were told the nearest one came to Reese Road, which isn't near us at all.

Thursday morning, I took Vicky to Kendricks High, to see if they could take her. I was told by the Principal, Mr. Toole, to go to Spencer and get a release, or permission to transfer from that school. I went to Spencer and talked with Assistant Principal, Mr. Buntin, who in turn talked with Mr. Toole. Vicky was accepted by Mr. Toole at Kendricks, as he said they had enough room for her in the 9th grade and we live less than a mile from there. Then, Mr. Buntin called the Muscogee County School District Office and was told Dr. Shaw would have to review it and make a decision. I was told by Mr. Buntin, to take Vicky home and he would call me and let me know what the outcome was. Around 12:30 p.m., he called and told me Vicky had been sent to Carver and was to catch the bus at Sims and McCartha Street, which is off St. Mary's Road, about three or four miles from our home.

At the present, Vicky is home, where she will remain, until she can either go to Kendricks, in walking distance, or else get a bus to take her to some other school that comes closer (at least 3 or 4 blocks) to the house, since busing seems to be what the Supreme Court wants. She is only 14 years old and I feel she needs an education just like any of the other children.

I am not writing this letter to be smart, but because I have four other children that go to school, all in different directions of town and I am very much interested in their education and welfare.

I have one that goes to Marshall Jr. High by bus and a son and daughter that go to Forest Road School, by bus. I also have another daughter that goes to Special Education at Woodall School and has no transportation. It's not that I'm against busing, I'm for it, if they have to be sent away from neighborhood schools.

My husband and I both work and have no way to take them and go get them from school everyday.

Please take my problem into consideration, as I feel I have one and review my case very closely.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) MARTHA HOLLOWAY.

[Attachment Number 4]

LIBERAL INTELLECTUALS KILLING SCHOOLS
(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—If you want to know where we now stand, particularly in our management of our dire internal social problems,

you can do worse than consider the following set of facts.

Item: Last June 17, the Pennsylvania Commission on Human Relations preemptorily ordered prompt, total desegregation of the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh school systems, by massive intra-city busing if need be. As of today, Philadelphia's schools are already above 60 per cent black.

Truly desegregated schoolings therefore impossible in Philadelphia. In addition, on the basis of all past experience over nearly 20 years, Philadelphia's white families with children to educate will gradually flee to the suburbs. So Philadelphia is almost certainly condemned to end as a near-ghetto city with a solid black school system.

Item: This is the present condition of Washington, D.C. Ironically enough, precisely because of the desegregation order of 1954, the Washington school system has been just about solid black for years.

It is deeply doubtful, furthermore, whether Washington's black children today get any better education than they did when there were still white children in white public schools. And it is certain that the clever black children—who should be the future door-openers for their people—are getting a much worse education than used to be offered in the wicked, segregated days at Dunbar High School.

Item: The New York Times, which at least cannot be suspected of prejudice, very belatedly conducted two recent surveys of the results of desegregation, one in New York City and one in the nation. The New York survey told of schools torn "by racial fears and resentment." The nationwide survey spoke grimly of "racial polarization, disruptions and growing racial tensions that sometimes erupt into violence."

Item: The few remains of this country's unique experiment in serious school improvement in the ghettos are in New York; but they are now likely to be cleaned away. The More Effective Schools Program has long been dying for two reasons. It had no support whatever from liberal intellectuals.

In addition, liberal educationists viciously attacked the program when it still had some juice in it as a "self-fulfilling rationale for segregated education." This bias in turn biased certain key reports on the program.

The program had its faults but was full of the richest promise. Yet the fashionably liberal reports spoke only of the failures, which could have been swiftly remedied by tackling the faults.

Item: In those days, the fashionable American liberal prescription was not schools improved by simple practical methods calculated to teach children to read and write. The fashionable prescription was, instead, "community control." The Adams School, in this city, is a good specimen of an experiment in community control.

That impeccably fashionable liberal, former Commissioner of Education Harold Howe, refused to lift a finger to aid the More Effective Schools in New York. Meanwhile, he found federal money for Morgan School. And a recent report in the Washington Post shows that Morgan School today is an educational disaster area, while its community control system has become something mighty close to a financial racket.

Add up these items, which predict the future of most of the major cities in America. What, then, do they mean?

First of all, and very obviously, they mean that the virtuous American liberal sloganeers have had hold of the wrong end of the stick for years on end. Instead of worrying about "self-fulfilling rationales," they should have been beating the drum for massive school improvement right where the children are in school.

When improvement comes—and it will have to come—it will be very expensive. It will require enriching education from a very early age, such as the able William Raspberry of the Post has just written about. It will

demand root-and-branch effort on the lines of the More Effective Schools Program. But if equal justice is to be offered to America's black minority, the job will have to be done in the end.

Yet the foregoing record, bulging with facts which have been around for years, also has another meaning. It means that American intellectual liberalism is now finally devoid of any intellectual content whatever; for intellectual content after all means ability to face and deal with facts like the foregoing. Instead, there are only two remaining American liberal slogans: "Lose the War" and then "Disarm the United States."

EXAMINING THE PREMISES OF SOCIAL WELFARE LEGISLATION

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I included in the RECORD an article from the September 10, 1971, Wall Street Journal on the limits of rationality in social programs. Today, I would like to continue examining the premises of social welfare legislation by concentrating on accountability in education.

Dr. Roger Freeman, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, and a consultant to President Nixon on economic and educational questions from 1969 to 1970, discusses in the current University Bookman the need to evaluate our education programs on the basis of their output rather than by simply measuring how much money we put into them.

As President Nixon said in his landmark message on education last March:

We must stop congratulating ourselves for spending nearly as much money as the entire rest of the world—\$65 billion a year at all levels—when we are not getting as much as we should out of the dollars we spend.

I commend Dr. Freeman's article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the University Bookman, summer, 1971]

THE CONCEPT OF ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION

(By Roger Freeman)

Ever since President Nixon sent his message on Education Reform to Congress in March 1970, a lively discussion has been going on about its content, its meaning, its implementation. Some of his critics thought that the President should have recommended federal support of public school operations to the tune of several billion dollars a year and left everything else to the school administrators, the boards of education, and the teachers. That is what the National Education Association and its allies have been demanding for well over a hundred years, and still deem to be the solution to the problems which beset the schools. But no President ever has recommended such a program, nor is Congress likely to approve one if it were proposed, at least for as far in the future as we can see ahead. In fact, the chances for federal general school support appear to be slimmer now than they were twenty or twenty-five years ago.

In his message of March 1970, the President followed a track that runs counter to

the road his critics in the educational establishment would want him to travel. He introduced the concept of accountability: "School administrators and school teachers alike are responsible for their performance and it is in their interest as well as in the interest of their pupils that they be held accountable." He declared: "We have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of schools."

That conjured up in the minds of some school principals a vision of being tarred and feathered if their students fell short of the national norm on standard achievement tests. But that is not what it was intended to mean.

At the outset the President made it known to the staff charged with drafting the education message that he wanted its prime emphasis placed on reform and not on finances. This message was in preparation for six months and was as thoroughly studied, discussed, revised, and edited as any Presidential document could and should be; it went through several drafts before it was finally issued.

In contrast to many other messages it does not say: here is a problem and this is the solution. It admits that we do not know as much about the learning process as we should, that we have no ready answer to the question why so many children do not learn the essentials they need. It makes it quite clear however that the time is overdue to find out.

Accountability of the schools is not an entirely new concept. Some of us have been talking about it for a long time. Wilbur Cohen, President Johnson's last Secretary of HEW, criticized three years ago "the voluminous, yet unsuitable data now available for assessing the products of our education." He complained that "practically none of it measures the output of our educational system in terms that really matter—this is in terms of what students have learned." He added that it is an "incredible fact that the nation has, year after year, been spending billions of dollars on an enterprise without a realistic accounting of that investment."

In this, the first message on education reform by any President, Mr. Nixon made it clear that though far more money would be needed for education in future years, money alone was not the answer. Educational processes and methods would have to be made more effective and more productive. "We must stop congratulating ourselves for spending nearly as much money on education as does the entire rest of the world—\$65 billion a year on all levels—when we are not getting as much as we should out of the dollars we spend."

The President promised: "As we get more education for the dollar, we will ask Congress to supply many more dollars for education."

If we are to establish accountability for huge manpower and material resources, whether in education or in any other field, we must relate input to output, or investment to return. Quantity is usually easier to gauge than quality, input easier to determine than output. But some measurement of quality is essential, particularly in education.

Until not so many years ago almost everyone active in education knew how to measure the quality of a school: class size (i.e., teacher-pupil ratio); qualification of the teachers (i.e., academic degree, years of experience, salary); number of books in the library; age, size, and equipment of the building; and dozens of similar gauges. The number of ta-

¹ In the school year 1969/70. The corresponding figure for the current academic year, 1970/71, exceeds \$70 billion. For the first time since the 1930s, the American people will in fiscal 1971/72 be spending more on education than on national defense.

bles in the NEA's annual *Rankings of the States*, listing available statewide data, jumped from 32 to 132 just within the past dozen years. But the final and most widely recognized yardstick of school quality that included all other measurements was: dollars expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance.

There is just one trouble with these data: they all list input, the resources consumed by the schools; they don't measure the output or product. We know how many young people go through the schools and how many graduate. We don't know how much they learn while they are there. We don't record the capacity and the skills and knowledge of the students when they enter school, nor when they leave. If we did, we would at least know how much was added in the meantime, though there still would be a question of how much of the increase should be credited to the school.

To be sure, the public schools administer many millions of intelligence and achievement tests each year. But the results of those tests are not systematically used. Moreover, they are closely guarded secrets in most school systems, for fear that they would be used, and possibly abused. A few major cities—New York, Washington, Oakland—have published test results in recent years and also given us such input factors as class size or expenditure per pupil; some have added socio-economic data which can be correlated. Those reports enabled us to gain valuable insights—which I shall discuss later—but we have no longitudinal studies which record a pupil's progress through his entire school career. Project "Talent" plans a sequential study, but it will be some years before final results will be in.

Some have tried to justify sharply increased educational spending, past and future, by giving improved education much of the credit for growth in the nation's economy. That better education advances economic growth will hardly be doubted. But how much the education which our schools actually provided contributed to greater production and higher incomes is problematical. Brookings economist Edward Denison tried to find an answer by a residual process: he credited education with whatever economic growth he could not trace directly to the infusion of manpower and capital investment. His estimate that almost one-third of our 1929-1963 economic growth was due to education has been profusely quoted. But it is very tenuous and has been seriously questioned by other economists who came up with a far smaller credit to education.

Some observers have related the years of formal schooling which an individual completed to his income level, in order to show the high return on investment in education and thereby, indirectly prove the value of a quality education. The Census Bureau computed lifetime earnings (from 18 to death) as follows:

[In 1968 dollars]

	Based on—		Increase 1956-68
	1956 earnings	1968 earnings	
Men with—			
Some elementary school...	168,287	219,996	51,709
8 years elementary school...	228,872	285,344	56,472
4 years high school...	312,622	382,678	70,056
4 or more years college...	477,137	602,864	125,727
Increase:			
8 years elementary over dropout.....	60,585	65,348	4,763
High school over elementary.....	83,750	97,334	13,584
College over high school...	164,515	220,186	55,671

In twelve years, then, the value of an elementary education increased by \$56,472, of a high school education by \$70,056, of a college education by \$125,727.

These figures have been widely used and interpreted as meaning that a young man could add \$97,000 to his lifetime income by attending high school, \$220,000 by attending college. But that seems to overstate the case.

There probably exists a positive causal relationship between school attendance and income level—with important exceptions. For example, a plumber is now paid \$355 for a 40-hour week in San Mateo County, which is more than the average teacher there gets. But to attribute all of the higher income of persons who have stayed in school for more years to the fact of their longer attendance is naive or misleading. Extended school attendance as well as economic success in later life, are causally related to the same personality traits more than to each other: higher intelligence, ambition, i.e., motivation to work hard, to plan ahead, to forgo immediate gratification for future advancement, etc. In other words, a man earns a higher income for the same reasons for which he attends school for more years: brains and tenacity.

The tendency of spokesmen for the educational profession to claim credit for the schools for economic growth, for higher income, and for just about everything else that is good and wholesome in American life, to praise school attendance as the answer to poverty and a remedy for most other ills, is understandable. But it boomeranged when shortcomings in the schools' product were becoming painfully obvious, and when some of the promised improvements did not materialize. Many educators laid a trap for themselves when they exaggerated the returns from school education; not surprisingly they were blamed for deficiencies even though the failures often were not the schools' fault.

Illiteracy has been sharply declining in the United States: it was reported at 11.3% of the population by the 1900 Census, at 4.8% in 1930, at 2.4% in 1960. These rates are higher than in major European countries—but at least they are coming down. Moreover, the 1960 illiterates averaged 58 years of age. With better than 99% of our school-age children now attending school, we seem to be well on the way of resolving the problem within not too many years.

But functional illiteracy—that is, inability to read and write sufficiently for a minimum functioning in today's economic, political, and social life—is far more extensive than the Census reports indicate. The Office of Education estimated that 24 million persons 18 years and over are "functionally illiterate"—they cannot read, write, or count at a fifth-grade level. Yet, there were on last count only 6.4 million Americans, 14 years and over, who have attended school for fewer than five years. In a study on Chicago's Southside, for example, 93% of the respondents were found to have completed at least the fifth grade; but fewer than half could read at a fifth-grade level.

School attendance in a particular grade, and even graduation, do no longer guarantee a specified educational level—ever since the schools, some years ago, discovered the secret of perpetual promotion. There are now some high school graduates who cannot even read their diploma. For about a quarter century, school critics such as Canon George Iddings Bell, Arthur Bestor, Mortimer Smith, and Admiral Hyman Rickover have blamed soft curricula and failure to maintain standards, for the inability of large numbers of public school children and graduates to master the three Rs. The schools' defenders countered that by maintaining rigid standards the school would be driving less able children from the classroom, which obviously would not help to raise their skills and

knowledge. The root of the problem, they asserted, was inadequate financial support.

In the early 1960s Congress became increasingly concerned over the reported educational deficiencies among millions of the nation's children, particularly those from low-income backgrounds. To be sure, the schools' revenue and expenditures had risen tremendously—from \$5.8 billion in 1950 to \$18.5 billion in 1965 (and to \$32 billion in 1970), which is a rate of increase more than twice as fast as enrollment and prices combined. But the added funds, it was asserted, had not reached the sections where the poor and their children lived and went to school. Class sizes had been coming down in the national average, it was said, because certain suburbs and other wealthy sections could afford to hire additional teachers while central city schools were increasingly plagued by crowding and excessively large classes. Small wonder that children from poor family backgrounds were lagging several years and falling behind further while the offspring of middle class and well-to-do parents made progress.

There were no statistical data available to prove these charges. But they seemed plausible enough and were widely believed. To establish once and for all the existing discrimination against children from low-income backgrounds, Congress ordered, in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, that a comprehensive survey be undertaken, to form the basis for future legislative corrective action. Some grumbled at the time that it was a waste of money to spend \$1.25 million to find out what had long been common knowledge. But the survey was undertaken anyway—the most extensive ever of American schools—by James Coleman, a sociologist from Johns Hopkins University. The results surprised Professor Coleman and everybody else—with the exception of a few heretical researchers who had been saying so right along.

Coleman summarized his findings: "The evidence revealed that within broad geographic regions, and for each racial and ethnic group, the physical and economic resources going into a school had very little relationship to the achievements coming out of it." He concluded that "if it were otherwise we could give simple prescriptions: increase teachers' salaries, lower class size, enlarge libraries, and so on. But the evidence does not allow such simple answers."

In response to questions by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Professor Coleman reported in June 1970 that eight reanalyses by other researchers had not in any way altered the results. Reviewing the national debate on the Coleman Report, Christopher Jencks of the Harvard School of Education summarized his conclusions: "Variations in schools' fiscal and human resources have very little effect on student achievement—probably even less than the Coleman Report implied."

Coleman found that the teacher-pupil ratio "showed a consistent lack of relation to achievements among all groups under all conditions."

Ample evidence of this was available long before the Coleman Report. The *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, summarizing over 200 studies of class size and pupil achievement, reported in 1950 that:

"On the whole, the statistical findings definitely favor large classes at every level of instruction except the kindergarten . . . the general trend of evidence places the burden of proof squarely upon the proponents of small classes. . . ."

More recently, the most detailed report now available on any city school system (*New York City School Fact Book*, City University of New York, 1969) found:

"The evidence we have accumulated is somewhat surprising. We have recorded traditional variables that supposedly affect the quality of learning: class size, school ex-

penditure, pupil/teacher ratio, condition of building, teacher experience and the like. Yet, there seems to be no direct relationship between these school measurements and performance. . . ."

A report on the Oakland Public Schools on 1966/67 state test results listed the median family income for each school. If we divide Oakland's 60 elementary schools into three groups, according to family income, we find these results: in the lowest income group the median pupil-staff ratio was 1:20.5, in the highest income group it was 1:28.2. SAT reading test results were:

	Grade			
	1	2	3	6
Median of lowest income group	1.6	2.1	2.9	4.2
Median of highest income group	1.8	2.9	4.0	6.2
Difference2	.8	1.1	2.0

I could cite many similar examples. But that seems hardly necessary.

Coleman was careful to point out that "racial composition per se of the school was not related to achievement when the social class composition was controlled."

With the long held and still widely believed assumption of a positive cost-quality relationship disproved, and race not the controlling factor, how do we explain the troublesome phenomenon that some children learn well and some don't? We have long known that differences in achievement among pupils tend to be wider within schools and classes than among schools. This suggests that the student achievement is not as closely related to school features as we have been led to believe. Otherwise, performance within schools and within classes would be far more uniform than it is. Educational attainment seems to depend largely on forces over which today's schools exercise only limited control.

Coleman found the factor with the strongest correlation with student achievements to be the socio-economic-educational status of the parents. He, and many others, interpreted that as meaning that the home environment; the substance, level, and intensity of conversations with family; the presence or absence of books; the example, encouragement, stimulation, and assistance by parents and other family members was the crucial element, aside from the contact with other children attending in the same school. Few will question that home environment can be a powerful factor in motivating children to learn. But studies of adopted children suggest that characteristics of the natural parents are far more influential than environment. A study of one hundred adopted children by Marie Skodak and Harold Skeels, for example, found that "the intelligence of individual foster children appears to bear little relationship to measures of the foster home in which they are placed, while appreciable correlations appear between the IQ of the foster child and that of his own mother from whom he has been separated from birth."² Studies by Sir Cyril Burt and others have found the IQs of identical twins reared apart to be almost as closely correlated as the IQs of identical twins reared together.

Considering what we can observe throughout nature, is it really so surprising that a child's score on the educational achievement tests of school tends to parallel his parent's score on the economic achievement test of life?

Intensive studies in recent years by Arthur Jensen, educational psychologist at the Uni-

² *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 1968, vol. 7, p. 428.

versity of California at Berkeley, confirm the conclusions of the pertinent scientific literature in the field. For example, Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner summarized in their massive volume *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings* (New York, Harcourt Brace, 1964):

"Large differences in intelligence as measured by the standard intelligence tests, are due principally to heredity. Here is one expert's review of studies on how much difference in ability results from the types of environmental differences usually found among homes and communities. One summary with which most others agree fairly closely, is that the variation in tested intelligence among school children is accounted for 75% by heredity, 21% by environment, 4% by accidental factors." (p. 217)

Experience has shown that the schools can teach almost every normal child to read, write, or count to the same extent to which it can teach him to sing, paint, sculpture, swim, run, play a musical instrument, or play basketball—that is, according to his individual capacity to perform and succeed in each of these fields. It can no more teach all children to read or count at the national average than it can teach all children to sing or swim or sculpture or play basketball at the national average. But some people seem to feel that in a country as rich and powerful as ours *everybody* ought to be above the average, or at the least, at the average.

This reminds me of the alchemists who for nearly two thousand years, with a tremendous effort and at a huge expense, tried to do what we now know cannot be done. But they and their sponsors had a deep emotional need to believe that it could be done, so they kept trying and went undeterred from defeat to defeat, always expecting to find success around the next corner. For how much longer will we let our latter-day alchemists set goals for our public schools?

At the Senate hearings to which I referred earlier, the Superintendent of Detroit Schools, Dr. Norman Drachler, pleaded with the committee in a manner that seemed facetious but was deadly serious:

"I might add, gentlemen, if this committee could do anything for education and equality, it would be wonderful if you would pass an act that would outlaw the national norm. It is a monstrosity for the school system. . . . As long as we have a norm, 50 percent must be below that norm."

This means not, I believe, that we should abolish the national averages as a statistical tool, but that we should outlaw it as a norm which all children are expected to meet. If school officials pretend that they can bring every child up to a national norm, they are bound to disappoint and frustrate many children, to antagonize their parents, shake the confidence of wide sections of the public and, in the end, diminish the school's chances of attaining even the goals which are within their competence.

But the belief in the magic of the dollar dies hard, in and out of Congress, particularly among the potential beneficiaries of a federal program.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 sharply expanded the compensatory education programs which had been initiated in several cities during the late 1950s or early 1960s. Congress was promised then—and has been promised several times since—that the added federal funds would enable the schools to raise to national norms the cognitive skills of "deprived" children who are lagging one or several years behind their schoolmates.

Now, five years later, we know that Title I has done nothing of the sort. Most compensatory education programs have not raised the arithmetic and reading performance of the "benefited" children. That is what President Nixon reported to the American people in his Education Message of March 1970:

"We must stop letting wishes color our judgments about the educational effectiveness of many compensatory programs, when—despite some dramatic and encouraging exceptions—there is growing evidence that most of them are not yet measurably improving the success of poor children in school . . . the best available evidence indicates that most of the compensatory education programs have not measurably helped poor children catch up."

"Recent findings on the two largest such programs are particularly disturbing. We now spend more than \$1 billion a year for educational programs run under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Most of these have stressed the teaching of reading, but before-and-after tests suggest that only 19% of the children in such programs improve their reading significantly: 13% appear to fall behind more than expected; and more than two-thirds of the children remain unaffected—that is, they continue to fall behind. In our Headstart program, where so much hope is invested, we find that youngsters enrolled only for the summer achieve almost no gains, and the gains of those in the program for a full year are soon matched by their non-Headstart classmates from similarly poor backgrounds."

Headstart has been called the most promising of all these programs, and it probably is: it has *promised* more than any other—but it has not delivered. We have been sending an increasing number of children to school at four years of age and at three, which is all to the good, though it has not produced lasting results. Some are now proposing that we start at birth. But the available evidence suggests that even intervention at birth may come about nine months late.

I could recite to you the failure of the Higher Horizons and More Effective School programs in New York City, of the Bancker project in St. Louis, of the Madison project in Syracuse and of dozens of others. Virtually all of these projects were initiated and directed by experienced educators, resourceful and enthusiastic leaders such as Jacob Landers, Samuel Shepard, Mario Fantani, Carl Hansen, supported by large numbers of equally enthusiastic teachers. The "Pygmalion in the Classroom" charge of self-fulfilling low expectations is contrary to the truth. Most of the big city projects were staffed by men and women who sincerely believed that they would succeed in lifting their students' academic achievements to higher levels. But sooner or later they could no longer hide their failure, from themselves or from others.

On May 21, 1970, Neil Sullivan, who was superintendent of Berkeley schools until 1968, testified before a Senate committee:

"Berkeley, as most communities in 1965, with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, put its first money into compensatory education. We went the whole route, lowered class size provided remedial reading teachers, bought the machines, did those things that we thought were right. The results after two and a half or three years clearly indicated that not only did the child in the inner city not improve, he had retrogressed."

That experience was repeated in city after city. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission reviewed the major compensatory education programs since 1957 and found that "none of these programs seems to have raised significantly the achievements of participating pupils."

More Effective Schools (MES) in New York City has now been going for seven years. Its 21 schools have an average teacher-pupil ratio of 1:11.7 and spent in 1967-68 \$1,275 per pupil. A similar-sized district in the borough of Queens (#25 with 23 schools) had a teacher-pupil ratio of 1:24.6, spent \$671 per pupil. Sixth-grade arithmetic scores (norm 6.4) averaged; in District 25, 7.0;

in the MES schools, 5.2—almost two years behind.

But the parents in the MES schools had been promised by city and school officials years ago that their children would soon catch up and perform according to norm. Is it any wonder that they no longer trust those officials and harbor bitter resentment, which on several occasions has exploded into violence?

Mayor Lindsay said in 1969: "Our schools are the most lushly funded school system in the nation . . . it has the best teacher-pupil ratio of any city . . . but the management of the thing is such that we just don't get the production." (*New York Times*, June 6, 1969) Achievements in New York City schools are substantially below national average, and they continue to slip.

New York City's school chief admitted six months later: "We have been spending a great deal of money on solutions which have little relation to the causes. Nobody knows why certain children are not profiting from the educational program. . . . Money is being spent on new gimmicks but nobody knows the cause and effect relationship. . . . We have offered all kinds of solutions but they are not producing results and nobody knows why." (*New York Times*, December 4, 1969)

If this is the conclusion of the head of the country's biggest school system, which is already spending more than twice the national average per pupil, how can we justify pouring huge additional funds into the country's largest and fastest growing industry, education—now spending at the rate of \$70 billion a year—until we know what works and what will give our taxpayers a proper return on their hard-earned dollars?

This is why President Nixon proposed that we try to find out what produces results in education before we add multi-billion-dollar programs to our present total of educational spending.

Accountability is a tool to concentrate the attention and efforts of officials who set school policy and of principals and teachers who carry it out, on making tangible progress toward the designated goals of the drive to lift the cognitive skills of lagging children. "For years," the President said, "the fear of 'national standards' has been one of the bugaboos of education." He explained that "success should be measured not by some fixed national norm, but rather by the results achieved in relation to the actual situation of the particular school and the particular set of pupils." (Emphasis supplied)

So we shall have to measure the skills and knowledge of children when they enter school and at stated intervals during their years of attendance. We must then evaluate their progress in the light of *their own* capacity for growth and compare it with the advance which other, similarly situated, children achieved in the same school or elsewhere. Accountability should help to stimulate teachers, principals, and school systems to vie with each other in friendly competition for the most effective instructional methods.

To conduct, sponsor, expand, and strengthen research into instructional methods, the President proposed to Congress the establishment of a National Institute of Education. It should help to find answers to some of the hundreds of questions which are puzzling those trying to solve our educational problems.

Here are some of the questions I would ask: Which are the most effective methods of teaching arithmetic, reading, writing to children who show little interest in those skills and seem not to possess much talent for them? Should we force all pupils into a Procrustes bed of standard curricula and national norms although we know that some children are tall and some are short, educationally speaking? Would it be more effective to shape various curricula to conform to

children's differential capacities instead of trying to adjust all children to a uniform mold? If so, what goals should we set and how? Should we continue our present school structure, should we try new organizational ideas, or should we follow the pattern that prevails throughout most of the rest of the world? What is the potential of programmed learning (machines), movies, and other mechanical methods of instruction? Should we work largely through the public schools or should we try to broaden the variety of offerings by getting private schools involved, as much as possible? Admittedly, these are leading questions, dealing with highly controversial subjects.

The Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity recently sponsored a few projects aimed to find answers to some of these questions. A far greater variety of instructional methods could be tested by free-market methods if parents were given a choice in the type of school to which they want to send their children. At this time, the nearest (or assigned) public school enjoys a virtual monopoly because not many parents can afford to pay the high charges that private schools must demand to sustain themselves from tuitions. This could be remedied by a voucher plan which is now being tried out: NEA, AFT, and other groups strongly oppose the voucher plan—whose results could prove embarrassing if some private schools succeeded where public schools failed. Income tax credits for school taxes or tuitions are another—and in my opinion more effective—way of reducing the economic penalty for the exercise of parental freedom of choice in selecting a school.

The advantages and disadvantages of voucher and tax credit plans are also being explored by the President's Commission on School Finance.

James Coleman advanced another idea which is now being tested: performance contracting. Instruction is farmed out to a private school or organization whose fee is geared to the pupils' measured progress in the cognitive skills. This idea is as obnoxious as the voucher plan to those who believe in the superiority of the monopoly approach to education.

In conclusion: Much thinking will need to be revised, many long-established practices altered, if we are to succeed in preparing children from low-income backgrounds more effectively than we have so far for the social and occupational demands of life in the last third of the twentieth century. The needed changes will extend to many public policies and institutions. But the schools will of necessity play a key role in the process of turning children into self-sustaining adults, able to take their proper place and meet their responsibilities in our society. This is why those to whom the schools are entrusted will have to accept a greater responsibility for their product than they have in the past. I trust that they will live up to that responsibility.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE
HUDDLESTON, JR.

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the tragic and sudden passing of our beloved former colleague George Huddleston, stricken by a heart attack at his office yesterday. In the more than 20 years that I have served in Congress, I have never known a more

able Congressman than Congressman Huddleston. I served on the Armed Services Committee with him and on many subcommittees. He was a dedicated American with a razor-sharp mind, sparkling wit and warm compassion for his fellowman. I join my colleagues here in the House in expressing our deepest sympathy to his lovely wife and children. We hope that their knowledge of his great contributions to his country and to mankind will give them some comfort in their grief.

ESTABLISHING SABBATICAL LEAVES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce H.R. 10704 today to restore public confidence in the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the Secretary of State to assign Foreign Service Officers to educational institutions and to trade, labor, agriculture, scientific, and other organizations for regular periods of sabbatical leave.

During their service at these private institutions and organizations, Foreign Service officers will be exposed to people whose concerns are related to domestic matters as well as to international affairs. They will be called upon to defend American foreign policy at the grassroots and will learn at first hand what makes this country great.

In many areas distrust of American foreign policy—or certain aspects of it—is pervasive. As the Pentagon Papers reveal, we are still paying the price for the Johnson administration's failure to level with the American people on Vietnam.

American officials need public support for an effective foreign policy, yet Americans quite correctly will not offer support until they can have confidence in their public servants. One way to insure this confidence is to remember the advice of President Eisenhower that "a prerequisite to the achievement of all our international affairs and finance programs is dynamic, positive, and dedicated leadership by the Department of State."

Yet many Foreign Service officers, our frontline in the State Department, fail to meet this responsibility.

Nor is this a recent failure. To the contrary, reformers of American foreign policy have been concerned with the cultural expatriation of Foreign Service officers at least since Secretary of State Dulles appointed Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University, to head an evaluation of the Foreign Service in 1954.

Noting that "men immersed continuously in other societies inevitably tend to lose touch with the circumstances and attitudes that shape national policy at home," the Wriston report concluded that the Officer Corps must become more broadly representative of American life to attract sufficient public support. The

report proceeded to recommend changes in recruiting and the return of overseas Foreign Service officers to duty in the United States after every 6 years if possible.

Yet despite the accomplishments of "Wristonization," the problem of re-Americanizing FSO's still remained. After conducting an intensive study of the requirements for foreign affairs personnel, the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel, headed by Christian A. Herter at the request of Secretary Rusk, in 1962 declared that "recruitment programs should place special emphasis on knowledge of the American heritage and institutions, a knowledge that must be continually refreshed." The committee recognized that the frequency of home duty was as important as the total time spent in the United States.

However, FSO's were able to live in the United States and still maintain their aloofness from American life and culture. A study in 1968 sponsored by the American Foreign Service Association concluded that "much greater stress should be placed on assuring that during assignment to the United States the Foreign Service officer receives maximum exposure to the many and varied aspects of American society and to the changing world of ideas."

A 1970 report proposing management reform for the State Department, "Diplomacy for the 1970's," provided further evidence that existing programs did not meet the need when it declared:

The Department should encourage leaves of absence as a means of affording an officer greater scope for developing his talents as he sees them.

Although these latest recommendations have defined the problem more clearly, they have yet to be fully implemented. True, the diplomat-in-residence program inaugurated in September 1964 promotes closer ties to the academic community by enabling Foreign Service officers to teach classes, meet faculty and students, and explain American foreign policy to townspeople. Yet only seven persons were enrolled in the program during fiscal year 1971 and these were required to be senior officers.

Moreover, of 1,287 FSO's assigned to the United States, less than 60 served as full-time students in private institutions during fiscal year 1971. Indeed, the bulk of the FSO's in the United States hold posts within the State Department or pursue training at the Foreign Service Institute—FSI.

Yet the FSI provides inadequate exposure to American life for returning FSO's. The Wriston report itself warned that unless the FSI provided a completely different change of pace away from the Washington area, the Institute would not fulfill the needs of FSO's. The FSI's present location in the Washington metropolitan area hardly meets the report's suggestion.

My bill would begin to implement these neglected recommendations. After initial approval on a limited basis, this program would eventually enable Foreign Service officers to spend 1 out of every 7 years in grassroots sabbaticals.

H.R. 10704

A bill to provide for the detail of Foreign Service officers to private institutions and organizations, and for other purposes

Whereas there is a need for direct communication between the Foreign Service people, the Government, and the American people at the grassroots concerning the objectives of our Government, in the field of foreign affairs; and

Whereas it is essential that the people of this country understand the role of the United States as the leader of the free world and the commitments and pledges of support, including mutual assistance and other international programs, which are an integral and necessary part of our leadership; and

Whereas it is essential in this time of world uncertainty and unrest that the people of this country be informed of these commitments and pledges so they may understand the problems facing our country and the efforts undertaken to further the security and prosperity of these United States; and

Whereas United States foreign policies and programs derive their fundamental strength from the fact that they are based on a broad and solid national consensus; and

Whereas the Foreign Service of the United States and its officer corps have firsthand knowledge and experience in the making of foreign policy and its implementation; and

Whereas the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and United States Information Agency have officers who are experienced and qualified in this field and who, after participating in a sabbatical leave program, would resume their careers in the Foreign Service, greatly enriched as a result of this firsthand contact with the American people; and

Whereas it would be beneficial to bring the American people and experienced officers of the Foreign Service together for discussions, lectures, and other direct contact which would bring greater understanding and appreciation of the difficulties of formulating and administering our country's foreign policy; and

Whereas the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, contains the basic authority relating to the appointment, compensation, service (including details and assignments) of officers and employees of the Foreign Service, it is deemed appropriate and advisable to amend this Act to provide the necessary authority to enable officers of the Foreign Service to participate in a sabbatical leave program: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 573 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for special instruction, training, consultation, or service at, with, or to public or private nonprofit institutions and educational institutions; trade, labor, agriculture, scientific, or similar organizations; or commercial firms. Any such detail or assignment shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 571, and appropriations utilized for the payment of salaries and expenses of officers and employees of the Service, and their dependents, are authorized to be reimbursed when reimbursements are received from any such institutions, organization, or firm for all or any part of the salary and expenses of any officer or employee of the Service and his dependents during any detail or assignment under this subsection. Any such officer or employee of the Service may accept, when authorized by the Secretary of State, quarters, travel expenses, and similar prerequisites from any such institution, organization, or firm during any detail or assignment under this subsection."

HELPING THE HUNGRY: MRS. JEAN LOGAN

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in this day when gross national products are measured in the trillions and Government budgets in the billions, the efforts of a single individual often go unnoticed. For this reason I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the work being done by a citizen of Tacoma, Wash., Mrs. Jean Logan.

Most of you are aware that the Puget Sound area of Washington was the first and probably the hardest hit by the current economic recession. For example, unemployment in Pierce County has averaged nearly 2½ times the national unemployment figure for the past 2 years.

As a result, many individuals who previously had been productively employed are now finding it difficult to provide the basic necessities of food and shelter for their families. In May of this year, about 91,000 Washington families—263,000 people—were using food stamps. Food stamps, however, must be purchased, and during 1970 and 1971 over 100,000 families have exhausted their unemployment compensation with benefits running out for many others each month.

The problem, of course, is that statistics on the poor state of the economy are somewhat like the weather, everybody talks about them but few act. Mrs. Logan is an exception.

It all started several weeks ago with a plate of leftovers in the Logan family refrigerator. Mrs. Logan is employed by the State to do housework for elderly and disabled individuals living on social security or public assistance. She took the job to help the family replace the furniture it lost in a fire which all but destroyed their home.

One day while cleaning the refrigerator of an elderly woman, Mrs. Logan noticed that its sole contents was a half stick of margarine. According to Mrs. Logan, it is customary for the person for whom you are working to offer you lunch. But, seeing that the margarine would have to last another 8 days until the next social security check arrived, Mrs. Logan hurried home to gather up a plate of leftovers.

Thereafter, she began taking her own food items to help feed the people she was employed to help as housekeeper. And soon learning that several other neighborhood residents were without food, Mrs. Logan took the family pickup truck and with the help of eight neighborhood youngsters painted a sign to stretch across the truck. The sign read: "Help Us Help Your Neighbor."

Mrs. Logan then drove the truck to various locations in the neighborhood where the corps of youngsters went from home to home asking for food for the needy. This was the beginning of the "Help Your Neighbor" food bank.

The idea spread quickly. News of Mrs. Logan's efforts reached area chapters of the DeMolay and the Job's Daughters,

whose members immediately began gathering truckloads of food for the food bank. Soon, local merchants, farmers, and orchard growers were delivering loads of foodstuffs to Mrs. Logan's garage. By the end of the week her garage was running out of space and arrangements were being made to transfer some of the food to a nearby church.

In little over 3 months Mrs. Logan's work has grown to include several food bank locations around the Tacoma area, and has helped feed more than 3,000 families. People have come from as far away as 30 miles to receive food.

In helping relieve some of the suffering of needy families in her community, Mrs. Logan has given us a good example of what one individual can do if he merely puts into practice the Biblical commandment to "love thy neighbor." However, she informs me that even with the efforts of local citizens to help their neighbors, many are still going without adequate supplies of food.

As you know, Members of the Washington State congressional delegation have for over 2 months been pressing the administration to use surplus food commodities to help needy families in Washington, as well as in other parts of the country where hunger exists. When the delegation met with the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture we were advised that surplus foods would not be distributed in the State because the circumstances that would call for such action do not exist.

It would seem that the hundreds of families Mrs. Logan has helped and the many more she could help if more food was available to her for distribution, bear testimony to the fact that such circumstances do exist.

The administration has on numerous occasions voiced its concern for the Nation's hungry. In my view the time to match concern with action and to see that needy families have food on their tables is now.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., OF ALABAMA

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues from the State of Alabama and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our former colleague, George Huddleston, Jr., who passed away this week.

George Huddleston served in the House from 1956 to 1965 and was an able, diligent, courageous Congressman. He had strong principles and convictions and he stood steadfast for those principles.

George Huddleston had an outstanding public service. He was an officer in the Navy for 4 years with 32 months service overseas; deputy circuit solicitor for the 10th Judicial Circuit in Alabama; and assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern

District of Alabama prior to his election to the Congress.

He served as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and made a substantial contribution toward assuring and maintaining a strong national defense. He was a fine, patriotic American and served his district, State, and Nation with distinction.

I want to take this means of conveying to Mrs. Huddleston and other members of the family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

NATIONAL SOAP BOX DERBY TITLE WON BY ENTRANT REPRESENTING OROVILLE

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess I was very proud that a fine young man representing the Second Congressional District, which I represent in the House of Representatives, captured top honors in the 34th annual running of the All-American Soap Box Derby which was conducted in Akron, Ohio, in mid-August.

It is of substantial interest that Larry Blair of Elk Grove, Calif., comes from a soap box derby family of long standing. His father and two older brothers both participated in soap box derby events during their day and achieved good records. However, young Larry captured the national honors to set the pace for a fine family.

I would like to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives a report which was published in the Oroville Mercury Register shortly after the Soap Box Derby in Akron.

The report follows:

NATIONAL SOAP BOX DERBY TITLE WON BY ENTRANT FROM OROVILLE

AKRON, OHIO.—Larry Blair, 13, representing Oroville, won the 34th annual running of the All-American Soap Box Derby here Saturday, and pocketed \$7,500 in college scholarship prize money.

Blair, of Elk Grove, won the Northern California Championship Soap Box Derby in Oroville on July 17, and a trip to Akron to compete in the national derby. This was the first time in the three-year history of the Oroville north state derby that a boy has gone on to win the U.S. title.

Last year, Steve Long, also of the Sacramento area, came close when he placed third, and won \$4,000 in scholarship money.

Blair won the title when his yellow car raced over the 954-foot Akron course in 27.2 seconds.

The winner comes from a long-time soap box derby family. Earl Blair, his father, raced in the Los Angeles Derby 34 years ago and won second place. Martin Blair, Larry's 20-year-old brother, was a participant in the 1966 Akron classic. Another brother, Kenneth, now 18, raced for four years in the northern California races, once taking third.

The final heat was expected to be close with the first three places at stake. Larry started off the blocks, and immediately had

a car-length lead, and kept that distance all the way across the finish line, pulling in ahead of second-place winner James Jackson, 11, of Lima, Ohio. Third place, not far behind Jackson, went to Mark Chamberlain, 14, of Seattle, Wash. The victory for Larry was the first California entry to win since Bob Logan of Santa Ana did it in 1965.

With the exception of the required \$25 for official wheels for the race, and more in wood for the car's body, Larry's travel expenses were paid for by the Y's Men Club of Oroville, his local sponsor.

Larry's first derby try, was in 1969 here in Oroville where he finished seventh at the age of 11. The next year he came back to Oroville, and took fourth place, and then this year he was the champion. Larry said that his three hard-worked years of soap box derby competition have paid off well. He plans to use that scholarship to pursue his ambition of becoming a veterinarian.

In the four heats leading up to his victory, Larry posted times of 27.16, 27.24, 27.17 and 27.20. His first heat mark, 27.16, was the second fastest time in the race. The fastest time was 27.14, set by Edgar Fearnow III of Ephrata, Pa. Fearnow finished fourth in the derby.

Larry's father is, an employe of Procter & Gamble plant in Sacramento.

ALASKA FLOODS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, during the early days of August, a severe and sudden rainfall caused heavy flooding damages to the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, and the unorganized borough of southcentral Alaska.

Because of the flood, families were evacuated from their homes, health and sanitation facilities were damaged and a state of emergency existed for several days. The major obstacle in repairing the damage was that access routes to the flooded areas were severely damaged. Bridges were washed away, debris blocked roads and the general conditions of the highways in the flooded area were extremely poor.

Gov. William Egan, after surveying the damage caused by the flood, issued a proclamation ordering the immediate repair and reconstruction of the damaged roadways. At this time, I wish to include into the RECORD a copy of the Governor's proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

Because of extreme rainfall, commencing on August 8, 1971, widespread damage was experienced throughout the following areas in Alaska as a result of extremely heavy flooding: Matanuska-Susitna Borough, Greater Anchorage Area Borough, and the Unorganized Borough of Southcentral Alaska. This flooding has produced serious and extensive damage to both private and public property. As a consequence, this State has sustained severe damage to its road systems which include bridges, roadbeds, and other facilities. Damage occurred on the Federal-aid System.

Damage throughout the Central and Southcentral parts of the State has been of such an extent that immediate repairs were necessary. Such conditions constitute an

emergency as is contemplated by the terms of Sections 125 and 120(f) of Title 23, U.S. Code as amended by Section 107 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of the state of Alaska, do hereby proclaim an emergency to exist throughout the Central and Southcentral parts of the State as a result of flooding conditions and consequent danger to life and damage to property including highways and bridge facilities on the Federal-aid highway system. The immediate repair and reconstruction of the damaged highways is vital to the security, wellbeing, and health of the citizens of the state of Alaska; and the Secretary of Transportation of the United States is hereby requested to concur in the declaration of this emergency.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the seal of the state of Alaska to be affixed at Juneau, the 13th day of August, A.D. 1971.

CITIZEN ATTITUDES IN THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to my colleagues in the House of Representatives on the results of my midyear poll of the attitudes of my western Michigan constituents with respect to a variety of important national issues. Over 12,000 persons residing in the 11 counties comprising the Ninth district completed the questionnaire.

Of course, this questionnaire is only one avenue through which I learn of the views of my constituents. But its results, together with discussions with residents in Michigan and the many letters, telegrams and telephone calls that I receive in Washington, give me a clear and consistent picture of prevailing opinions on many issues. Recognizing the importance of periodic sampling of views on questions before the Congress and the President, I feel that it is entirely appropriate that I submit this information to my colleagues and to our Chief Executive.

Before commenting on each of the questions and the replies, let me summarize the results to all of the questions in percentage form:

	Yes	No	Undecided
Do you—			
1. Feel that wage and price controls are necessary.....	76	21	3
2. Favor the President's policy for ending U.S. involvement in Vietnam?.....	67	27	6
3. Feel that greater Federal efforts to reduce unemployment are necessary?.....	64	32	4
4. Favor a law requiring binding arbitration to prevent strikes in such industries as transportation affecting critical national interests?.....	82	14	4
5. Favor Federal revenue sharing with State and local governments?.....	65	27	8
6. Favor the admission of Red China to the United Nations?.....	53	40	7
7. Prefer the President's welfare program to the present system?.....	60	23	17

	Federal spending in these areas should be			Un-decided
	More	Same	Less	
1. Education.....	37	39	20	4
2. Defense.....	15	32	49	4
3. Crime control.....	75	18	4	3
4. Drug abuse.....	71	17	8	4
5. Poverty programs.....	22	30	42	6
6. Mass transit systems.....	36	30	27	7
7. Pollution control.....	66	23	7	4

The response to the first question, which dealt with wage and price controls, is of particular interest in light of recent developments. Returning their forms prior to the imposition of the 90-day wage-price freeze by President Nixon, an overwhelming majority of my constituents indicated that they supported such controls. Their attitude reflects the discouragement of millions of Americans over the wage-price spiral; they have lived for too long with the realization that their salary increases were being absorbed by price hikes on their required purchases. Senior citizens have been confronted too long with the erosion of the buying power of their pension and social security checks. While my constituents often voice deep-seated concerns about the growth of governmental power, growing frustration over inflation has led them to call out for strong governmental action to meet this threat to their economic well-being. I join with the residents of the Ninth District in applauding the comprehensive and forthright economic policies of the Nixon administration.

The second question focused on the Vietnam war. Against a background of continuous debate within the Congress and throughout society over our Vietnam policies, over two-thirds of my constituents who responded to the poll indicated support for the President's policies for ending American involvement. The results suggest the development of a consensus on Vietnam since my poll of a year ago. At that time, opinion was very evenly divided on the President's handling of the war. My voting on the various Vietnam questions that have come before the House has reflected the prevailing attitude within the Ninth District. I continue to support the President's program, believing that he is proceeding on a course that will result in the safe withdrawal of our forces and the significant expansion of the capability of the South Vietnamese troops to defend their country.

Constituent opinion on unemployment reflects the high jobless rate which marks so much of my district. Almost two-thirds of the district's residents favor a greater Federal effort to reduce unemployment. The new economic policies of the administration are aimed in considerable measure at this objective, and I assure my constituents that I will support any sound programs which offer the prospect of improving the employment picture. I actively supported both the Accelerated Public Works Act and the Public Service Jobs Act this year. The latter, signed into law earlier this sum-

mer by the President, is now beginning to channel Federal funds to local communities to enable them to fill a variety of public jobs, thereby improving the caliber of governmental services and responding to area unemployment problems.

Respondents to my poll expressed their strongest opinion on the question dealing with strikes. Evidence mounts that the American people are fed up with crippling strikes in vital industries, which are disruptive and costly not only to the strikers themselves, but to workers in related industries and to the national economy. Joining Congressman JAMES HARVEY of Michigan, I have sponsored legislation to solve the recurring problem of labor tieups in the railroad industry, and to avoid annual last minute congressional actions which have come to be virtually inevitable in this industry. In addition, I have called upon the President to establish a commission to examine the broad problems of labor-management relations, and to make recommendations as to how the Nation can settle contract differences without experiencing strikes. An interdependent economy such as we have in this country today cannot tolerate seemingly endless rounds of strikes such as have occurred during the past several years.

The results of my questionnaire also demonstrate strong support within my district for the President's revenue sharing proposal. I remain hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee will report a revenue sharing measure to the floor, in order that the issue may be debated fully and resolved. Rarely has an idea been supported so strongly by leaders of both political parties as has revenue sharing. We must reverse the steady flow of responsibilities to the national government, and begin to revitalize our State and local governments. A key element in this process is the restoration of adequate revenue to these units of government.

As in the case of wage and price controls, it was fortunate that I chose this year to seek opinion on the admission of Red China to the United Nations, for since the poll was taken, the President announced that the United States will alter its policies on this matter to support the admission of the People's Republic of China and the retention of representation for the Taiwan Government. Fifty-three percent of my poll respondents expressed support of the admission of Red China. I look forward with great interest to the President's planned trip to the Chinese mainland, and am cautiously hopeful that the visit will result in a relaxation of tensions between our two countries. World peace can only be established and maintained through the development of greater understanding among all nations, and it is inconceivable that much progress can be made in Asia without the cooperation of the government of a nation of over 800 million people.

I also sought opinion on the President's welfare program. Sixty percent of the persons answering the poll indicated support of this policy, for which

I voted when the legislation passed through the House. It is interesting to note that greater uncertainty was expressed in response to this question than to any other, a fact which I interpret to be an outgrowth of the morass which has characterized welfare efforts in recent years, which have failed to reduce the numbers of welfare recipients.

The second half of the questionnaire dealt with the public's thinking on the reordering of Federal spending priorities which highlights much contemporary political debate. Among the results is a clear indication that many people want to devote less money to defense programs. I believe that their attitude reflects not only their concern about the war in Southeast Asia, but also widespread apprehension and doubts about defense commitments and overseas military assignments throughout the world. In this connection, I have sponsored a resolution to encourage our NATO allies to assume a greater share of the burden of European defense. I also have advocated other economies within our defense programs which would not impair our military effectiveness, but which would help the United States to reestablish a sound defense spending program.

It is also clear that my constituents want to spend less on poverty programs. The poll results correspond closely with much mail that I receive, in which citizens sharply question the value of many existing welfare concepts. The House has passed the welfare reform measure which is now awaiting Senate consideration. The measure represents a significant opportunity to instill a greater sense of purpose and a greater degree of operating efficiency and effectiveness in the Government's work in this field.

Citizens of western Michigan share the national interest in better crime control. The respondents showed a greater willingness to increase Federal spending in this field than in any other listed governmental function. We must improve upon our efforts to cope with soaring crime rates. I believe that an attack on crime can achieve maximum effectiveness only if programs to eradicate the causes of crime are accompanied by vigorous prosecution and enforcement efforts throughout the country. The record in this field has been discouraging; but the fact remains that there can be no escape from Government's fundamental obligation to maintain social order through the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district, as people throughout the United States, want peace at home and abroad. They want job security and opportunities to improve living standards. Strong support of wage and price controls bespeaks their willingness to sacrifice in order to achieve a more sound national economy and a brighter longrange economic climate. These responses to my questionnaire demonstrate a belief in the programs of the Nixon administration. I renew my pledge to do all that I can as their congressman to enable them to realize these goals through the development of public policies which will best serve their interests.

NOW THE NADER TEAM IS PLAYING
NASTY GAMES WITH THE CALI-
FORNIA STATE WATER PROJECT

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Center for the Study of Responsive Law, headed by Ralph Nader, recently issued a report which amounted to a broadside attack on California's effort to solve its water problems. This unwarranted attack on the State water project is the most irresponsible piece of work I have ever seen.

The section on the State water project included in the report on "Power and Land in California" is full of inaccuracies, half-truths, and innuendoes.

Nader and his Raiders ignored the fact that the California Water Project is one of the world's greatest engineering achievements that will provide water and power for industry and everyday living, flood control, and recreational facilities. The project is designed to harness the flood waters of the north in order to benefit the dry areas in the central and southern parts of the State—for the benefit of all Californians.

Nader has performed a public disservice. He has indicted not only the four Governors and all of the State legislators who have worked on this project since it was first proposed, but he has also indicted the people. This water project was authorized by the people through their elected representatives in 1959 and a bond issue was approved by them in 1960 to finance it.

Up until now, I have admired the work Ralph Nader has done in the areas of consumer protection and automobile safety, but this latest report makes me question his work and intentions. If this is an example of the caliber of research and investigation that goes into his recommendations, then I think we should look upon Mr. Nader's actions with a degree of suspicion.

Mr. Allen Bottorff, a man who is nationally recognized as being qualified to discuss financial matters as they relate to water development, has prepared a detailed reply to Nader's charges.

Mr. Bottorff is trained and experienced in accounting and business and operates his own 600-acre farm in the Buttonwillow area of Kern County. He has been closely associated with the State water project since 1952. For 8 years, he was a member of the Board of Directors of the Kern County Water Agency and served as its first president. At present, he serves as consultant and authorized representative of the Kern County Water Agency on the State Water Contractors Audit Committee, and served as the committee chairman for several years.

Mr. Bottorff is on the State Chamber of Commerce Water Resources Committee. He has been a leader in the California Water Resources Association and was an incorporator of the Water Association of Kern County.

I am happy to insert at the end of my remarks a copy of Mr. Bottorff's state-

ment entitled, "Now the Nader Team is Playing Nasty Games—With the California State Water Project."

The Nader report also questions the U.S. Forest Service's right to grant a lease for the construction of an all-year highway through the Sequoia National Park leading to the proposed \$35 million Mineral King recreational project to be built by Walt Disney Productions. It is not surprising that the Nader task force took essentially the same position as the Sierra Club when it is learned that the Sierra Club contributed 40 percent to the cost of preparing the report on "Power and Land in California."

I have two newspaper articles that discuss this relationship between the Nader group and the Sierra Club that I will insert at the end of my remarks.

An objective study of land and resources in California could have been very beneficial, but one that is undertaken with built-in biases serves no useful purposes.

The Nader report on "Power and Land in California" is not an objective study. It is only a limited and one-sided look at California and its water distribution and land problems.

Mr. Bottorff's statement and the newspaper articles follow:

NADER TEAM IS PLAYING NASTY GAMES—WITH
THE CALIFORNIA STATE WATER PROJECT

(By Allen Bottorff)

Second-guessing is great fun. And it's easy, too. The devotees of this popular sport date back into antiquity. It's always been the delight of some people to step into the arena of life and snipe at the folks who are busy at the job of making that life more livable. A case in point is the great California State Water Project. Even this ambitious endeavor—carefully planned by the engineers and economists—debated freely in the State Legislature—aired fully in public hearings—given wide exposure to the people of the state—and then approved by a vote of the citizenry—has not escaped the hazard of the "second-guessers." At this late date, after 98% of the initial construction features are completed or well under way, the detractors are sending in their first-string "second-guessers" admittedly to scuttle the entire Project!

Just as the benefits of this great undertaking are beginning to be felt—just as underground water tables are beginning to feel its beneficial impact—just as the desert is becoming green and fruitful with the application of water which, if unharnessed and unused would run out to the sea—in come those who say that the whole Project is a fraud, a deception, a flim-flam, a windfall for the wealthy, and a congame. They point out how the Project can be stopped, and loudly claim that it should be, and that the chances of stopping it are excellent.

Of course, the "second-guessers" of this hatchet squad have one possible minor advantage—the advantage of hindsight—a luxury not enjoyed by those responsible in the first place for planning, authorizing and implementing the Project—and they have not lived with or built any part of the Project. And though they have gained some public attention by rushing into the arena, screaming at a high decibel level—they do have the disadvantage of being late. Now, if their purpose were to be helpful rather than destructive their tardy suggestions would rate some consideration and use to extent yet found feasible.

This recognizes that, admittedly, no such project is perfect; and that any project might be improved. It also rightfully assumes

that such criticisms are based on fair and honest appraisals of all facts concerning the undertaking. And it assumes further that the suggestions are not the result of contrived, distorted, inaccurate or incomplete information, or based on mistaken assumptions; and that they are not induced by motives geared primarily to the proposition of stopping the project or impairing its usefulness.

Unfortunately, a new grand-scale team effort is now in the wings, ready to make and publish major and serious charges against the State Water Project. Judged by the rhetoric already previewed publicly, the motives displayed and the methods employed do not add up to a serious effort to be constructive. The forerunner of this team effort is an article called "The California State Water Project" authored by a team member, Keith Roberts, a young San Francisco attorney. His blast at the efforts of California to solve its water problems appeared in a San Francisco publication called CLEAR CREEK. The Roberts article was next reprinted in full in the Congressional Record at the request of Congressman Jerome R. Waldie of California's 14th District.

The introductory remarks of the Contra Costa County, Congressman as they appear in the Congressional Record, hail and warmly embrace the Roberts article. Waldie reveals the article to be a part of a larger Ralph Nader Report, "Power and Land in California". At this writing the report has just been released by Nader's Center For Study of Responsive Law.

WHO BENEFITS—WHO PAYS?

The entry in the Congressional Record places Roberts in the role of skilled researcher and master auditor. One is given the impression that long and careful study has been given by Roberts to all of the Project's financial aspects. These would include the fiscal and other relationships with local water agencies throughout the state.

His Clear Creek article casts him in the role of expert critic of the taxing policies of the State, the Agencies, and the Districts responsible for financial and taxing programs. The entire Project and many people and agencies connected with it are roundly attacked after the author perused what he has since referred to as the "rather profuse publications of the Department of Water Resources".

As we have since learned, Roberts engaged in only limited conversations with informed officials concerning the Project. It stands to reason that a governmental department charged with the responsibility of planning and constructing so huge an undertaking as the California State Water Project would, of necessity, be obliged to prepare and issue voluminous reports. Also it can be categorically said that no one in a few short weeks could, without a background of years of day-to-day experience and familiarity with the Project, hope to absorb and pass judgment on the reports and the Project in all its ramifications. Yet this very feat Roberts would have us believe he accomplished.

At this writing it is not known what the full thrust or impact of the complete Nader Report will be, but we do have before us the Roberts section which now has become an important part. To get the feel of Roberts reporting let us look at his conclusion as found in the first sentence of its closing paragraph. He admonished his readers to "Join or support organizations working against the State Water Project. . ." The organizations named as deserving such support are: The Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, The Committee of Two Million to Save the Eel, and the California Planning and Conservation League.

It is indeed disconcerting to contemplate the probability that many present members of these organizations may have been in-

duced to join these efforts on the basis of such misinformation and brainwashing as is found in the Roberts writings. Many present members probably joined years ago because the organization appealed to their love of Nature—a love shared by many of us who are not members. Now they find themselves saddled with policies with which they perhaps would not agree if given the full facts. Which leads to the further observation that this latest blast adds no new lustre to the Nader reputation.

Mr. Waldie, in introducing the Roberts article in the Congressional Record, quotes from an interview with Mr. Robert Fellmuth, chief co-ordinator for the Nader study, who said concerning it: "The key principle we are seeking to implement is this: when someone receives a benefit from public money he should pay according to the benefit". The implication is clear that the Nader team would have us believe that the State Water Project clearly fails to meet this principle.

A little reflection, however, will establish that the application of this principle in government is more often noted for its omission than its commission, yet the fact is that the State Water Project more nearly exemplifies this principle than any other government program, with the possible exception of some toll bridge programs.

It is notable that the arguments advanced by Roberts have as their central theme that the Project is rife with "special interest favoritism" and "subsidy to large landholder"; that "outrageous costs and slim benefits" mark the Project's development and future; and that it does a gross injustice to the California taxpayer. Plausible cause, indeed, for scuttling the State Water Project, and most appealing to the average citizen—if true! Fortunately such charges are completely untrue!

To set the record straight will be the primary purpose of this article. It will advise both member Roberts and the Nader team, as well as the general public, concerning some of the facts overlooked in the Roberts article, and some of the errors and incorrect assumptions it contains. In what ways the Roberts article is wrong will be established through point-by-point analysis of its charges. No attempt will be made, however, to respond to them all. Other observers may have an interest and some responsibility in this matter.

THE LABEL AND THE CONTENTS

First in line is the Roberts charge that the State Water Project, as it is being developed, is something "quite different" from what the legislature authorized and the people voted upon. Frankly, nothing in this article tells us that he has the haziest notion of what was actually authorized by the legislature or approved by the people. Let us inform him: They authorized and voted for "The State Water Resources Development System for the State of California".

Of what does this system consist? The answer: "The State Water Facilities as defined in Section 12934(d) and such additional facilities as may now or hereafter be authorized by the Legislature as a part of (1) the Central Valley Project or (2) the California Water Plan and including such other additional facilities as the department deems necessary and desirable to meet local needs, including, but not restricted to, flood control, and to augment the supplies of water in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and for which funds are appropriated pursuant to the Act".

The Act, as approved, which is actually a document of ten closely-printed pages, describes both generally and in some detail the State water development system which it authorized. It lays down the rules for its construction, operation and maintenance and for its correlation with the State Central Valley Project which was authorized by

the Legislature and passed by a vote of the people nearly four decades ago. This latter act had been a part of the law for years—unused because no market existed for the bonds it authorized during the depression years of the early Thirties.

The State Water Resources Development Bond Act is a big order. One and three-quarter billion dollars of general obligation bonds were authorized to "assist" construction of the system, of which the State Water Facilities are but the initial unit. The State Central Valley Project Bond Act provided for Revenue Bonds, but it has been of assistance to the financing program. Obviously, such a broad authorization can have different meanings for different people.

However, the very broadness of the concept denies anyone the right to charge that the State Water Project, as it is being developed is something "quite different" from what was intended.

At the time this Bond Act was voted upon by the people of California the State Water Facilities were necessarily described in general terms, reflecting the accomplishments expected of the Project rather than specifying details. Since that time the original outline has been judiciously filled in with more specific plans and specifications. Additional capital funds have been appropriately raised or provided through the earlier State CVP Bond Act or other legislation as contemplated in the 1960 Water Bond Act. The genius and foresight of those who conceived and planned the Project can be attested to by the lack of necessity for major changes during the 11 years since passage of the bond measure.

Changes made were dictated largely by changing circumstances over the past decade. None were made willy-nilly or to deceive; neither were they made without the benefit of public hearings; nor were changes made except as provided by existing law or new legislation.

Thus, let us dispose of all argument that the Project is "quite different" from that sold the public. Its variations from any early norm were expected, and provided for either in the Act, or by new legislation, duly approved.

Late-comer Roberts is wrong in saying otherwise. Second-guessing may be fun; it may be easy, but it can and did lead to false conclusions!

HOW MUCH WILL THE PROJECT COST?

In his related complaint Roberts says the Project will cost close to ten billion dollars, instead of the two billion the people thought they were approving. He further asserts that the people were not told about interest costs. How ridiculous! Any reasonable assumption would be just the opposite.

The public was not then, and is not now, confused into believing that the cost of the Project should be expressed as the sum total of all present and future costs—including capital costs, operating, power, maintenance, replacement and interest costs from 1960 to date and for the next 65 years. Nader authority Roberts should know this to be true yet he does not, for he includes all of these costs when he mentions his ten billion dollar figure. By doing so he shows that he is the one confused. It can well be mentioned here that also during that 65-year period, with cool heads prevailing, more than 200 million acre feet of water will have been conserved and transported to points of use along the California Aqueduct. Not a bad accomplishment for ten billion dollars—or whatever the exact final all-inclusive cost may be.

As we continue to review the questions raised by Nader's writer concerning matters of costs and their propriety, we should discuss the distribution or charge-out of these costs along with certain factors that are extremely pertinent. First, it should be known that for many years expenditures made by the State for construction and operation of

the State Water Project have been under review by internationally recognized, independent certified public accounting firms hired under contract by either a single agency or by a group of agencies that have contracted for water supplies from the Project.

During these years of investigation both the amounts and the methods of distribution of costs among the contractors for project service have been regularly examined and reported upon to the participating contractors. Nothing is known of any effort on the part of Roberts or any other Nader team member to consult with the agencies involved in these audit programs or any member of these auditing firms to assist his review of fiscal aspects of the Project. Had Roberts done so, he might have written a far different article, or perhaps, none at all.

In any case, had they contacted persons in the contracting agencies involved in the audit programs, their understanding of the Project might have been substantially enhanced.

A second important factor is the Water Service Contracts executed by the State and the 31 Agencies or Districts engaged in receiving and distributing State Project Water. Under these contracts these governmental entities are committed to pay ALL capital costs of the Project allocated, in accordance with the Act and other particulars of law, to the water supply functions of the Project. Presently this is estimated to be about 90% of all capital costs plus interest. We refer to all capital costs to date, and such future capital costs as are projected, together with interest at the project interest rate—from the date incurred until paid in full, plus all related operating, power, maintenance and replacement costs, payable as they are incurred.

Quite clearly these water service contractors and their constituents have been aware of this obligation including the interest payment requirement, for it comes about through the contracts, all of which necessarily were approved by public bodies and several of which had to be further approved by the people. Further, the Districts Securities Commission and its successor, the Districts Securities Division, State Treasurer's office, which review the financial details of such agencies prior to their going to the market with their own securities to finance their own construction programs, is fully informed, concerning this commitment to pay such interest as is the public through their hearings.

As noted, this accounts for about 90% of all Project costs. What about the other 10%? From the C.P.A.'s audit reports, as well as from State Department of Water Resources publications, it may be learned that Project costs allocated or anticipated to be allocated to others than the water service contractors and reimbursed by them will amount to about 2½%. Costs allocated to non-reimbursable functions, such as recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement may amount to about 7½% of the total project capital costs and related operating, maintenance, power and replacement costs during the 75-year period. Incidentally, the FULL cost of mitigating any damages from the Project to fish or wildlife is entirely at the expense of the water service contractors. Only enhancement values are not reimbursable by the contractors. Every step in the procedure of allocating costs to non-reimbursable functions is controlled by law and accompanied by public hearings.

What about the costs of these non-reimbursable functions, who pays them? Generally speaking, the public at large will pay such costs. This public also includes those who reside in areas served by State Project water—the same people who participate in repaying, in full, the remaining 90% of costs! Thus the principle of "they who benefit shall pay according to the benefit received" is reasonably complied with in this situation.

The non-reimbursable functions are those providing benefits that redound to all the people of California and therefore are quite properly recovered from the State's taxpayers as a whole—with the exception of the costs of flood control which are paid by the United States Government as a matter of national policy. These monies are collected from taxpayers nationwide.

NO INTERESTS ON THE TIDELANDS FUNDS?

A third factor which also refutes Roberts' charge that State money advanced to the Project, such as Tidelands Oil and Gas Funds are provided interest-free, concerns the utilization of such funds, how the interest charges actually apply, and what they accomplish.

First, it should be made clear that use of Tidelands Oil and Gas Funds for part of the capital for Project construction was both contemplated in the early years of Project formulation and provided by legislative action. Actually, a portion of this support was drained away by subsequent legislative action at a time when the State Budget needed help. Many view this action as a violation of a previous commitment of such funds to the Project.

These commitments of State support were made on the theory that a revenue derived from a State non-replenishing resource, such as oil and gas, could be put to best use by investment in a permanent asset such as the State Water Project. Apparently these facts are unknown to Mr. Roberts.

However, because of the way the water service contracts are written, neither the source of Project construction funds, or any practical legislative requirements concerning their repayments, really controls the charges to the water supply contractors with respect to interest. This is due to the fact, as pointed out earlier, under the water service contracts, interest charges begin to run on costs and are charged to the contractors immediately when such costs are incurred for Project construction. Thus one of the important purposes of the independent C.P.A. audits of the State records is to precisely determine the date and the amounts in which such costs are incurred.

Now that we know the water service contracting agencies must pay such Project costs with interest, it may be asked, what is done with the interest earned—what becomes of the repaid funds? To respond, briefly, it is necessary again to refer to the California Water Resources Development Bond Act which, paraphrased, says that such revenues, together with any net revenue derived from power shall be deposited in a special account or accounts in the California Water Resources Development Bond Fund. Then they may be used for the following purposes only, and only in the following order:

—Priority No. 1. Maintenance, operation and replacement costs;

—Priority No. 2. Annual payment of principal and interest on bonds sold under the Act;

—Priority No. 3. Transfer to the California Water Fund money to reimburse funds utilized from this Fund for construction of the State Water Resources Development System;

—Priority No. 4. Any surplus revenues not required for the above purposes, and not required to repay the General Fund for State advances for payments on Bond principal and interest; shall be re-deposited in a special account and such funds are then appropriated, and available for future construction of facilities of the continuing State Water Resources Development System.

All of these revenues constitute a trust fund pledged for the above purposes and uses and further pledged as security to the owners and holders of the issued bonds.

All fiscal operations of the State Water Project are required to follow these priorities and rules. Thus, expended Project funds re-

turn to the Project in full circle, augmented by extra interest earned along the way. DWR Bulletins of the 132 series fully describe this process, both on a historical and projected basis extending through the period from the year 1960 to the year 2035.

These bulletins have several purposes, among which is the technical support of the charges regularly billed to the water service contractors. Auditors for the contractors closely review the bulletins and comment on their contents as they relate to the propriety of such charges.

Both the text and tabulations of series 132 bulletins tell many interesting things about the State Water Project, particularly when they are correctly interpreted. Bulletin 132-71 issued by the Department in May of 1971 forecasts the grand total of the Project net revenues, or surplus at about \$2,567,000,000 for this 75-year period. Of this amount about \$1,067,000,000 (the amount of its advances), will be returned to the California Water Fund in accordance with Bond Act priority No. 3 requirements. This fund may be again drawn upon for future Project facility construction or, as an alternative, it may be appropriated by the State Legislature for other purposes entirely, in which event it would no longer be available to the Project.

The remaining surplus, projected at about \$1,500,000,000, will be retained in Project funds in accordance with Bond Act priority No. 4 requirements. Such funds may be drawn upon for construction of additional facilities of the State Water Resources Development System in future years. The need for Additional Project Construction is now estimated to materialize beginning about 1996.

It is particularly worthy of note that when, in the future, money from either priority 3 or 4 sources is expended on later Project facilities, interest again begins to accrue on the amounts allocable to the water supply function and chargeable to the water service contractors. Thus the refunding and net revenue circle begins again.

One item of record, which may be related to the Nader team's mistaken theory that the Project's cost is ten Billion, instead of two Billion dollars, is found in Bulletin 132-71. It indicates that Project gross revenues for the period 1960 to 2035 are anticipated to total about ten billion dollars! Note, particularly however, that this is revenue—gross income—not costs.

This bulletin also projects total operating costs at about \$3,135,000,000 during the period; project bond service principal repayment at about \$1,672,000,000; and projects bond service interest at about \$2,649,000,000. The remainder, projected at a little more than \$2,500,000,000 constitutes the project's net revenue or surplus mentioned above.

The anticipated Project gross revenues are derived from the following sources:

Projected reimbursements to be largely derived from payments by agencies contracting for state water service

Delta water charges:	
Capital costs reimbursement, including interest	\$2,397,017,000
Operating costs reimbursement	450,977,000
Transportation charges:	
Capital costs reimbursement including interest	4,048,541,000
Operating costs reimbursement	2,496,554,000
<hr/>	
Total reimbursements to the State by the contractors	9,393,089,000
<i>Other revenues as projected</i>	
Davis-Grunsky loan repayments	\$53,753,000
Recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement subject to legislative approval	118,963,000

United States (San Luis share of operation)	\$126,560,000
Miscellaneous income, including interest earned and Oroville net power revenues after year 2018	319,599,000

Total projected revenues

10,011,964,000

It may be noted that the terms anticipated and projected are emphasized. The purpose is to draw attention to the fact that all future values here shown are anticipated or projected on the basis of Department of Water Resources' latest studies. Their assumptions may vary somewhat during the next 64 years, however, their estimates have been pretty good so far. The DWR fully explains the assumptions it uses in the development of these projections.

Obviously, the details cannot be fully reviewed here. Suffice it to say that the Department's projections are believed to be reasonable and adequate for their purposes.

THE DELTA POOL EXPLAINED

At this point a question may be raised concerning the propriety of accumulating the huge net revenue or surplus projected from operations of the Project. Both the justification and the necessity for the procedures which make possible this projected net revenue, or surplus, arise from the Delta Pool State Water Resources Development Bond Concept—a built-in feature of both the Act, which the public approved in 1960 and the State Water Service Contracts. Essentially this concept established the principle that, when the supply of water available to the State Water Project at the Delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers is diminished below the entitlement levels called for in the Project water service contracts (primarily anticipated because of possible increased up-stream or Delta use) additional facilities shall be constructed to conserve, transport and make available a new supply of water at the Delta pumps sufficient to make up the shortage.

The added cost of this new supply is then blended in with the Delta charge already applicable, with the result for all State Service Contractors that a new, probably higher, Delta water charge becomes effective, based on this new average cost. At the same time, if late-comers desire to use a portion of any newly developed extra water supplies provided by the system, they can do so at no greater cost for conserved water than that which must then be paid by the other earlier contractors receiving water from the Delta.

It has become a matter of great concern to the contractors that, though they have fully assumed the obligation of future increased Delta water costs under this concept, they now are faced with a call for the shut-down of the entire Project and a struggle to ward off those like Nader, Roberts and Waldie and others who would make it utterly impossible for them to fulfill their commitments to their own water users—or the late-comers.

The provision of the Act and the water supply contracts which require the accumulation of funds for future Project facilities in this manner to augment the supply of water upstream and in the Delta, together with the averaging of both early and late costs among the early contractors and new-comers, mainly upstream, are the practical means provided for the fulfillment of the Delta Concept.

Had the Nader Team writer consulted with the Project's auditors or with knowledgeable officials of the Department of Water Resources, or the water service agencies involved in the program, or had more thoroughly studied the documents related to the Project, possibly many of these matters would have been clear; and he might not have felt compelled to charge "gross injustice" and

"special interest favoritism" in the construction and operation of the project.

From the beginning of Project planning it was generally recognized that costs to the areas of water use would be high, particularly because there would be no way for them to avoid the interest costs of the program. Moreover, an important natural water resource would need to be conserved at great expense, transported long distances, lifted for service to some areas as much as 4000 feet.

The objective agreed upon by the water supply contractors was that the State would develop and deliver this water at the lowest cost possible and the contractors would pay properly allocated costs consistent with a policy of fairness to all; and by all was meant the entire State of California.

It is true that construction costs have risen across the nation in the past 11 years. Increases in the projected interest rate also have occurred. On the other hand, some savings have been achieved in Projection operational costs, with the end result that unit values per acre foot have been contained within acceptable limits.

This was the objective of the California Water Resources Development System from the beginning. The record this far has been an excellent one, in spite of such charges as the Nader report puts forth.

Perhaps many of Roberts' complaints against both the Project and against those who have participated in its development, will fall of their own dead weight with this better understanding of the Project and its future.

WHO PAYS FOR THE POWER?

The argument Nader's team member Roberts offers that purchasers of electric power will pay 100% of the costs thereof is of no great moment—they *should* do so. Actually, from the Bulletin 132 series we learn there may be some extra revenue to the Project from power, particularly during the later years, but such revenues would not have been possible had there not been a Project and the vast participation of the water service contractors. Furthermore, vastly greater amounts of Power are required for operation of the Project than it will produce. Always it was expected that the power produced could be transmitted and used for project pumping or the value thereof could be converted to dollars—particularly when higher peaking values could be realized—then used for purchasing of other more conveniently located or lower costs, off-peak power.

His arguments that local taxpayers in the Project service area will pay taxes to support their Agencies' water service contract program is doubtless true in varying degrees—but why should there be any complaint about this?

Where such agencies will supply water for municipal and industrial purposes, their billings from the State are on a type of advance repayment schedule. Many of the agencies pay vast sums to the State under their contracts before receiving a drop of State Project water. Consequently they must levy taxes to do so. These advance payments, however, effectively reduce the total interest costs they must pay on their proportionate share of all capital costs allocated to water supply and ultimately this will reduce water costs within such agencies.

On the other hand, the tax base of water agencies serving agricultural water users from the Project is generally insufficient to permit such advance payment; therefore, their contracts with the State have been geared to a longer payment program. The effect of this deferment is an increase in ultimate costs to the agricultural areas served, because of the longer repayment period, and consequently they must pay greater interest charges with higher total water costs over this period.

Experience does indicate, however, that some taxes will be levied by agencies serving agriculture to assist their programs for providing and distributing water. Their taxing policies appear properly to be matters of local determination, subject to the general or specific laws governing such agencies.

ZONES OF BENEFIT

Nader team member Roberts makes the ridiculous off-hand charge that the Kern County Water Agency plans to collect a third or more of the State bill for Project water service by levying ad valorem taxes. It is true the Agency may levy some ad valorem taxes but only in accordance with certain special limitations and hearings provided by the Kern County water Agency Act, described below in more detail. However, the Agency's present projections indicate that not more than 13 to 15% of funds required to meet State obligations will be provided by this means. It is plain to see that these projections differ radically from Roberts' claim that one-third or more will be collected in this manner.

How does the Kern County Water Agency proceed under its Agency Act? First, certain steps must publicly be taken; and certain conditions must exist before any tax may be levied for the purpose of making any payment to the State under the Agency contract for water service. Prior to any such tax levy, the Agency must hold public hearings.

These hearings must be held by the Agency Board of Directors, and supplemental hearings may be held by the Kern County Board of Supervisors. As a result of such hearings and public participation, zones of benefit may be established and ad valorem taxes may be levied within such zones for the purpose of assisting in payment for State Project water service.

However, such taxes must be based solely on benefits to be received from the Project. In the establishment of the zones of benefit within which taxes may be levied, there must be taken into account the following requirements:

- (a) Improvement in the underground water supply.
- (b) The contribution to the underground water supply made available independently of the agency.
- (c) The adequacy of the water supply made available independently of the agency.
- (d) The prospective need for a water supply.
- (e) Extractions from the underground water supply in excess of contributions.
- (f) The economic impact resulting from the water supply made available under such contract or contracts; provided that areas not receiving a surface water supply or an improvement in the underground water supply by reasons of such contract or contracts shall not be assessed pursuant to this particular subsection.

Any fair-minded consideration of these stringent requirements should lead to commendation rather than condemnation of the Kern County Water Agency's practices. Such consideration would also reveal how completely nonsensical is Roberts' charge that the Agency was formed expressly to let its agricultural users draw on the Bakersfield tax base. Possibly the City area could be determined as within a zone, or zones of benefit established through the above outlined procedures, whereupon a portion of the ad valorem taxes levied could thereby relate to the Bakersfield urban area. So long as this is done in accordance with the Agency Act requirements; however, certainly there is nothing improper with that. The voters approved this procedure long ago when they voted in favor of the Kern County Water Agency Act in the first place, as did the Superior Court later when, in a lawsuit protesting a tax levy, it sustained both the Agency's procedures and the Act.

BENEFIT—OR BOONDOGGLE

When discussing such matters as the determination of Project benefits, it is indeed disappointing to note Nader team member Roberts' complete failure to recognize many of the valuable benefits that flow from the Project.

Nader's lieutenant Roberts acknowledges no general-type economic benefits from the Project, and no benefits to agri-businesses and their employees from a strong agricultural economy sustained by Project water; he admits to some benefits for water users, but only those received by the larger landholders, particularly the larger corporate landholders, the special interest water users, or the land speculators; he acknowledges none of the benefits that may accrue to the smaller, mill-run type landowner, or farm operator.

Nader's analyst Roberts seems also to be totally unaware of any benefit from the Project received by recreationists, or achieved through Project enchantment of fish and wildlife.

While he acknowledges some benefit may be received by the Project builders, he makes no reference to the millions of man hours for which good wages were paid to thousands of people employed in this endeavor.

Neither does Roberts recognize any possible benefits from the Project in the way of flood control or salinity repulsion.

His super-failure, however, is his omission of any reference to the tremendous benefits received by the public at large from farm production made possible by State Project water in the San Joaquin Valley, or elsewhere, where its use may be feasible despite its higher level of cost. In the valley, because of this water, farms, large and small—corporate, individual, or partnership in ownership—now contribute substantial amounts, and later promise to provide greater amounts of food and fibre essential to human life and elemental in the economic prosperity of county, state, and nation.

USERS—LARGE AND SMALL

The farming industry is not static—great changes constantly occur; among these, the loss of farm land to urban and industrial use, parks, highways, and airports, to name a few. Changes occur, too, in the capacity of lands to produce, whether from cropping patterns, pests, weed intrusion, air pollution, or what not.

Without defending or criticizing the rights of the larger, or the smaller farm operators, or the right of corporations to participate in this changing pattern, or the right of any farmer to share in the production of farm produce needed to make up some part of the deficiencies arising because of these changes, without fear of contradiction, it may be said that the farm products resulting from this activity give greater strength to our state and nation.

Project water is really needed by many farms that have been in production for a long time; and it is essential to any additional agricultural growth. It will, when received, overcome increasing groundwater deficiencies that have been developing for years, threatening thousands of productive acres.

As one well-informed Kern agriculturalist analyzed it: "water represents a basic resource necessary not only to develop new acreage but also to sustain acreages in Kern County. It is known that the native aquifer is declining annually both in depth and quality and can now be projected to a date of potable unuseability as well as economic limits for agricultural use. This means that without project water to supplement our native supply—agriculture in this area is terminal."

Speaking to the general question of new land development as well as continued production on older lands, and, further, to the question of large vs. small farm operations,

he added: "The development of new agricultural acreage is often associated with 'oversupply' in terms of agricultural production. The term 'oversupply' connotes that waste will be associated with increased production and that supply is actually greater than demand in a physical sense. Actually, supply will equal demand at a certain price. 'Oversupply' also neglects factors of quality and implies that all agricultural products are the same. If an increased supply means somewhat lower prices to the farmer, the ultimate benefactor will be the consumer. The development of agriculture in California with new production methods means better availability and higher quality products for California and the rest of the nation. Further, the statement that small farmers will be driven out of agriculture 'by the thousands' is misleading. Some of the less efficient producers will not be able to match new production or quality standards and will leave agriculture. This type of process has been in existence throughout the history of free enterprise agriculture. It has meant that the general public is better off in terms of quantity, price and quality of goods produced." (end of quote).

The closest Nader's Mr. Roberts comes to admitting any benefits from Project water is when he says, in his Clear Creek article: "While many people ultimately receive this water, the only ones who benefit are those who receive substantially more or substantially cheaper water than they would get without the Project." Admittedly, under such circumstances, when they exist, a benefit would be established; but such circumstances fail to account for many other benefits to many others that accrue within the Project service area.

At another point in this article he says: "The Project does not really benefit the average Southern Californian. But the Project does benefit two classes which use large amounts of water: large landholders and water-using businesses." While he acknowledges some of these beneficiaries are in Southern California, his choicest barbs are thrown at the San Joaquin Valley where he says: "the major beneficiaries are the corporate farms." Accepting data prepared by others in 1959, he flatly but falsely declares the total acreage of such corporate farms served by the State Water Project is more than 2½ million acres.

Without intention at this moment of either defending or condemning the larger corporate farms—but simply because I detest exaggeration and falsehood, I would say, right here is a good place to draw the line—the place to declare, as General Anthony McAuliffe once declared at Bastogne, "NUTS".

It's time for Roberts' credibility to be examined. (a) because he fails to notice obvious benefits available now, and increasingly to become available from the Project; and (b) because he blandly accepts and brashly reports irresponsible computations by others that 2½ million acres of corporate held acreage is served by the Project. This is drastically more acreage than the sum total of all acreage to receive such service in the San Joaquin Valley.

First, it can be acknowledged, without prejudice, that larger corporate farms do exist in the valley and they do include considerable acreage that may be served by Project water now, and later. They employ a substantial number of people, generally at good wages. Some of these corporate farms are large—some of them relatively small. Also, there are many other farms in the valley that receive, or will receive, Project service that are not corporate-owned. Some of these are large—some are small. They, too, employ many people, generally at good wages. They are all a part of the economy of the valley.

Second, the entire water supply to be provided in the San Joaquin Valley from the

Project is only sufficient to serve about 500,000 to 600,000 acres with a full supply—based on a maximum use of about 2½ acre feet per acre—a minimum for successful farming. Many properties, whether owned by large or small operators, however, will not receive a full supply; therefore, it may be reasonably estimated that a maximum of 700,000 to 800,000 acres may ultimately be served to some degree by the Project.

This total acreage, is less than a third the corporate acreage alone claimed by Roberts to be served by the Project.

But that is not all.

More exact information on this question is available from the Kern County Water Agency which, through its member units and improvement districts, will distribute about 80% of all San Joaquin Valley delivered Project water. This Agency's recap indicates that all larger corporate landholdings to be served by the Project within these Kern districts account for not more than about 225,000 acres. Some of this acreage will receive little, if any, Project water—other such acreage perhaps a full supply.

The larger corporate holdings in the San Joaquin Valley other than those in Kern County, but served by water districts receiving State Project water, although substantial in acreage, account for far less Project-served corporate acreage than that served in Kern County—perhaps as much as 100,000 acres in total. Accordingly, a fair estimate of all larger corporate landholdings receiving State Project water would perhaps be something in the order of 325,000 acres in the Project's San Joaquin Valley service area—far less than the 2½ million acres Roberts claims would be supplied.

Obviously Nader team member Roberts is guilty of irresponsible reporting on this score. No more irresponsible, however, than with respect to many other charges he leveled in his Clear Creek article and now used in the Nader report.

This disposes of questions concerning the actual acreage of larger corporate landholders served by the Project. Admittedly these corporations do engage in farming—many have done so for many decades. They have committed their resources to payment of the cost of Project water with interest in accordance with the water pricing policies and taxing policies of the respective agencies or districts serving them.

In view of these facts, Nader's team member Roberts, however, lays an egg when he charges these corporate landholders receive great subsidies and other unearned benefits.

To respond to the Roberts charge that Kern County agricultural water users abnormally benefit from a subsidy of \$20.00 or more per acre foot through Agency or State malfeasance, requires stating again that, neither under the State Water Service Contracts, nor under the KCWA-member unit contracts, is there any prospect of any such subsidy. Additional proof that no subsidy exists, could be demonstrated by further analysis of the pricing and taxing policies of each Kern County Water Agency member unit district, but this can hardly be undertaken here.

It is sufficient at this time to indicate that basic policies by which these member unit water districts are guided are essentially the same as those which control the Kern County Water Agency itself and many other water districts in California. Essentially, this policy calls for payment of all properly allocated costs by those who receive the benefit—the "Fellmuth principle", if you will.

SURPLUS SUBSIDY?

However, the charge Nader team member Roberts tries to establish concerning an alleged State impropriety and a vast subsidy to users in State delivery of Project surplus water at a reduced charge of about \$4 an acre foot requires attention. His claim that Project surplus water is not surplus in reality but is firm water instead, worth full price,

calls for answer. His basic contention is, that water labeled surplus water by the State is not actually surplus because it would always be available except in an extremely dry year.

Why this is incorrect, and why surplus water has greatly reduced value, and the considerations that must be taken into account when considering its actual availability, will be explained here: First, it should be pointed out that water charged for, at so much per acre foot, is not the water bills from the State to the agencies read.

Instead, each contracting agency is billed in full, with interests, for its proportionate share of costs of conserving the water, and its proportionate share of the costs of transporting it to the takeout points serving the Agency's service area.

Thus the capital costs of the Project, with interest, which are paid for on a deferred basis, and the operating costs of the Project, which are paid for on a semiannual or monthly basis, are fully paid by such agencies, each to the extent it is required to share in such costs under its contract, and regardless of the exact amount of water actually received.

In effect, as Prudential would say, each agency is buying "a piece of the rock", or as the younger generation might say, "a piece of the action." The fact that no title to this capacity is conveyed by the State to the Agency does not diminish the fact that, when an agency assumes such an obligation under its contract with the State, it becomes entitled to use of a specific share of the capacity of the project transportation facilities as specified by the contract, while it also assumes, and must pay the capital costs with interest and the related fixed operating costs, regardless of whether its water entitlement is fully received or not.

If Project firm water is short of meeting a contractor's entitlement, the variable transportation costs (largely power costs) would not be charged.

Why then, under such circumstances, should not facilities and service thus paid for be used to provide surplus water when available? As this question is examined, it should be pointed out that many physical or regulatory factors, some of which are unknown in advance, can have a bearing on the amount of surplus water available at the Delta.

One physical factor is, that the State Water Project is not a gravity system—instead it depends on massive pumps and electrical energy to deliver water. The pumps may fail, or the electric energy may not be available or the power contracts may not permit the supplying of power for pumping surplus water even though the water is available at the Delta, even when aqueduct capacity to move the water is available.

We can remind ourselves that rulings of the State Water Resources Control Board, or other agencies, may affect water availability. We also know that, under the State Water Service Contracts, the agricultural water supply must suffer the first deficiencies as compared to municipal and industrial supply in the event of drought and water shortage. This reduction is without benefit of any reduction in the fixed charges to the contractors for related capital costs or operation costs of the Project. Those that would like to use surplus Project water must consider these hazards and these unrewarded costs. They cannot agree that surplus water is dependable. While they plan to make use of some surplus water, when available particularly in early years of the Project when local distribution costs, too, are burdensome; and while they hope surplus water will be available later, they also must hedge, by maintaining costly wells and pumps, to provide the dependability needed, even though they may not use them. Obviously, too, surplus water will only be provided by the State when it is amply available. All of this speaks eloquent-

ly for making surplus water available to users at lowest cost whenever all circumstances permit its use.

Third, is yet another overriding consideration—the economic preservation of a natural resource—groundwater. Considering the fact that the recovery and use of groundwater involves substantial cost for pumping and, at times, costly conveyance, there are good, and substantial reasons for providing surplus water at the lowest possible cost—both for direct replenishment of groundwater, and for direct application of such water to permit less pumping than would otherwise be required.

By so doing, the groundwater resources of the State, as they exist in the many service areas of the Project, can be conserved and, in the course of time, the public benefited. In the meantime, no harm is done to anyone; no new costs are imposed on any except those who may benefit. And those who benefit stand to gain no more than they should all things considered. Why then, complain?

STOP THE STATE PROJECT?

Nader's author Roberts has made it abundantly clear through his Clear Creek article, that his conclusions are based on certain prejudices, and certain objectives. He states clearly that his motive is to stop the State Water Project. He aims to reduce the taking of water from the Delta, even though the water service contractors have footed the bill to conserve it. Among his methods, the stopping of the Peripheral Canal is considered by him to be a key necessity.

To defend the Peripheral Canal concept point-by-point will not be an objective of this article. Again too much space would be required and the readers should not be further burdened at this time.

However, one observation may be in order, namely, this: The State Water Resources Development Bond Act and the System it contemplates will take care of the problems of the Peripheral Canal, and indeed there may be some, in a way that will be fair to everyone. Roberts is foolish in trying to contend otherwise, just as many of his other complaints about the Project are foolish.

Perhaps we should not blame him too much for his misconceptions. The State Water Project, is indeed, a complex and massive undertaking. Perhaps its workings are not readily apparent to the casual student. But perhaps what has been written here will serve to accomplish in a small way a needed part of the understanding that is desirable.

THE PROJECT—BANE OR BLESSING?

Personally, I think we can be very proud of the State Water Project—proud of the water pioneers, the engineers whose early studies led to its concept, and the engineers and officials, and all persons involved in its construction and operation to this day. We can also be proud of legislators who approved the Bond Act in 1959 and have steadfastly kept the Project on course. Too, we can be proud of the voters who approved this measure in 1960, and who later have been called upon to ward off measures that would have crippled the State Water Resources Development System.

Continuing, I think we should appreciate and be grateful for the Project's capacity to serve so many people throughout so much of the State, now and in the future. We should recognize with appreciation the important part played by the water agencies and districts in this program, many of which have as their primary purpose the serving of State Project water to their areas. Likewise, we can be proud of the officials of these agencies for their unselfish work in behalf of their constituents. Credit is due the great State of California for its part in the Project.

But the capstone on this huge structure consists of the many people throughout the service area who have accepted responsibility

for repayment of so large a share of the cost of the California State Water Project.

[From the Fresno Bee, Aug. 26, 1971]

NADER JOINS MINERAL KING CRITICS

SAN FRANCISCO.—The Ralph Nader California Task Force questions the US Forest Service's right to grant Walt Disney Productions a developmental lease for the proposed \$35 million Mineral King Project.

Taking essentially the same position as the Sierra Club, the Nader report challenges the lease policies and the state-federal authority to build a \$23 million all-year highway.

Nader's report writers also challenge the USFS right to allow resort development within a congressionally mandated game refuge.

The USFS invited bidders for a ski resort development in Mineral King. The report notes that of the six bidders, two presented \$35 million to \$40 million proposals, proposals 10 times larger than those sought by USFS.

The Mineral King report by Nader's task force concludes, "Pending an adverse decision on the Sierra Club suit, the private development will proceed. The Disney contributions to state and federal political campaigns have been substantial."

The Sierra Club filed a federal suit in San Francisco challenging both the Forest Service and the National Park Service on the Mineral King questions. The suit prevailed in the lower court, was reversed on appeal and now the Sierra Club has appealed to the US Supreme Court.

Nader's strongest attack on Mineral King is directed at the state legislative processes, the State Division of Highways, the National Park Service and the USFS joint plans for a 25-mile-long road that must cross through Sequoia National Park to reach the Mineral King project.

"This road was placed in the state highway system . . . by means of a rider on another bill, and by clandestine maneuverings by the (then) president pro tem of the (state) Senate," the report states.

The report notes, "no legislative hearings were held" on this proposed \$23 million addition to the state highway system.

The report charges the USFS asked for environmental comment from its own wildlife experts, then ignored those reports because they were unfavorable to the Mineral King proposals.

In general the report alleges the Disney development is too large and that it is ecologically destructive. The report contends the wildlife and the natural plant life will be seriously damaged or destroyed.

[From the Tehachapi News, Sept. 1, 1971]

SIERRA CLUB HELPS PAY NADER REPORT

(By Bill Mead)

Tehachapi-area voters who gave overwhelming approval early this summer to a system to use State Project water will have serious reservations about the so-called Nader report on "Power and Land in California".

It's "so-called" because Ralph Nader's involvement appears to be limited to writing an introduction to the report and—more recently—defending the questionable document from mounting attacks.

The Nader report was actually prepared by a group of young political activists, many of them closely connected with the ultra-conservationist Sierra Club. The total effort received strong financial backing from the Sierra Club, which has long sought to sabotage the State Water Project. The young man in charge of the Nader report admitted that direct Sierra Club support amounted to 40% of its total costs. Other observers say much of the balance of the report's financing came from sources allied with the Sierra Club.

In view of this Sierra Club backing, it's no surprise that the resulting document is highly critical of the State Water Project in terms echoing Sierra Club utterances in the past.

It will be hard for Tehachapi people to see much logic in the Nader report's conclusions that the big water system is "unnecessary" and "damaging to the environment". The longwinded report also implies that the State Project mainly benefits large farming companies in the San Joaquin Valley.

The factual absurdities on nearly every page of the Nader report are so numerous that an entire issue of this paper wouldn't provide enough space to debunk them all. So let's direct our attention to what the State Project means to this area, as contrasted with what the Nader critics claim.

If anybody thinks the State Project is going to degrade the environment, they first ought to imagine what this area would be like without the project. Perhaps Nader's followers see a great deal of charm in wiped-out communities, but the people who live and work in them feel differently. Without the State Water Project, Tehachapi and the surrounding Valleys would be reduced—and soon—to economic disaster.

It's no exaggeration to say that the State Water Project is this area's lifeline. Without it, there would have been no other way to provide enough water around here to support more than the lowest level of existence for a handful of people. Taking it a step further, if it hadn't been for the participation of those big, bad farmers in the San Joaquin Valley, the cost of water from the State Project would have been so high that Tehachapi couldn't afford to buy it.

A critical examination of the Nader report—especially the portions about the State Water Project—makes reasonable people see much truth in the comment this week from the San Diego County Assessor, who summed up his reaction to the Nader report in these words:

"Ralph Nader should have stuck to seat belts."

At the very least, it would seem that the wall-to-wall distortions by the young zealots who wrote this latest Nader epic ought to make the professional consumerist more selective in franchising his highly-promoted reputation.

CHALLENGE OF THE CONSUMER CRUSADER

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the consumer has often been shortchanged by the media in this country. Articles of importance to consumers often are relegated to the women's pages or back sections of newspapers, preceded by gawdy advertising or dangerous products. But sometimes the public finds allies in unexpected quarters, concern for consumerism where one would least imagine it.

Comic magazines lately have begun dealing with controversial, topical issues. A good example is the September issue of Detective Comics, "Challenger of the Consumer Crusader," deals with the efforts of a Naderesque consumer investigator.

National Comics should be commended for its efforts to educate our young people in the field of consumer protection,

and also for unleashing the Batman on some of the less well known, but still unsavory, criminals of our society—those who seek to deceive and cheat the American consumer.

CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME FOR THE EEC

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the ingratitude of our "foreign aid friends" is constantly amazing.

The nations of the European Common Market, saved from total destruction at the high cost of American lives and reconstructed by billions of dollars in American foreign aid, refuse to support the American people in our move to save our sagging economic system.

Even Britain, our "sometime friend," supports the move on the part of the EEC to demand official devaluation of the American dollar, a move that has left the American people in virtual isolation in their attempt to salvage what is left from repeated governmental overspending.

Had our Government taken a similar attitude to the plight of Europe after World War II, there would be no "common market." We have, in effect, created, fed, and nourished a creature that will now support moves to hasten our downfall from our position as a world leader.

It is past time to stop the nonsense; it is past time supporting the world only to see it turn against us. The American people must not blame our foreign friends, our leaders and their programs have caused our decline.

I insert related news articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1971]
REALIGNMENT ASKED FOR CURRENCIES IN NEW EEC PROPOSAL

(By Richard Norton-Taylor)

BRUSSELS.—The European Common Market's executive commission today called for a realignment of all major trading currencies—including the dollar—and the progressive run-down of the dollar's role as a reserve currency.

The call came in a five-page document to be discussed by the six Common Market finance ministers Monday. Although the commission does not specifically propose devaluation of the dollar in terms of gold, senior commission officials make it clear that this is what the commission has in mind.

The view of the independent commission is of significance in that the nine-man executive body traditionally tries to formulate a common denominator out of the opinions of the six member states.

In the past few days, leading figures in the Italian government—currently chairmen of the market's council of ministers—have suggested devaluation of the dollar, while the British treasury is reported to be favoring a rise in the price of gold.

Common Market finance ministers will concentrate Monday on trying to adopt a joint stand on the reform of the interna-

tional monetary system, market sources say. On the following Wednesday, ministers from the Group of Ten—linking the western world's richest nations—will meet in London for further talks. At that meeting, the United States can be expected to confront a common stand in favor of a dollar devaluation.

"Realignment of the currencies of industrialized countries," the commission says, "must be carried out in such a way that the sharing of the burden of such adjustments takes account of the relative economic situations of the countries involved."

In an indirect criticism of the way the U.S. has managed its economy up to now, the commission says that "without exception," all the countries concerned must accept the constraints and obligations that such parity realignments involve, and must introduce "appropriate internal policies."

The commission proposes that "international liquidity should continue to be based on gold, and, to an increasing extent, by reserve instruments created and managed collectively on the international level; this implies the adaptation and the development of the system of Special Drawing Rights (SDR's). It is thus important to organize a progressive decline in the role played by national currencies as instruments of reserve."

Common Market experts are thinking in terms of defining their currencies in terms of Special Drawing Rights, and no longer pegging them to the dollar. But the exact means of making the Common Market currencies independent of the dollar will depend on whether or not the United States agrees to a change in the gold parity of the dollar.

While the Common Market and Britain are apparently moving towards agreement on ways of reforming the international monetary system, they are clearly still at odds on how to combat speculative movements of short-term capital and on how much—if at all—the Common Market currencies should be allowed to "float" against the dollar.

Such concentration on the broader, political issue of the future monetary relationship between Western Europe and the United States is bringing the Europeans closer to French thinking. In brief, the French argue that European currencies should not be tied to a single national currency like the dollar, thereby being at the mercy of internal American economic policies.

Signor Franco Baria Malfatti, president of the European Commission, today took up President Pompidou's proposal for a meeting of heads of government of both the Common Market six and the four candidates seeking membership of the market.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1971]
BRITAIN SUPPORTING EEC PLAN ON DOLLAR

LONDON.—Britain lent strong backing today to a European call for the devaluation of the dollar against gold within a reformed world money system.

The development, on the eve of talks between finance ministers and bankers representing the world's 10 richest nations, had the informal backing of Japan and Canada, according to senior authorities.

It therefore seemed to ensure the virtual isolation of Treasury Secretary John B. Connally, who was flying in under President Nixon's orders to defend the administration's emergency economic recovery program. This program includes a controversial 10 per cent surcharge on most U.S. imports and broke the dollar's nearly 40-year-old tie to gold.

Word of the British move spread after Chancellor of the Exchequer Anthony Barber met twice with Italian Finance Minister Mario Ferrari-Agradi, who is president of

the European Common Market's Council of Ministers.

The Italian had flown in from Brussels to rally British backing for a definition of Common Market policy—agreed on Monday—toward the main issues involved in the international monetary crisis.

Barber advised Ferrari-Agradi that the six Common Market countries can count on broad British backing for most of their key aims.

These included:

A reform of the world money system, with a devaluation of the dollar against gold. The British think this should be limited to about 5 per cent.

The phasing out of the role of the dollar as a reserve currency just as Britain's pound sterling's role is being phased out. Instead a system of special drawing rights on the International Monetary Fund, should be developed.

A realignment in the value of the world's leading currencies, including the dollar, and preservation of the system of fixed parities. But controlled floating of currencies also would be permitted by enlarging the upward and downward limits of fluctuation. The British would like a margin of about 3 per cent each way.

Abandonment by the United States of its 10 per cent supplemental import tax which most trading nations see not only as a threat to freer world trade that could bring reprisals but also as a bar to a realignment of exchange rates.

The British hope the two-day conference of "the Group of 10" will permit them to begin a middleman's role in order to prepare a package of compromise measures reconciling the conflicting interests of the key nations.

Nations taking part are Britain, the United States, Canada, Japan, Sweden, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium and Holland. Switzerland sits as an observer.

The value of the U.S. dollar dropped to new lows in West Germany and Japan and declined on several other international exchanges, apparently in reaction to the common market's decision.

In Tokyo, the value of the dollar fell to 337.75 yen, off 6.2 per cent from the old standard of 360 yen per dollar and the American currency's lowest value there in the post-war years.

In West Germany, where the Deutsche mark itself has been allowed to seek its own level since May 10, the dollar dropped to a closing rate of 3.3755 marks. This was a plunge below the previous 22-year low of 3.3810 marks registered Aug. 26 and equivalent to a dollar devaluation of 7.7 per cent against the mark.

The dollar also opened lower in London, closing at \$2.4675 to the pound sterling.

This amounted to a dollar devaluation of about 3 per cent against the old official rate of \$2.40 to the pound.

In Paris, the dollar lost ground against the franc and finished at 5.345-5.355 on the free market, a devaluation of 3.7 per cent on the dollar.

The dollar plunged to 24.45 Austrian schillings on the Vienna market, lowest since Mr. Nixon's move. And in Spain, there were indications the dollar also was under pressure. The dollar was quoted in Madrid at 69.20 pesetas for buyers and 69.436 for sellers, compared with 68.85 and 69.21 Monday.

On the Brussels market, the dollar reached its lowest point of the month, 48.065 Belgian francs, a 3.87 per cent drop from the previous official value. In Amsterdam, the devaluation against old parity was exactly 5 per cent at 3.4263 guilders at the close. The Swiss franc closed at 3.99 to the dollar, an unofficial devaluation of 2.21 per cent.

SALE OF JETS TO CHILE

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have voiced my deep concern over the ill-advised decision of the Export-Import Bank not to assist Chile in purchasing three Boeing commercial aircraft. Not only has this unwarranted determination seriously damaged our image and credibility in Latin America but it has also forced the Chilean Government into seriously considering the purchase of commercial jets from the Soviet Union and the dispatch of a special mission to Moscow.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried a very timely and perceptive editorial on this tragic situation. As this editorial aptly observes, the poorly conceived decision not to grant Eximbank financial underwriting will simply reinforce the efforts of those elements seeking an open break between the United States and Chile. I present herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, this Washington Post editorial and urge that our colleagues give it careful consideration.

I also include for insertion my exchange of correspondence with the White House on this issue. I find very little encouragement in the implication that there must be some quid pro quo before further consideration can or will be given to Chile's request, particularly when the Allende government—as noted in the Post editorial—has already taken steps to show its good faith in recent compensation cases. I remain unconvinced, contrary to Mr. Cook's assurances, that political factors were not the foremost of considerations.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1971]
BULLYING CHILE

Chile's dispatch of a mission to Moscow to buy eight Soviet commercial jets signifies a major failure of American policy. Chile wanted to buy three more Boeings for its currently all-American fleet. With Boeing gasping after the SST cutoff, the \$21 million deal looked like a natural. The Nixon administration, seemingly recovered from the fitters with which it greeted the socialist Allende government, had lent Santiago \$5 million to buy a military plane and assorted gear. Chile had made satisfactory compensation arrangements with Bethlehem Steel, Bank of America and—a big one—Cerro copper, all targets of nationalization. The \$10 million loan Chile was seeking from the U.S. Export-Import Bank to cover the Boeing jets was, relatively speaking, peanuts. Nobody doubted that Chile could and would pay.

But Eximbank, which had led Santiago to believe the Boeing loan would go through, drew back. Whether it was acting for the two large nationalized copper companies, Anaconda and Kennecott, whose compensation claims are pending, or whether it was simply a case of the United States Government, in particular the Treasury, wanting to play tough, is not clear. But Eximbank refused to approve a loan for the Boeing jets. Instead, it asked Chile to report what it planned to pay Anaconda and Kennecott (and Cerro—for technical reasons its compensation figure has not been set). The Allende government replied that these questions were still in the

works, and sent the vice president of LAN-Chilean Airline to Moscow.

Now, in Washington the Eximbank statement to Chile is described as a routine banking query. In Chile and throughout Latin America, however, the statement has been understood—and properly so—as a classic case of big-stick diplomacy. Chileans of all political persuasions—indeed, Latin Americans of all political persuasions—have joined in protest against it. No self-respecting government, Marxist or otherwise, can be expected to dance a jig for Henry Kearns—who is president of Exim. And in addition to the manifest political implications, the conversion of a fleet from American to Russian planes involves difficulties of expense, training, spare parts and the like. Mr. Allende might well have paused on these.

The matter is not likely to end with Santiago's switch from Boeings to Tupolevs, however. By forcing President Allende to buy Russian, the United States surely will strengthen the hand of those in Santiago who wish to promote a break with Washington. The United States will have made it measurably harder for Anaconda and Kennecott to get fair compensation settlements. And it has compromised itself throughout the hemisphere.

AUGUST 12, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will recall that I wrote to you early last month to express my deep interest in the desire of the Government of Chile to purchase three commercial jets—two Boeing 707s and one Boeing 727—from the United States with the assistance of the Export-Import Bank. In my July 7 letter I noted that the best interests of the United States would be served in approving a Chilean request for Ex-Im Bank financing and I urged that the Chilean Government's request be favorably considered.

I was most distressed to learn in this morning's papers that the Export-Import Bank has refused to negotiate loans and loan guarantees with the Chilean Government in order that it may purchase these aircraft. I believe this decision is not only unwarranted and ill-conceived but that it also casts very serious doubts over your previously announced desire to maintain normal relations with Chile. Frankly, Mr. President, the Ex-Im Bank's action is nothing more than a callous rebuff to Chile and I am fearful that it will serve to further strain our already troubled relations with this Latin American republic.

It seems to me that the primary basis of the determination whether or not to grant Ex-Im Bank financing is the applicant's credit worthiness and this should have been the basis upon which the United States responded to Chile's overtures. However, it would appear that political considerations and certain unfounded apprehensions took precedence over economic factors in arriving at the decision not to grant aid.

Consider the potential economic benefits which would accrue to our financially plagued aerospace industry if the purchase could be made in the United States. According to news accounts, the only alternative now open to Chile will be to try to purchase these needed planes from the Soviet Union—a development which our already questionable image in Latin America can ill afford.

I respectfully urge that the appropriate officials of your administration very carefully review the unfortunate decision made by the Export-Import Bank and thoroughly reconsider Chile's request with a view toward granting approval. I believe that positive action is long overdue in our relations with Chile and that approval of the loan request to purchase the planes may very

well facilitate negotiations now underway in connection with certain U.S. interests in Chile.

Sincerely,

HERMAN BADILLO,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, September 9, 1971.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BADILLO: I have inquired further regarding your letter of August 12 to the President about Chile's interest in acquiring three Boeing aircraft with the assistance of the Export-Import Bank.

Despite press reports to the contrary, the Export-Import Bank, far from refusing to discuss the matter with Chilean representatives, has held some discussions already and is entirely prepared and willing for these discussions to continue. The Bank has been, and remains, interested in obtaining information on Chile's intentions regarding its various international financial obligations. We believe that such information would be of legitimate interest to any potential creditor, and that the Bank is acting in a way designed to meet its responsibilities for the taxpayers' funds appropriated to it by the Congress. Thus normal banking and financial criteria, and not political considerations, underlie the Bank's position.

At the same time we have very much in mind the concerns you express over the state of our aerospace industry, our relations with Chile, and particular U.S. interests in that country, and you can be sure that these matters are being very carefully considered.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

RICHARD K. COOK,
Special Assistant to the President.

SALMON FACING DEATH RATE OF
90 PERCENT IN NEXT 3 YEARS IN
WASHINGTON STATE

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, an alarming amount of toxic concentrations of dissolved nitrogen persists from the most upstream dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers threatening the future of salmon and steelhead. The Environmental Protection Agency's Region 10 office in Seattle, has just released a report that states the anadromous fish of the Columbia Basin, a major regional and national resource, due to this condition in the Columbia and Snake Rivers, could be reduced to 10 percent of its present size within 3 years.

To save this national resource and the great American salmon fishing industry, Congress and Federal agencies must implement aggressive strategy for an early and effective reduction of dissolved nitrogen concentrations in the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

Nitrogen supersaturation is caused when river flow must be passed over the spillways of the main stem hydroelectric dams. Air, which is 79 percent nitrogen, is entrained in the flow as it passes over the spillways and, as the water plunges into the deep stilling basin below the

dams, the increased pressure and turbulence force the gasses in the air to dissolve in the water. This is causing the deaths of uncounted thousands of salmon.

Mr. Speaker, the causes are well-documented. Now, we must turn to solutions and we must do it rapidly. The Corps of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries Service, Bonneville Power Administration, and Oregon and Washington fisheries agencies have worked diligently during the past year toward the development of short-term and long-range solutions to the problems of nitrogen supersaturation.

Now, however, with the EPA report on this serious problem, I urge the Department of Interior to prepare the necessary legislation to meet the problem, and submit it to Congress hastily. There are many recommendations that can be accomplished at the local level, and I urge local agencies to set about their work. But, here in the Congress we have an obligation to save an essential resource from extinction. Today, I have written Secretary of Interior Rogers C. B. Morton seeking immediate attention to the legislative needs to save these salmon.

EEOC: STRENGTHEN IT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Act of 1971 represents a major commitment by Congress to the concept of equal rights for all Americans.

Until now, the Federal Government has said much, but done too little. However, I am realistic enough to recognize that H.R. 1746 is not a cure-all for the inequities that plague our society.

Nevertheless, the fact is that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will have significant enforcement powers for the first time.

Congress, in enacting this legislation, finally will put employers on notice that discrimination in hiring and employment will no longer be tolerated.

Transferring the Office of Federal Contract Compliance from the Department of Labor to the EEOC is a major step toward unifying our efforts in the war against discrimination. Bringing smaller employers and unions, as well as State and local governmental employees under the umbrella of Federal protection is a significant milestone.

The battle will continue, however, until each and every employer in this Nation realizes that swift legal action will follow any discriminatory behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of H.R. 1746. As the representative of a constituency composed primarily of members of minority groups, I know that this bill will have an important influence on their lives. They will not be deceived into thinking this bill does everything, but it will give them hope that their Government has made

a commitment to stopping the discrimination that relegates so many of them to menial jobs and inadequate pay.

At a time when President Nixon tells us that any type of work is preferable than welfare, he speaks in ignorance of the discrimination that bars those with black or brown skin from many jobs. He speaks in ignorance of the discrimination that prevents many women from being promoted, despite their ability. He speaks in ignorance of the discrimination that keeps Spanish-speaking citizens from being hired.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1746.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, testimony I received at the Minneapolis health hearings included remarks by Dr. Matt Plasha and Mr. Warren Eustis concerning the problems of rural health care.

Dr. Plasha is a general practitioner and a member of a mixed specialty group in Coon Rapids, Minn. He pointed out three areas of concern as they relate to his area. First, he discussed the physician shortage. There is a shortage of practicing physicians who actually see those who are sick. He estimated that only 50 percent of all doctors in the area see patients. He pointed to the lack of family physicians.

Specialists, according to Dr. Plasha, greatly outnumber general practitioners today. In 1947 approximately 75 percent of physicians beginning practice were general practitioners, but in 1971 approximately 75 percent of physicians beginning practice were specialists of one sort or another.

Second, he discussed the assistance given by paramedical personnel. He discussed the legal problems that arise when employing individuals with only some medical training. As has been pointed out, the question of licensure was one of the central questions in dealing with the problems of expanding trained medical personnel. Third, Dr. Plasha discussed some of the costs that lead to inflation in doctors' fees. For example, the problem of malpractice forces doctors to practice a much more defensive type of medicine. In Dr. Plasha's opinion, doctors order additional, and at times, unnecessary tests in order to be protected against any possible eventuality. In some States malpractice insurance is unavailable. As a related problem, Dr. Plasha pointed out that much more medical service could be provided on an outpatient basis.

Mr. Warren Eustis, an attorney representing the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council, discussed some of the less evident problems of bringing medical care to rural areas. Mr. Eustis has had a central role in developing a regional approach to medical problems and had requested funding for the Freeborn-Mower project. This proposal

joined two southern Minnesota counties in planning for their health care needs. This is, according to Mr. Eustis, one of the first steps in attempting to solve the lack of intelligent planning in various rural areas. As a strong supporter of the Federal comprehensive health planning program, Mr. Eustis urged continued congressional support for an expansion of the activities of this program. Specifically, he suggested that comprehensive health planning groups should have not only review authority but also authority to initiate programs and possibly run some.

This idea deserves a great deal more thought on all levels of government and may be one of the ways to solve the problems of health care in rural settings.

A TRIBUTE TO THE SISTER CITY PROGRAM OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIF.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, international relations can be approached on two levels. We can negotiate between leaders of nations in an attempt to improve relations from the top, but a far more effective method is to bring individuals into contact to improve international rapport through interpersonal relationships.

The city of Redondo Beach, Calif., a portion of which lies within my district, has demonstrated for a number of years the value of the second approach through the outstanding success of its Sister City program. This Friday evening, September 17, 1971, in Washington, D.C., appropriate tribute will be paid to that program by the Town Affiliation Association as the city in the 25,000 to 75,000 population category with the best overall Sister City program. Of course, the honor of Redondo Beach's selection also reflects upon her two sister cities, La Paz and Ensenada, Mexico.

Under the leadership of Mrs. Helen P. Colwell, chairman of the Redondo Beach sister city program, this effort has become more than a surface program of annual visits between dignitaries of the cities involved. Instead, it has become an example of international cooperation and mutual assistance between the three communities. Rather than two separate programs with the two Mexican cities, there has been a spirit of tri-cityhood that has fostered increased fellowship between La Paz and Ensenada as well.

In recognition of Mrs. Colwell's personal leadership in the success of the program, she has been asked to be a member of a special task force on planning for the future to meet during the TAA convention this week here in Washington.

Redondo Beach began its sister city activities in 1960, at the suggestion of Robert Curry, former publisher of the South Bay Daily Breeze, who had spent much time in La Paz and had noticed

many similarities in the two communities. Mr. Curry encouraged Redondo Beach officials to visit La Paz and, as a result, the affiliation between the two cities was agreed upon. In 1963, Ensenada approached Redondo Beach about a similar program and was soon included as the third sister in a tri-city relationship.

This year, the program, which has always been organized on the basis of individual members rather than member organizations, included 2,192 Redondo Beach members, 1,411 from La Paz, and 1,531 in Ensenada. As a result of the program, Redondo Beach residents paid 1,923 visits to La Paz and 3,114 to Ensenada, and 1,925 visitors from La Paz and 3,317 from Ensenada came to Redondo Beach for periods of from 3 days to a year.

But those are only the statistics; let us look at the results.

A free dental clinic was established as a joint sister city project last year, with an additional \$30,000 worth of supplies donated and delivered this year. Also, \$20,000 in medical supplies has been sent to La Paz for a 60-bed clinical hospital, the Red Cross, and the medical clinic for working mothers and their children. In Ensenada, a sister city parkette has been built on land secured through the efforts of their sister city committee, with \$7,000 worth of modern playground equipment provided by their counterparts in Redondo Beach. When a similar project was launched this year for La Paz, a local trucking company donated transportation for the playground fixtures from Redondo Beach to Ensenada; from there it was shipped to La Paz by boat.

Special courses have been added in the schools of Redondo Beach to provide a greater understanding of the language and culture of Mexico as a result of the sister city relationship. Because both of the Mexican cities in the program are on the Baja California Peninsula, special emphasis has been placed on that area in the school programs. Student exchange programs in the three cities have involved nearly 48,000 persons in the international relations activities on a personal basis. A "pot luck" dinner in Redondo Beach, limited to the immediate families of those hosting a musical group from Ensenada, brought 700 persons to the dinner. The families adopted these young people "not just for that week, but 'for always,'" Mrs. Colwell reports.

Special sister cities festivities have been organized in all three cities, and the calendar of events alone took three pages of Mrs. Colwell's report on this year's activities.

The number of individual persons involved totaled more than half a million people among the three communities. Even allowing for repeated participation and the crowds of 60,000 or more drawn for major festivals, these are impressive numbers for three cities whose combined populations total less than 200,000.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the award is presented this Friday to Redondo Beach for the best overall sister city program in her population class, Mrs. Colwell and her committee will have done the work. The citizens of the three cities will have

had the experience and satisfaction of making lasting friendships. And, the whole world will reap the benefits of better international relations.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN SUPPORTED BY GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a press release issued by the Nebraska Governor's Commission on the Status of Women. Of particular interest are the diverse groups supporting the Equal Rights for Men and Women amendment without change or amendments. We will be considering this legislation on the floor next Wednesday, and I feel that all Members would find this press release of interest while pondering the question of whether we are finally going to make full human rights for women the law of our great land.

The press release follows:

PRESS RELEASE

Members of the first statutory Governor's Commission on the Status of Women have voted unanimous support of the Equal Rights Amendment in its original wording. The amendment is scheduled for September 15 action in Congress when two amendments to the original bill will be debated and voted upon.

The action was taken at a recent organizational meeting of the commission in Lincoln. (Sat. Aug. 28) According to Mrs. Helen Haggie, Lincoln, chairman of the new commission, women and men in Nebraska are urged to write members of the Nebraska Congressional delegation in support of the original amendment by September 10.

The text of the original amendment is, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." The bi-partisan proposal to amend the U.S. Constitution would enable Congress to enforce the provisions by appropriate legislation. The amendment would not take effect until two years after date of ratification.

Over 40 national organizations have endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment in its original form. Eleven state legislatures have petitioned Congress for its adoption. It has received the support of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon.

National organizations supporting the amendment who have Nebraska representation are: General Federation of Women's Clubs; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; National Education Association; American Women in Radio and Television; Women's Christian Temperance Union; National Federation of Republican Women's Clubs; American Association of College Deans; National Organization for Women; Soroptimist Federation of the Americas; American Society of Women Certified Public Accountants; Zonta; National Democratic Committee; National Republican Committee; American Association of University Women; Quota International; American Civil Liberties Union; Ladies of the Grand Army; United Presbyterian Women; United Presbyterian Church; B'nai B'rith Women; Women's Equity Action League; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation.

Offices of the first statutory Governor's

Commission on the Status of Women are: Mrs. Helen Haggie, chairman, Mrs. Betty Jeanne Holcomb-Keller, vice-chairman, Mrs. Venette Creager, secretary, all of Lincoln and Mrs. Arlene Travnicek, treasurer, Wilber.

Other members are: Mrs. Sue Morrissey, Kearney; Mrs. Mae Huerta, Scottsbluff; Mrs. Emmett Smith, Mrs. Elizabeth Pittman, both of Omaha; Mrs. Madeline Coder, Wellfleet; Mrs. P. R. Beacom, South Sioux City; Mrs. Marian Kjar, Lexington; Mrs. Rose Lute, Ogallala; Mrs. Tom Tideman, Hartington; Mrs. Robert Carlson, Blair; Mrs. Marilu El-lerboek, Bellevue.

Lincoln members include: Dr. Anne Campbell, Mrs. Virginia Portsche, Mrs. Fran White, Mrs. Kathryn Braeman, Mrs. Lucy Nevels, Mrs. Melba Scott, Mrs. Helen Lassek, Mrs. Helene Krivosha.

DIAL-A-FRIEND

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, a comforting voice in time of stress can be a welcome sound for those who are in need. For people who feel they have no friends, trying times can become desperate hours and the question, "Where to turn?" can become a haunting one.

I know that my colleagues in the House will be interested to know that a group of compassionate citizens in my congressional district have come together to fill that void. By simply picking up a phone, people with problems can now "Dial-a-Friend" in the Bridgeport, Conn., area.

This is an outstanding service, Mr. Speaker, performed by volunteers whose only reward is the satisfaction of assisting someone in need. I would add that there can be no greater reward than that.

I know my colleagues will join me in saluting this anonymous battalion of good samaritans and their leader, Mrs. Earl Weyant of Fairfield, Conn.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeport Post took an in-depth look at the workings of "Dial-a-Friend" and I would like to share that fine account, written by Margaret McCarthy, with you now:

"DIAL-A-FRIEND" HOT LINE IS HUMMING WITH COMFORT, ADVICE TO THE TROUBLED

(By Margaret McCarthy)

An 86-year-old woman is lonely and has no one to talk to . . . A teenage girl is unwed and pregnant and doesn't know how to tell her parents . . . A married woman has an alcoholic husband and threatens suicide.

What do these people have in common? They, as well as thousands of other troubled persons, have taken advantage of a telephone service called Dial-A-Friend (D-A-F), which was organized slightly over a year ago.

A person who wants a listener or advice calls the hotline number (375-5904), which puts them in contact with one of 35 volunteers who man the phones seven nights a week from 7 to 11 p.m.

Volunteers have to be at least 18 years old. Each works at D-A-F about one night a week at a location that the D-A-F prefers to keep unpublicized.

Among its accomplishments since its birth on June 24, 1970, D-A-F has saved the life of a drug addict who took an overdose of narcotics; prevented suicides; talked children

out of running away from home, and given advice to the lovelorn.

It also acts as a referral service, giving callers phone numbers of agencies such as Alcoholics Anonymous and or Planned Parenthood.

MUCH HELP AVAILABLE

"People aren't aware of all the help that is available to them," says Mrs. Mary Weyant, D-A-F's director of volunteer training.

She attributes the success of D-A-F to the fact that volunteers take all calls very seriously.

"Callers know we're interested," she says.

Mrs. Weyant explains that no calls are shrugged off as unimportant or practical jokes. "It's usually easy to tell if a caller is sincere by the way he talks and expresses himself," she says.

However, a volunteer who suspects a practical joker doesn't say, "You're joking," and then hang up.

"There's always a chance that it is not a joke," Mrs. Weyant says.

If a volunteer feels the call is a hoax, he still treats it as a sincere call. "We sometimes get a caller who's hysterically laughing and it appears to be a hoax, but it could be a nervous reaction," Mrs. Weyant explains.

According to Mrs. Weyant, another reason for the success of D-A-F is the rule that there must be no personal contact between the caller and the volunteer.

A caller has an easier time talking if he knows he's never going to have to face the person on the other end of the telephone, she explains.

NO PERSONAL CONTACT

Do the callers ever ask to meet the volunteers? "Oh, yes," Mrs. Weyant replies, "but there is no personal contact whatsoever. It is a strict rule," she says, and adds that the organization would turn out to be a dating service if the rule was broken.

The only exception to the "strict rule" is in the case of a suicide threat. One D-A-F staff member exclusively handles suicides. He is the only person on the staff allowed to leave the office and go to the homes of callers.

"We don't play with suicides," says Mrs. Weyant.

Volunteers must go through a two-week training period before they can take calls. Mrs. Weyant coaches them on how to talk to people on the phone, and how to cope with the types of calls that come in. Calls range from a child who is afraid of the dark to suicides.

After the two-week training period, the new volunteer is watched very carefully for a four-week probation period.

Guest speakers on such subjects as Planned Parenthood, homosexuality and non-violent action, are scheduled to speak to the volunteers to broaden their knowledge of subjects they may have to deal with.

Reading material is also made available to the volunteers.

CALL D-A-F NUMBER

Persons interested in becoming volunteers should call the D-A-F number and ask for "Mary" or "Sue."

Telephone conversations between callers and volunteers are sometimes more than four hours long, Mrs. Weyant reports. It has been proven that keeping a person on the phone can be a lifesaver.

One night, a person who had just taken an overdose of narcotics called. "The important thing to do in this instance is keep the person awake," Mrs. Weyant explains. The volunteer succeeded and also persuaded the caller to go to the hospital.

According to a letter sent to D-A-F by friends of this caller, the doctor on duty in the hospital's emergency room that night said D-A-F had saved his life.

"That person is now cured of his drug problem, and is a regular caller," says Mrs.

Weyant. He keeps D-A-F informed of where he is working and what he is doing.

"Those who are actually cured of narcotics addiction and alcoholism are few and far between," she adds.

Mrs. Weyant claims that many people call D-A-F back to tell how a volunteer's advice helped.

"Some former addicts call every night to boast: 'I'm not taking anything tonight,'" she relates.

PHONES EVERY NIGHT

A lonely 86-year-old woman calls every night. Volunteers talk to her to keep her company. As a mark of her appreciation, she sent D-A-F \$2.

Sometimes volunteers refer lonely persons to other lonely persons.

Some sons and daughters of people in convalescent homes request D-A-F to call their parents. "The family of a lonely person may visit every night, but it's those in-between hours that are important," Mrs. Weyant says.

D-A-F doesn't receive calls only from adults. Young runaways, students seeking help with homework, and children 7 and over who want dating advice are frequent callers, Mrs. Weyant says.

"We have to explain to runaways the disadvantages of running away from home," she says, and adds, "I think kids want to go home, but they have to be pushed."

If they refuse to go home that night, D-A-F refers them to a place where they can spend the night, such as the Salvation Army.

Callers do not know the age of the volunteer they are speaking to. "Sometimes you tell the truth about your age, sometimes you lie," Mrs. Weyant reports. "If they want you to be 21, you're 21."

NEVER LACKS CALLS

The number of calls D-A-F receives in a night varies, but, according to Mrs. Weyant there has never been a night with no calls. The number of calls ranges from about eight to 30 nightly.

D-A-F receives funds primarily from donations. The town of Stratford, as of Aug. 1, is paying D-A-F telephone bills.

In December, 1970, a proposal was made in the Stratford Town council that the budget include \$23,700 for the hot line. This allotment would have extended the service to 24 hours a day.

Under the proposal, two persons would have been hired from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., and two from midnight to 8 a.m. Also, \$13,000 of the proposed allotments would have gone to the program leadership.

However, the proposal was not passed and the funds were not appropriated.

"WE SHALL NOT REST . . ."

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most needlessly cruel aspects of the war in Vietnam has been the intransigence of the North Vietnamese regarding our American prisoners of war and missing in action.

Those of us who have been working for an end to this conflict and to the safe return home of all of our men are ever mindful of these more than 1,550 Americans and of the anguish borne by their families and friends.

As we continue up the road toward peace, let us bear in mind the words of Defense Secretary Laird, spoken a few

months ago at the annual convention of the National Broadcasters. He said, in part:

Our ultimate objective is to bring the prisoners back home and reunite them with their loved ones . . . I need not point out the needless human tragedy which results from Hanoi's policy toward the prisoners of war and the missing. It is tragic for those Americans who are held in Southeast Asia. It is tragic for wives and parents, and children here in our country—particularly for those who do not know the fate of the man who went off to this conflict. The courage that these men and their families display commands our awe and admiration. . . . We shall not rest until every American who is a prisoner comes home again to live out his life in peace.

EVENTS MARK DEDICATION OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT SITE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be able to be present at two significant events in the history of our city of Buffalo, N.Y., this past weekend.

Tuesday, September 14, was the 70th anniversary of the date on which Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President following the tragic death of William McKinley.

The administration of the oath to Mr. Roosevelt was in a stately mansion on what is easily the most famous street in my home city of Buffalo.

The beautiful structure at 641 Delaware Ave., was at that time the home of Ansley Wilcox and was pressed into use after Mr. Roosevelt had rushed back to Buffalo after learning that President McKinley's condition had taken a critical turn.

Last Saturday, a large number of Buffalonians and others gathered at the pre-view event known as the "Contributors Reception." Attending were those many, many people who had a part in restoring the Wilcox mansion to the way it looked the day Theodore Roosevelt took his oath. This, of course, was even broader than a community project.

I am proud of my own role in this project which culminated in 1966, when then President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law legislation designating the Ansley Wilcox mansion as a national historic site.

Obtaining enactment of the legislation was a long and frustrating exercise for me and the many cooperating Buffalonians who were determined to save this historic site from demolition.

It was in recognition of my sponsorship of the enabling legislation which gave me the pleasant task of taking part in last Saturday's reception and in the formal dedication ceremony on Tuesday morning.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include an interesting historical summary of that emotional event 70 years ago, also a story on the reception last Saturday.

The articles follow:

[From Buffalo Courier-Express, Sept. 13, 1971]

WILCOX MANSION HELPS RECALL HISTORY HERE
(By Ralph W. Loew)

Seventy years ago today at 6 a.m., Theodore Roosevelt and his family were climbing Mt. Marcy. At the lake called "Tear in the Clouds," the family parted allowing the vice president and his older boys to push up toward the peak. It was not a light-hearted climb.

Just a week earlier, a crazed man had attempted to assassinate the president of the United States and Roosevelt had hurried to Buffalo. Now he had returned to his beloved mountain hike, encouraged by the confident statements of the attending physicians who assured him that the president was recovering.

The hikers returned to the timber line for lunch, coming through fog and then eating in the wet and comfortable rain. It was there that they heard a signal, pre-arranged, and Roosevelt answered by firing his own gun.

At 5 p.m. he met the messenger who told that President McKinley was dying. That began the all-night journey that brought him down the mountain, then 35 miles by horse and buckboard. It was almost dawn when he reached the train and learned that the President was dead.

TOOK OATH ON ARRIVAL

He reached Buffalo on the 14th at about 3 p.m. and soon took the oath of office at the Wilcox Mansion, the house which has now been restored to a grateful city.

Reading this history again we are aware that our own troubled period is not the first age of anxiety. Toynbee tells us that it is the obligation of the historian to remind us that self-centeredness is an intellectual error as well as moral error. The historian places the present in the context of life and death.

We are all indebted in Buffalo to those persistent and imaginative citizens who have restored this mansion and brought an awareness of history to us.

It is much more than a museum-piece or a local monument. It serves as a very impressive reminder that Delaware Ave. was once one of the nation's most beautiful avenues, that important and poignant history transpired here and we who live in these revolutionary times are not the first to have had to deal with tough realities.

FORM IS SHAPE OF CONTENT

The famous artist Ben Shahn (whose artistry graces Temple Beth Zion, another triumph for Delaware Ave.) has written, "Form is the visible shape of a man's growth; it is the living picture of his tribe at its most primitive, and of its civilization at its most sophisticated state. Form is the many faces of the legend—bardic, epic, sculptural, musical, pictorial, architectural; it is the infinite images of religion; it is the expression and the remnant of self. Form is the shape of content."

It is this reminder of the content of our history and our necessary dealing with life's urgencies which is embodied in the form of this mansion. It is not in its dignified architecture alone, although that's impressively important. It is that it has become involved with the crossroads of important history.

Seventy years ago is not so long in the span of history. Yet think of the enormous events that have occurred in our country since that day when Theodore Roosevelt stood with tear-filled eyes and emotion-filled spirit to take the oath of office as President.

It was the first and only time that New York City was to have its own native son in the White House.

Pessimists were certain that this man who didn't fit the easy categories was going to run wild. Seven and a half years later historians were writing of the significant leg-

islation and of the indelible mark on history that had been made by this man. And it began here.

We're grateful today for the restoration of a significant house which is now a national memorial. It is equally important for us to restore the quality of confident courage which marked the history we recall.

[From Buffalo Courier-Express, Sept. 12, 1971]

PRESIDENT'S KIN LAUD RESTORATION
(By Betty Ott Plants)

"An example of outstanding recognition to Poppa" was Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth's message for guests attending the Contributors Reception opening of the Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural National Historic Site at 641 Delaware Ave. Saturday afternoon.

Unable to attend in person, Mrs. Longworth who is 87 and lives in Washington, sent her message with Floyd B. Taylor, a landmarks specialist of the National Park Service Dept.

Messages also were sent by Mrs. Ethel Roosevelt Derby of Protorsville, Vt., and Archibald B. Roosevelt of Hobe Sound, Fla. who, with Mrs. Longworth, are the surviving children of the late President, Theodore Roosevelt.

The historic site formerly was known as the Wilcox Mansion. It was the home where Theodore Roosevelt, on Sept. 14, 1901, took the oath of office as the 26th president of the United States following the assassination of President McKinley.

CHILDREN ARE APPRECIATIVE

Archibald Roosevelt wrote that he regretted not being able to attend since he is moving from Long Island to Florida, and is setting up his new home. Mrs. Ethel Roosevelt also wrote to express her deep appreciation to "the wonderful people and groups who made this possible." She hoped that all connected with the restoration would come to Sagamore Hill, the Roosevelt family homestead in Oyster Bay, L.I., now a National Historic Shrine. Alice was 17 years old and Edith only 10 at the time their father took the oath.

City, county and federal officials were among the hundreds of guests attending the event. Civic leaders and members of the Junior League of Buffalo Inc. and their husbands and members of the Site Foundation and their counterparts attended. They were the sponsoring organizations of the Contributors Reception.

Mayor Frank A. Sedita was so enthusiastic when he arrived, he hoped there would be a ribbon cutting ceremony this day as well as Tuesday morning at the official opening.

ROUGH RIDER'S BELONGINGS

Taylor brought with him several personal belongings of the Rough Rider president from the family homestead.

The personal effects of Teddy Roosevelt that will be on loan to the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society for an indefinite period include a pocket watch of coin silver with the initials D.R. and C.R.P. engraved inside, and a leather strap, a gift from Douglas Robinson and Corrine Roosevelt Robinson.

Taylor made the presentation of the pocket watch and campaign banner to Dr. Walter S. Dunn Jr., director of the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, and Paul F. Redding, curator of the Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural National Historic Site.

Among the guests who attended the event were Mrs. Howard A. Riggins, secretary to Ansley Wilcox in 1910 when she was 25 years old, and Miss Violet G. Kendall, a registered nurse for the last 54 years, who was Ansley Wilcox's nurse during the last years of his life. Miss Kendall said, "This is quite a memorable occasion for me since I just turned 79 yesterday." (Sept. 10).

OATH WATCHED FROM LAWN

Mrs. Nathaniel K. B. Patch, a girlhood friend of Ansley Wilcox's sister, Mabel, recalled she watched Roosevelt take the oath of office from a vantage spot on the lawn in front directly outside the library. Mrs. Patch, who turned 90 last Feb. 18, with great emotion viewed the original bookcase she gave to the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society for the Wilcox restoration.

All these women reminisced with William W. Kimmins Jr., president of the Site Foundation.

FAMILY MURAL DISPLAYED

Peter B. Seever, co-chairman of the Contributors Reception and treasurer of the Site Foundation along with O. William Shelgren Jr., architect for the site and vice president of the Landmark Society and Mrs. William F. Hall Jr., president of the Junior League, admired the two canes and the Roosevelt family mural now on display in the exhibit room. In this area also is featured the exact duplicate of the pistol that Leon Czolgosz used to shoot McKinley. The original is in the vaults at the historical society, Dunn said. Dunn said he is grateful for the assistance of Sheldon Brown of the Pistol License Service for helping to obtain the display which includes empty cartridges.

Others who admired the original fireplace in the main dining room of the old mansion, now painted off-white to match the woodwork throughout the restored areas, were Mrs. Oliver M. Lawrence, the widow of the former owner of the Wilcox Mansion when it was well-remembered as the Katharine Lawrence Tea Room, on her first visit back since 1960; Appleton Fryer, president of the Landmark Society, a trustee of the Site Foundation, and the co-chairman of the reception and Crawford Wettlaufer, president of the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society.

FIREPLACE CARVINGS NOTED

Mrs. Daniel R. Donaldson, co-chairman for special guests at the reception, showed these onlookers the beautiful detail in the carvings of the fireplace, as well as the details in the restored ceilings. Redding remarked that the ceiling in the orientation room was restored with a canvas base on which were placed oval wood carvings with a four-leaf clover motif inside each oval.

Guests could view all of the library from the two doorways leading into the famous room where Roosevelt was sworn in by the late Judge John R. Hazel of the United States District Court.

A large glass window which formed a wall between the two doorways was installed.

The newest addition to the library is the Queen Anne lowboy, loaned for the reception and inaugural ceremony by the Kittinger Co. Inc., Buffalo manufacturers of period furniture.

FLOWERS ADORN ROOMS

In each of the rooms, Hodge Florists donated fresh floral arrangements in autumn shades of yellow, bronze and golden chrysanthemums, small pompoms and celosia. Some of the bouquets were arranged with gladioli of fall colors, while other arrangements featured red, white and blue flowers. Hodge display donated all the permanent arrangements of ferns and rhododendron used on the lowboy, window seat and pedestal in the library.

In the exhibit room a picture of Ansley Wilcox (1856-1930), who was a good friend of Roosevelt. Roosevelt had been guest at Wilcox's home for the opening of the Pan American Exposition in May of 1901.

Roosevelt had to be called back hurriedly from a camping and fishing trip in the Adirondacks in September, 1901 to be sworn in as the new president.

As Roosevelt had only camping attire, he borrowed a frock coat from Wilcox to wear

at the inauguration. This coat is on display in the exhibit room. Also in a corner of this room is a slant top cherry desk made with seven pigeon holes inside and detailed with fan-shaped inlay and Japaned enamel work at the four corners of the slant top enclosing. Atop the desk is an Empire-period Ormolu clock.

TANBARK COVERED STREET

Miss Frances Babcock recalled that her father had told her that when Col. Poinsett, commanding officer of the barracks on the site of the Wilcox Mansion in 1838, had brought with him a plant from Mexico following a tour of duty there. The plant was unknown and since it had no name, Poinsett named it Poinsettia. Miss Babcock also noted that McKinley stayed at the John G. Milburn home on Delaware Ave. next to the present Canisius College.

Mrs. Dexter P. Rumsey, a guest at the reception, recalled how Delaware Ave. was covered with tanbark at the turn of the century to deaden the sounds of the hoof beats of the horsedrawn buggies.

Mrs. John G. Young mentioned that she and her husband had met Joseph Von Tury of New Jersey, the artist who has been commissioned to handcraft the tiles that soon will be placed around the fireplace in the library.

MANY NOTABLES ATTEND

Others who attended were Frank D. Leavers, vice president of the Site Foundation and Mrs. Leavers; Mrs. Seever, wife of the Site Foundation treasurer; Mrs. Wetlaufer, wife of the Historical Society president; E. Perry Spink, a trustee of the Site Foundation and Mrs. Spink; Mrs. Owen B. Augspurger, honorary trustee of the Foundation; Mrs. Fryer, wife of the co-chairman of the Contributors Reception; Mrs. Dunn, wife of the Historical Society's director and Mrs. Redding, wife of the curator of the Theodore Roosevelt Site.

And, Mrs. Edward A. Rath, chairman of the Junior League Wilcox Committee and her husband; Mrs. Richard S. F. Gallivan, chairman of the Contributors Reception and her husband; Mrs. Roy R. Neureuter co-chairman of invitations, and her husband; Mrs. John M. Montfort, co-chairman of invitations and her husband, secretary of the Site Foundation; and Mrs. Kevin D. Cox, co-chairman of special guests and her husband.

And, Mrs. Roger W. Brandt co-chairman of the reception arrangements and her husband; Mrs. George F. Hoover, the other co-chairman of arrangements with husband; Fred W. Eder and Richard C. Wagner, respective husbands of the co-chairmen of publicity for the Wilcox Restoration Committee; and Mrs. Theodore J. Stein Jr., chairman of refreshments for the reception and her husband.

League members who served as hosts, in Victorian costumes, were G. Lee Thompson, John Grieco, Ames Bartlett Hettrick, Earl W. Hunt Jr., Reginald B. Newman II, John F. Sallada, Jack L. Sanders, Cyrus S. Siegfried III, Charles J. Wilson Jr., William A. Wilson and Miss Gretchen M. Meissner.

OUR "ALLIES" ARE KILLING AMERICAN TROOPS BY INACTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, our so-called friends are killing American servicemen in Europe.

There are over 300,000 U.S. military personnel now stationed in Western Europe, in theory to support and defend our allies. Yet at the same time we are expending vast human and financial resources to protect these allies, they are showing their ingratitude by failing to take effective steps to cut the flow of narcotics to our troops.

Haynes Johnson and George C. Wilson reported on the military drug epidemic in Europe in yesterday's Washington Post. Maj. Forest S. Tennant, Jr., told them that his studies showed that 46 percent of all American troops in Europe have used illegal drugs at least once. Twenty-two percent of those now using drugs began while stationed in West Germany.

It is evident that German authorities have failed to prevent the flood of narcotics from reaching our troops.

We have been exposed to the drug crisis in Southeast Asia. Now Mr. Johnson and Mr. Wilson have uncovered the depth of the epidemic in Europe.

It seems that, no matter where he is to be stationed, a soldier can leave home a hero and return a heroin addict.

The article follows:

OUR STRUNG-OUT TROOPS AND THE BIG O
(By Haynes Johnson and George C. Wilson)

SCHWEINFURT, GERMANY.—He set up his charts and diagrams at the back of the stage and then stepped to the microphone.

"The reason I'm here is very simple. The reason is because every day our hospitals here in West Germany are admitting people who are having bad reactions from drugs and people who are dying and have died—right here in this caserne, as a matter of fact—from drugs, and I can assure you that you'll continue, here in the Army, to hear about drugs as long as people continue to get sick and continue to die from these problems. It's as simple as that."

While he was speaking, his enlisted assistants walked through the auditorium passing out the "flash" comics with the groovy drawings and hip language about pot, acid, speed, hash, opium, bummers, trips and flashbacks. Most of the soldiers remained slumped in their chairs, dozing or asleep. A few—and only a few—picked up the papers casually and read:

"June was really awful—like terrible month in the drug scene. Check these reports . . ."

The drug incidents reported were from Army installations throughout this area of Germany and they were listed in the argot of the user: Harvey Barracks, dude with hepatitis from brown morphine injection, been in Germany only three weeks, his first hit, morphine contaminated . . . Another dude in hospital vomiting his guts out from bad opium, black type, lots of junk in it; Hindenberg, freakouts from hash and wine; Giebelstadt: freakout from "blue cheer"; Bad Kissingen, Auburg, Wildflecken; bad freakouts from mixing hash, acid, dude tore up stomach with ANI juice and . . .

After the enlisted men, former junkies all, had put on their drug education skits, the officer again stepped to the microphone. This time, his tone was sharper.

"Now, I'll tell you why I'm really here this morning," he said. "I'm here because of opium. The big O. I'm here because sitting right out there, in this battalion, are pushers who are dealing opium. You know who you are and I want you to know I know you're out there. I know because two GIs from this unit wound up in my hospital from opium over-

doses, and one of them nearly died, and he told me where he got it.

"Now I'm here to tell you I'm going to be back every morning, and every night, until you understand how dangerous opium is and until we stop this thing. I'm here to tell you this Army is not going to get strung out on opium the way the Army in Vietnam is strung out on heroin."

His enlisted assistants again circulated throughout the auditorium, passing out drug use questionnaires. When the soldiers turned them in, the battalion was dismissed. "That's the scruffiest bunch I've seen yet," said Major Forest S. Tennant Jr., a surgeon attached to headquarters of the 3d Infantry Division at Wurzburg. "You could tell that some of them were on it right out there. Take a look at these returns. They'll show you some of the dimensions of the problem."

He handed over the sheaf of questionnaires with check marks beside the use of various drugs. At the end, the soldiers had been asked to offer personal comments. They spoke for themselves.

"Man, I am spaced out to the limit . . ."

"Tell Captain—to get off his high horse and talk to the troops."

"Help me get out of . . ." (The sentence was uncompleted).

"The truth has been said."

"They're all freaks."

One soldier who said he uses hashish more than three times a week merely commented: "It's my thing." Another, in answer to a question about what specific means can be employed in his unit to decrease drug abuse, replied: "None."

Day after day, Dr. Tennant has been conducting these drug education seminars for American troops stationed here. From the data he has gathered in nine separate Army communities, he has reached some arresting conclusions.

His studies indicate that 46 per cent of all Army personnel in Europe have tried an illegal drug at least once. Sixteen per cent are using illegal drugs more than three times a week. Thirty per cent of that last group have used drugs more potent than hashish, itself eight to 10 times as powerful as marijuana.

Two other figures show another side of the drug problem: 78 per cent of the soldiers now using drugs first started before coming to Germany; and 65 per cent began before entering the Army. That means 22 per cent of the drug users first began in Germany.

The European drug situation is unique in one respect. Hashish, relatively uncommon in the United States and Vietnam, is used by the vast majority of soldiers. Hashish, a resin extract from the hemp plant *Cannabis sativa*, is imported from the Middle East and Mediterranean areas. It is easily available in every Army installation. The soldiers buy it in small, compressed brickettes that are named according to their color and source—Turkish green, Afghanistan black, Lebanese red. They pay from \$1.25 to \$2.50 a gram for it (in the United States, prices would be from \$5 to \$30 a gram). It is smoked in pipes. In their terminology, they "break a bowl."

"It makes you feel real funny," one user said. "Like I'm numb and floating. That's about the only thing it does for you; it makes you relax."

The doctors think otherwise. They say the use of hashish, or hash, can produce marked personality changes. It instills apathy, confusion, fatigue, passivity and paranoia. Hardly the ingredients for an effective Army. And it is related to serious bronchial disorders.

As Dr. Tennant says:

"The overwhelming observation regarding hashish in West Germany is the tremendous abuse rendered it by some American soldiers. Some soldiers report the spending of the majority of their monthly paycheck on hashish

and the smoking of the drug on an hour-to-hour habitual basis, just as tobacco is smoked. The smoking of 150 to 200 grams of hashish per month—that's the equivalent of many hundred marijuana cigarettes—is frequently described by soldiers."

Dr. Tennant is probably the leading expert on drug usage among American troops in Germany. He has been conducting virtually a one-man drug education crusade. It was Tennant who set up the first drug abuse center, called the Now House, for soldiers in Europe. How the Now House was established at Wurzburg says a great deal about the Army's initial steps to handle its drug problem.

"I didn't ask permission to do it," he says, "I just did it and told them about it later. If I had put in to do it they'd still be agonizing about it."

He not only established the clinic under the Army's drug amnesty program, where a soldier is promised judicial immunity from what he tells his doctor, chaplain or commander. He also provided his own money for it.

With his own \$500, Tennant began paying for the drug education charts, the drug newsletter in the form of comic strips, and for the gasoline and meals for the six volunteer workers who travel with him from base to base. When two of President Nixon's closest White House advisors, Robert Finch and Donald Rumsfeld, were in Germany, Tennant briefed them on the drug situation by using his charts. They didn't know those charts were prepared by private donations, including money raised from a drug abuse booth at a German carnival. Even today, Tennant is still paying expenses from private sources.

What worries him most about the drug scene today is new evidence about one of the deadliest narcotics—opium. "Our opium drug usage rate has almost tripled in the last three months," he says.

His alarm is reflected at the highest levels. As Gen. Michael S. Davison, newly arrived from Vietnam as the top American Army commander in Europe, says: "A drug addict is a walking suicide." He also says: "Heroin is only beginning to make its appearance over here. Well, that's enough to scare me right there—when they say it's only beginning to make its appearance—because it's most insidious. It's hard to detect. A guy could be on it with light to moderate addiction and you'd never tell because he could still fly an airplane or do a complicated task. It's a very insidious thing."

Gen. Davison was speaking from personal knowledge. He knows from his experience in Vietnam what heroin can do to the Army. "Conservatively, I would say 10 to 15 per cent of E-5s and below in Vietnam were on heroin," he says. That figure is even more alarming because the heroin used in Vietnam is infinitely more powerful than that available elsewhere. One drug expert, for instance, estimates that good quality Southeast Asia heroin is 20 times stronger than what a user could get in the District of Columbia.

At this writing, there is no way to estimate accurately the extent of heroin usage at Army posts in the United States. There is no question it is widespread. Like hash in Germany, it is easy to get—everywhere. At Ft. Dix, N.J., you can buy it for \$5 a bag. At Ft. Bragg, N.C., you can get it for \$10 a hit. At all bases the story is the same: American soldiers, deeply involved in the hard drug culture, either willingly or through gang coercion or group pressure, forced to find money to support an expensive and destructive habit.

For the pusher, the rewards are immense. Some soldiers are earning from \$500 to \$800 a week dealing in drugs. "One week ago," said a medic working in the drug

program at Ft. Bragg, "a guy told me he had just made \$2,000 from one trip to Miami where he gets his stuff. And he was bragging about using Army gasoline for the trip."

For the addict, the tragedy is immeasurable. There are American soldiers at Army bases in the United States earning \$280 a month who are spending from \$100 to \$200 a week for heroin. And where do they get the money? The answer is simple. They steal. Or, as a psychiatrist at Ft. Bragg put it: "They have to steal."

"Look at it this way," he said. "Let's say you have just a hundred soldiers spending \$3,000 a month for heroin. You're talking about \$300,000 a month from just that one small group. It adds up to millions and millions of dollars. They steal from the Army, and they steal from their fellow soldiers. They steal anything from shoes to T-shirts, but stereo tape decks, record players and Army blankets are the most common items."

The soldier then pawns the items, and uses the money to buy more drugs.

Serious as the resulting crime is, it pales into insignificance beside the human wreckage. Take the sight these reporters encountered on their first night on an Army base as research for this series began.

The base was Ft. Dix. Walking back to the post from a motel, we noticed a group of young soldiers in uniform sitting on the grass, literally outside the main gate. They were sniffing cocaine out of cellophane bags, and they were incoherent. One of the soldiers suddenly jumped up and began flapping his arms like a bird in flight. Then he ran to a pine tree several feet away, first trying to climb it, and then simulating making love to it. All the time, he uttered squawking sounds.

It was a scene straight out of Dostoevsky. Later a colonel at Ft. Bragg told this story. On a Sunday in one of the barracks in his battalion, he said, a soldier began to go into convulsions from drugs. Four other soldiers were in the barracks at that time. They sat and watched the soldier thrashing on his bunk, but did nothing to help him. A sergeant happened to walk into the barracks at that moment. He immediately called for help, took the soldier to the hospital, and saved his life.

"I called in those four soldiers, one by one, after that happened," the colonel said. "Two of them were the best soldiers in that group. And I asked them why they hadn't done anything."

"Basically, the answer that came back was that soldier on drugs had been causing a lot of problems in the barracks. They had tried to do something about him, and had failed. They had given up on him. So when he went into convulsions they felt it was his own decision, and his own funeral."

Such incidents do not answer, of course, the harder question: why the soldiers turn to drugs. Dr. George F. Solomon, associate professor of clinical psychiatry at Stanford University's School of Medicine, offered one opinion when he testified in mid-June before the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. He cited the example of a pilot whom he called "X."

"X" was considered a 'gung-ho' soldier," he testified. "He deeply resented antiwar demonstrations at home. After Vietnamization of the Delta, he was involved in ferrying ARVN (South Vietnamese) troops by helicopter to areas of operations in the Delta. Frequently the South Vietnamese soldiers were reluctant to land and had to be forced from the 'choppers,' sometimes by beating their hands as they clung to the runners. Two of X's friends were killed by bullets from U.S. M16 rifles shot by resentful ARVN troops after they had been landed. 'X' turned to heroin in order to be able to keep flying,

while many of his friends refused flying status. He is now militantly antiwar."

Obviously, there are other factors. Not only the Army but American society is attempting to understand them all.

But understanding the problem is a long way from solving it. Only in recent months has the Army even conceded it has a major drug problem. It wasn't until May 11, for instance, that Ft. Dix initiated a drug abuse program. A drug educational center at Ft. Ord, California, didn't open until last January.

"When we started we had no guidance from anybody," said an officer at the Ft. Ord center.

That isn't to fault the Army for a lack of effort, will or good intentions. What comes over after visiting a number of drug abuse center programs both here in Europe and in the United States, however, is the multitude of problems associated with them. Everywhere, there is a confusion among those running the programs about what they can and cannot do; about whether their mission is to treat and rehabilitate, or treat and discharge; about following up the patients after they are sent back to their units; about how to stop the ubiquitous pushers and dealers. Money and trained personnel are critically short, and at this stage the Army is only barely beginning to penetrate the layers of the drug culture in its ranks.

More important are the attitudes of some noncommissioned officers and unit commanders. No matter what Army policy may be, in reality these men all too often regard the drug user as a criminal to be punished.

The officer in charge of one of the Army's major American drug centers, at Ft. Benning, Ga., spoke candidly about the drug amnesty program as it is preached—and practiced.

"By and large, the drug amnesty program is bull—," he said. "It's a step in the right direction, but when it comes to the implementation of the amnesty regulation, it's just so much crap. It serves to con a kid into surfacing. It con him into identifying himself as a drug abuser, but in asking for help he's said, 'Look, I'm one. I have a big X on my chest—you'll know me from here on in.' Well, from that point they won't say 'Take him down and throw him in the stockade immediately' for having said this. Again, they comply to the letter of the regulation. But the spirit of the regulation says to help the man to help himself. Instead, the reality is this guy winds up on a host of unpleasant tasks."

"He's being ostracized by the hierarchy of his particular unit. There are a lot of adverse things happening to him that add to his problem. They make life a hell of a lot more frustrating for him. Finally, he throws up his hands and says, 'To hell with it. Why should I do this?'"

The officer gave two personal examples that came to his attention recently. A young soldier on drugs who had sought help from the amnesty program was held for two hours after his company was released from duty for the day. Another soldier from an infantry unit was placed on what he called "dumdum duty"—permanent telephone duty in the orderly room.

"And I can't use this example too clearly because it might identify him," he went on, "but we've had a high-ranking officer taken from a fairly effective position to a non-effective position like cleaning out the commodes."

The soldiers know these situations all too well. Consequently, only a handful of actual drug users seek help through the amnesty program. They also know that some officers are more interested in protecting their fitness reports—and their chances of promotion—than to concede they have a serious problem.

A commanding general illustrates that attitude by telling of the time he visited a captain. "What's your drug problem like, captain?" the general asked.

"No problem, sir," the captain replied briskly.

The general looked hard at the captain, and said: "Captain, you've got your head up your ass."

Like the problem of crime in the barracks already described in these articles, the one of drugs cannot be overstated. In the long run, it is probably the most vexing of all—not only for what it does to the soldier's ability to function, but for what it says about his mental outlook.

"About 90 per cent of the people I deal with say they take hard drugs because it helps them to forget the Army," said a medic working with drug patients at Ft. Bragg.

Then, in a reflective moment, he added: "I go back to the barracks at night and feel very contemplative. I wonder how many people are using it, and I wonder why I haven't. At times, it gets a little depressing."

He also confessed to another emotion. "Futility. Not futility at the Army, but futility at the task to be done."

THE SITUATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND: A REPORT, NO. 2

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today's report that at least 250 Catholics are being detained by the British soldiers under the authority of the infamous Special Powers Act. It is ironic that this body just yesterday approved a repeal of a similar detention law to prevent its use in this country.

Explosions, killings, and terrorist activities by extremists on both sides continue to rock the northern province. I have asked U Thant to intercede in this matter to restore peace. I have also called on this body to pass a resolution urging a plebiscite of all Ireland to determine once and for all the question of unification.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues today three reports which detail the gestapolike tactics of the British troops in their operations under the Special Powers Act:

CENTRAL CITIZENS' DEFENCE COMMITTEE—CCDC

(The identity of individual witnesses will not be divulged without specific permission of the witness.)

Name of deceased: Desmond Healy, (aged 14).

Address: 8 Bunbeg Park.

OCCUPATION/STATUS

1. Where did incident occur? Near junction of Lenadoon Ave. and Glenveagh Dr. (Sketch on back, if necessary).

2. Day, Date, and Time? Monday 9-8-1971, between 2 and 4 p.m.

3. Details of Incident:
(i) People involved (please tick off).
(ii) Number involved:

Men	-----	150
Women	-----	
Children	-----	
RUC	-----	
Army	-----	20
Armed civilians	-----	

(iii) Details of army personnel involved (regiment, unit, rank, uniform, berets, or any other identification): Soldiers with black berets.

(iv) Location of army: Down Lenadoon Ave. at junction with Kerrykeel Gdns.

(v) Describe the situation in the immediate area just before the incident.

A crowd of 100-150 young men stoning the troops. A lorry had been hi-jacked (an army food supply lorry—BOND) and youths were throwing sauce bottles from lorry at the troops. This cat and mouse game went on for about one hour.

(vi) Describe the circumstances in which the deceased met his/her death and any other relevant details.

Troops fired rubber bullets and then CS gas. After they fired the gas, (about 4 or 5 canisters) the crowd ran. It was then the shot was fired. I saw a young fellow falling about 40 yds. away. I went over with 3 or 4 others to lift him. I saw the sauce bottle in his hand. Then the soldiers on foot and tank started coming up the hill. We had to clear, leaving the boy there. They came up to the boy, lifted the body, (about 4 of them), and held him up for the crowd to see, as if he was a trophy. Then they put him into the back of the tank and after about 5 minutes, they moved off.

Civilian: Dermot Ormby, 33 Riverdale Gdns.

(vii) Who, in your opinion, fired the fatal shot(s)? Army.

CENTRAL CITIZENS' DEFENSE COMMITTEE—CCDC

(The identity of individual witnesses will not be divulged without specific permission of the witness.)

Name of deceased: Desmond Healy (Aged 14).

Address: 8 Bunbeg Park.

OCCUPATION/STATUS

1. Where did incident occur? Lenadoon Avenue, below Glenveagh Drive. (Sketch on back, if necessary.)

2. Day, Date, and Time? Monday, August 9, 12:00 p.m.

3. Details of Incident:
(i) People involved (please tick off).
(ii) Number involved:

Men, women, and children	-----	100-200
RUC	-----	
Army	-----	
Armed civilians	-----	1

(iii) Details of army personnel involved (regiment, unit, rank, uniform, berets, or any other identification): Paras.

(iv) Location of army.

(v) Describe the situation in the immediate area just before the incident. At between 12 and 1 p.m. on Monday, August 9th, a riot was in progress at Lenadoon Ave. About 100-200 men, women and children were involved. A NAAFI lorry had been hi-jacked and a dozen youths were taking a trolley of bottles of H.P. sauce.

A shot was fired at army from Rosapenna direction (see sketch). Five soldiers then fired 4 or 5 rounds each in direction of fire. 10 minutes. One single shot was fired toward recess, hit wall and splintered brick.

(vi) Describe the circumstances in which the deceased met his/her death and any other relevant details.

5 minutes later Desmond Healy ran out of the mob and threw a bottle of sauce which smashed short of soldiers.

He was returning, walking back, had gone 2 or 3 paces and was shot in back. Witness was 2 yards from Healy—say soldier clearly. Witness and others dragged Healy away.

Waited for one minute, then soldiers advanced firing rubber bullets, Saracen too. Lifted Healy like a sack of potatoes and threw him into the back of the Saracen.

Two women who tried to help were told: "F— off, you Irish whore. I shot the bastard and I'll shoot you too. Now F— off."

Some men came round and wanted to know who was shot, and advised everyone to get off the street.

John Finnucane, 10 Bunbeg Pk.

(vii) Who, in your opinion, fired the fatal shot(s)? Army.

THE OLD: DOES ANYBODY CARE?

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second of a series of eight articles on the problems of elderly people by Carol Ann Smith in the Champaign, Ill., News-Gazette. This article was published on August 30, 1971.

The article follows:

TOMORROW MUST EVENTUALLY BRING OLD AGE (By Carol Ann Smith)

"Boast not of tomorrow, for you know not what any day may bring forth."—Proverbs 27: 1.

Tomorrow for most of us will bring old age, a fact which many of us will shove as far back into the mind as it will go. And while we may not know, as Scripture points out, what any day may bring forth, there comes a time in life when we may very well know what most days will bring forth.

Some 15,000 aged persons in Champaign County know what life has brought them since that day when the calendar said that they were old and many of them know with irrevocable certainty what the next day will bring, and the next and the next.

No studies of the aged in Champaign County have been done to the degree they have been accomplished in other areas of the country. But it is safe to say that nearly all aged persons face some common situations, common adjustments. The aged as a societal group have been studied and in some detail.

What has not been studied is the aging process itself, the physical phenomena have never been completely identified. We cannot describe the aging process in the same way that we can describe in minute detail the growth and development of the human child or the adolescent. We do not know why some persons live to be 100 years of age in excellent condition nor do we know why some persons have deteriorated almost completely by the age of 65.

But as individuals, operating in a societal framework, we have some work to draw from. Irving Rosow has written widely in the area, and one of his publications is a book based on a study of the aged in the Greater Cleveland area, an area encompassing all types of geographic and land use patterns.

"Problems of old age," he begins his book, "are of two general kinds: those that older people actually have and those that experts think they have."

Rosow makes the split, he says, because persons who work directly with the aged are deeply committed to the point of regarding the work as an ideological movement. They are in a sense too close and their perception is warped.

Another reason is that practitioners also oversimplify the problems of the aged.

"As a pragmatic people, we are generally much more sensitive to material than social needs and think more readily in concrete terms," Rosow postulates. "Hence by concentrating on concrete material problems, practitioners can avoid thinking about sub-

ties social needs that are less apparent and harder to manage, but equally compelling.

Rosow himself at first consideration sees the problems as medical, material and social.

Medicine has altered the health and illness of the aged as drastically as the young, Rosow indicates. Science has checked the infectious diseases which traditionally took a high toll of older people. It is responsible for the increased number of old people.

The aged, he continues, now suffer mostly from various chronic illness—cardiovascular, arthritic, rheumatic, respiratory disorders and disturbances of the central nervous system, stomach or kidneys.

Roughly three-fourths of those 65 and over have some kind of chronic condition, however severe or mild. At the time that Rosow wrote, only 9 per cent were homebound or could not get around alone and only 14 per cent had a major limitation of activity. The percentages, if anything, have decreased.

Rosow continues by insisting that the social meaning of chronic disease is "not self-evident." Doctors, social workers and other practitioners "overestimate" the impact of chronic illness.

"Except for the small minority who are immobilized and severely restricted in activity, the chronically ill apparently do not regard themselves as seriously sick or handicapped.

He bases the claim on studies in which the aged did not report themselves as seriously limited. As older people age, they simply come to expect more aches and pains and creaks in their daily lives, and they expect them as normal as long as they are still able to get around and function adequately.

Health and illness have far greater implications, implications that go beyond creaks and medicine. From the standpoint of the individual, they are financial concerns.

Rosow describes Medicare as "step in the right" direction, but continues by noting that it is not a truly comprehensive health care plan and represents no final solution.

The pinch occurs because medical needs increase at a time when income has dropped drastically.

But the materiality involved in medical needs has not been the sole focus of experts in the field. A tremendous amount of work has been done based on the premise that housing is a major problem of older people.

"For the age group as a whole, this is certainly a serious error," Rosow concludes, advancing the thesis that the housing problems of the aged do not differ significantly from the younger population.

Special construction, he remarks, might prove to be just as essential to a young mother as to an aged widow. The aged need decent, ordinary housing at a price they can afford, and it is again income or rather the basic lack of it which makes it difficult for the aged to solve their own housing problems.

Appropriate housing, he insists, is available, but at prices beyond the limited reach of many retirement incomes.

Experts will argue with Rosow, both about the health problems and about housing. He is obviously taking a swipe at what has become the obvious thrust of this nation's and Champaign County's major investment in the aged.

That major investment has been in institutions, nursing homes and mental institutions. Both have been described as "warehouses" and sometimes "warehouses for the dying who would not have to die."

The focus on housing and medical needs does effectively focus attention away from what many experts believe to be the most significant problem of the aged, the social problems that most of the population will have to face.

Those social problems revolve around the social participation of the aged and the consequences of major changes in their lives, such as loneliness, isolation and alienation.

What does it mean to become a widow, to wake up one morning and go to work and the next day not go to work? What becomes of the family unit, the involvement in groups, the interest in decision-making, the circle of friends.

What happens to a feeling human being who wakes up one morning old?

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S STRENGTH

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, appropriately the season for increased political conjecture over President Richard Nixon's running-mate in 1972 has opened.

From his propensity for frank and open analysis of the many problems confronting this Nation, Vice President AGNEW has become controversial among certain segments of the news media. This stems from the Vice President candidly pointing out that not the least of America's problems have derived from a demonstrated lack of objectivity in reporting the news of the day on the part of certain commentators and even certain networks. Too often in the reporting profession one sees the truth of the maxim "its not so much what you say as the way you say it."

That Vice President AGNEW is doing a good job, has a splendid—if controversial—record, and will add a solid measure of strength and appeal to the Republican ticket next year is made abundantly clear in David Lawrence's column appearing in the September 15 Washington Star. In an age where image and charisma are frequently accepted as top qualifications to hold national office, it is worth reflecting that SPIRO AGNEW's nut-and-bolts approach towards making Government effectively work for the people has helped this country.

The article follows:

AGNEW'S RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

(By David Lawrence)

Gov. Ronald Reagan of California said the other day that he is confident that Vice President Spiro Agnew will be on the Republican ticket in the 1972 election. A number of other governors gathered at San Juan, Puerto Rico, for the annual meeting of the National Conference have made the same comment. Indeed, the executive committee asked Agnew to act as liaison man for the governors on "hard-to-solve" problems with the federal government.

Gov. Warren Hearnes of Missouri, chairman of the conference, said:

We asked the vice president if he would take the job and he said he would. He agreed to make himself personally available to the governors for the problems we can't get solved in the ordinary way. Naturally, we're not going to take every problem to him—some of them you can solve yourself."

Perhaps not much is known generally

about the work Agnew has done in his contacts with state and local governments since he has been serving as vice president. He came into public office originally as the county executive of Baltimore County, which is one of the nation's largest subdivisions of local government, and served in that post for four years prior to his election as governor of Maryland in 1966.

Gov. Agnew's first accomplishment, with the support of a Democratic-controlled General Assembly, was to make a thorough revision of the state's tax structure, establishing such innovations as a graduated income tax rate, and making other changes and increasing the state's aid to public schools.

Agnew sponsored the first statewide fair-housing bill in his region of the country and legislation which accelerated highway construction programs. He pushed for anti-pollution measures on the state's waterways. He took part in planning funds for rapid-transit systems in the Baltimore and Washington metropolitan areas. He supported many social reforms.

Spiro Agnew has been deeply interested in public affairs and has had experience in the operations of local government which is unrivalled by many of the persons who are aspiring to the presidency. He served on the executive committee of the National Governors Conference as vice chairman of the committee on state urban relations. President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed him to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Since becoming vice president, Agnew has exercised considerable influence in shaping the new policies of the federal government in revenue sharing with state governments. Very soon after his administration took office, President Nixon assigned the vice president to work with the governors in intergovernmental relations, and he has a 12-man staff for the purpose. He has an office in the White House and, while he participates in some ceremonial duties in behalf of the President, spends much of his time taking care of specific assignments for the chief executive.

The vice president sits with the Cabinet and on the National Security Council. He heads or is a member of a number of special commissions which the President has established. He attends Nixon's meetings at the White House with the congressional leadership and private briefings with government specialists. He gets the same information that goes to the President from the Council of Economic Advisers. Aides at the White House say that Agnew has become very familiar with executive affairs and that hardly a meeting passes in which he doesn't express an opinion.

The vice president has traveled around the country in behalf of the President and also has made trips abroad. His record has been satisfactory to the President.

Then why should there be so much talk about the possibility that Agnew might not be nominated for vice president next time? The only reason is that he managed to antagonize some members of the press and some of the TV commentators. When he pointed out that they had been unfair in some of their remarks about the President's speeches, this started a wave of hostility. The mail that reached the White House, however, indicated that a "silent majority" agreed with his criticism in the instances to which he referred.

Agnew has contended again and again that he is entitled to "free speech" just as are others who have spoken out in public affairs. It is believed that the criticism has brought friends to his side and the Republican National Convention in 1972 will re-nominate Spiro Agnew for vice president.

COMMUNIST THREAT FINDINGS
REPEALED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last night this House passed by a wide margin, 356 to 49, H.R. 234, a bill "to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18."

Swayed by emotional appeals based on the idealistic notion that repeal of such a statute would somehow absolve the guilt of our fathers for ordering the imprisonment of Japanese Americans during World War II, the Members of the House moved swiftly to abolish non-existent detention camps that contain imaginary prisoners. Very few of the Members realized that in voting to repeal this act, they were actually giving legislative approval to the left-wing liberal theory that the Communist movement toward world domination is no longer a threat to the American people and the free world.

Section 2 of this bill, lines 22-23, provided for the repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 811-826). This title contained "congressional finding of necessity" that clearly stated:

There exists a world Communist movement which in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise) espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a world-wide Communist organization.

So that our colleagues may see what in actuality they did when they abolished nonexistent concentration camps filled with imaginary prisoners in an attempt to expiate the guilt of our fathers for imprisoning Japanese Americans during World War II, nearly 30 years ago, I insert the complete text of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 in the RECORD:

SUBCHAPTER II.—EMERGENCY DETENTION OF
SUSPECTED SECURITY RISKS

§ 811. Congressional finding of necessity

As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Congress finds that—

(1) There exists a world Communist movement which in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all

the countries of the world through the medium of a world-wide Communist organization.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) The system of government known as a totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, and by substantial identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, action organizations which are not free and independent organizations, but are sections of a world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship. Although such Communist organizations usually designate themselves as political parties, they are in fact constituent elements of the world-wide movement and promote the objectives of such movement by conspiratorial and coercive tactics, and especially by the use of espionage and sabotage, instead of through the democratic processes of a free elective system or through the freedom-preserving means employed by a political party which operates as an agency by which people govern themselves.

(7) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and, in countries other than the United States, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiate their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(8) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the methods referred to above, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries of Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(9) The agents of communism have devised clever and ruthless espionage and sabotage tactics which are carried out in many instances in form or manner successfully evasive of existing law, and which in

this country are directed against the safety and peace of the United States.

(10) The experience of many countries in World War II and thereafter with so-called "fifth columns" which employed espionage and sabotage to weaken the internal security and defense of nations resisting totalitarian dictatorships demonstrated the grave dangers and fatal effectiveness of such internal espionage and sabotage.

(11) The security and safety of the territory and Constitution of the United States, and the successful prosecution of the common defense, especially in time of invasion, war, or insurrection in aid of a foreign enemy, require every reasonable and lawful protection against espionage, and against sabotage to national-defense material, premises, forces and utilities, including related facilities for mining, manufacturing, transportation, research, training, military and civilian supply, and other activities essential to national defense.

(12) Due to the wide distribution and complex interrelation of facilities which are essential to national defense and due to the increased effectiveness and technical development in espionage and sabotage activities, the free and unrestrained movement in such emergencies of members or agents of such organizations and of others associated in their espionage and sabotage operations would make adequate surveillance to prevent espionage and sabotage impossible and would therefore constitute a clear and present danger to the public peace and the safety of the United States.

(13) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

(14) The detention of persons who there is reasonable ground to believe probably will commit or conspire with others to commit espionage or sabotage is, in a time of internal security emergency, essential to the common defense and to the safety and security of the territory, the people and the Constitution of the United States.

(15) It is also essential that such detention in an emergency involving the internal security of the Nation shall be so authorized, executed, restricted and reviewed as to prevent any interference with the constitutional rights and privileges of any persons, and at the same time shall be sufficiently effective to permit the performance by the Congress and the President of their constitutional duties to provide for the common defense, to wage war, and to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution, the Government and the people of the United States, Sept. 23, 1950, c. 1024, Title II, § 101, 64 Stat. 1019.

HISTORICAL NOTE

Short Title. Congress, in enacting this subchapter, provided by section 100 of Act Sept. 23, 1950, cited to text, that it should be popularly known as the "Emergency Detention Act of 1950."

Separability. The first sentence of section 116 of Act Sept. 23, 1950, cited to text, provided: "If any provision of this title [this subchapter], or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this title [this

subchapter], or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

Legislative History: For legislative history and purpose of Act Sept. 23, 1950, cited to text, see 1950 U.S. Code Cong. Service, p. 3886.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Mead Cavert is the assistant dean of the Medical School, University of Minnesota. Dr. Cavert, in his testimony earlier this year when I held health hearings in Minneapolis, discussed how the University of Minnesota is attempting to meet the need for more physicians. He discussed in great detail the physician augmentation program at the University of Minnesota. The 60 additional freshmen medical students that were enrolled in the academic year of 1970-71 was larger than the sum total in augmentation programs in all of other Big 10 schools combined.

Dr. Cavert also discussed the transfer program for 3d-year medical students. Some States in the upper Midwest area do not have 4-year medical schools. At the end of 2 years of school, students from those areas who wish to continue with their medical education must transfer. Many of them transfer to the University of Minnesota.

The following summary sets out in more detail the various programs underway at the University of Minnesota to increase the number of available physicians:

MEDICAL SCHOOLS—TWIN CITIES CAMPUS (By Dr. Mead Cavert)

PRIMARY MISSION

The primary mission of the Medical School is to provide opportunities and programs in undergraduate and graduate medical education for future physicians to serve the state and nation.

BACKGROUND

About one-half of the 3,700 physicians currently practicing in the state were trained at the University of Minnesota Medical School.

While many family physicians and medical specialists practice in the major medical institutions and the urban population centers of Minnesota, a relative shortage of physicians and other health care professionals exists in many areas of the state.

A Hill Family Foundation study in 1966 predicted a shortage of 200 to 300 physicians in the state by 1975. The effects of this deficiency will be much more severe unless physicians can be more appropriately distributed by specialty in relation to statewide needs.

Of the 3,700 physicians currently practicing in the state, about 2,300 are located in the Twin Cities metropolitan area and Rochester.

The University is taking major steps to train more family doctors and to encourage their distribution throughout the state, particularly in rural areas.

NEW PROGRAMS

The Department of Family Practice and Community Health is a new and rapidly growing department of the Medical School. After their second year of medical school, students may now select family practice as one of five broad pathways of specialty emphasis.

Early estimates show a high degree of interest in the new field of family medicine. In 1970, 21 senior medical students spent six weeks with practicing physicians throughout the state on a preceptorship program sponsored by the Department of Family Practice and Community Health.

Family practice residency programs are being enlarged at the University of Minnesota in cooperation with six community hospitals in the Twin Cities. Affiliated family practice residency programs are moving forward at Hennepin County General Hospital and St. Paul-Ramsey Hospital. All three programs in family practice graduate training received legislative funding for the 1971-73 biennium.

A Physicians Associate Program for senior medical students will begin in September 1971. Participating students, after their second year of medical school, will spend one year in a rural community, working with community physicians. They will then return to the University and complete their undergraduate medical education, hopefully many of them to return later to a non-urban community to practice medicine.

ENROLLMENTS

In June 1971 the Medical School graduated 183 new physicians. In June 1972, partly resulting from a recently-adopted, optional three-year M.D. curriculum, there will be approximately 250 graduates leaving the Medical School. Under existing and proposed new programs, the graduating class of M.D.'s may reach approximately 280 by 1976.

Freshman enrollment at the Medical School was increased from 1962 to 227 students in the fall of 1970, with funding of the enrollment increment through a five year grant from the federal Physician Augmentation Program of the National Institutes of Health.

The Medical School receives over 20 transfer students annually (29 in 1971) who have completed two years of basic medical science education in other states, principally North and South Dakota. Also, most medical science students in Duluth's program (24 freshman in 1972; 48 in 1976) will transfer to the Twin Cities campus for completion of their course.

MEDICAL SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA— PHYSICIAN MANPOWER

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
1. Medical school entering class.	162	227	227
2. Physician augmentation program		60	120
3. Transfers to 3d year of medicine	23	22	29
4. M.D. graduates	179	184	250
5. Optional, accelerated 3-year M.D. program			175
6. Medical student enrollment	685	747	816
7. Rural health physician associate program			120
8. Minority student program	2	11	26
9. Department of family practice and community health: Undergraduate (senior elective pathway)	45	35	140
Graduate physicians (residents)	1	3	28
10. New medical student curriculum (phase)	A	A,B	A,B,D

¹ Number estimated.

² Includes 26 1st-year residents at 6 community affiliated hospitals.

MEDICAL SCHOOL—UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Physician Augmentation Program

PAP increment in entering class	60
Total entering class, 1970	227
Minnesota total increment (65) as percentage of U.S. increase (938) 1970, 100 schools	7%
PAP grant funds, 1970-71	\$1,074,161
Operating funds	672,161
Facilities rental, renovation	402,000
PAP grant funds, 1971-72	\$1,609,717
Operating funds	1,042,717
Facilities rental, renovation	567,000

Termination of PAP grant: June 30, 1975

PRESIDENT NIXON, THE 10-PERCENT IMPORT TAX AND OUR LATIN AMERICAN NEIGHBORS

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing the Nation today is the fact that growing numbers of American citizens do not believe what their Federal Government tells them.

This is called the credibility gap. More directly, it should probably be called the truth gap.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the greatest errors this administration can make is to deliberately mislead the citizens of this country or the foreign governments with which we do business.

Certainly the Nixon administration did not invent the untruth as a policy tool, but it apparently is accelerating the use of it.

In a major address to the Inter-American Press Association in Washington on October 31, 1969, President Nixon set forth his administration's Latin American policy. He uttered some very uplifting rhetoric for the benefit of our Latin neighbors that evening.

As an example, the President stated that—

We have heard many voices from the Americas in these first months of our new administration—voices of hope, voices of concern, and some voices of frustration.

We have listened.

These voices have told us they wanted fewer promises and more action. They have told us that the United States aid programs seemed to have helped the United States more than Latin America. They have told us that our trade policies were insensitive to the needs of other American nations. They have told us that if our partnership is to thrive or even to survive, we must recognize that the nations of the Americas must go forward in their own way, under their own leadership.

So much for the President's generalities. His specific promises made that evening directly point out the great difference between the words and the actions of the Nixon administration in the conduct of our affairs with Latin America.

Among the specific express promises made by the President that evening two were of particular note:

Third, to support the establishment, within the inter-American system, of regular procedures for advance consultation on trade matters. United States trade policies often have a very heavy impact on our neighbors. It seems only fair that in the more balanced relationship we seek, there should be full consultation within the hemisphere family before decisions affecting its members are taken, not after.

Finally, and most important, in the world trade forums, I believe it is time to press for a liberal system of generalized tariff preferences for all developing countries, including Latin America. We will seek adoption by all of the industrialized nations of a scheme with broad product coverage and with no ceilings on preferential imports. We will seek equal access to industrial markets for all developing countries, so as to eliminate the discrimination against Latin Amer-

ica that now exists in many countries. We will also urge that such a system eliminate the inequitable "reverse preferences" that now discriminate against Western Hemisphere countries.

The President was certainly correct when he said that—

United States trade policies often have a very heavy impact on our neighbors.

As an example, Mexico imported \$1.565 billion worth of American goods, mostly manufactured items, last year. The United States imported \$833 million worth of Mexican goods, resulting in a plus U.S. trade balance of \$732 million.

Mexico, like most of the developing nations in Latin America is striving to build its manufacturing capabilities in order to create jobs and raise its GNP.

President Nixon has not only broken his promise to "press for a liberal system of generalized tariff preferences for all developing countries, including Latin America," but he has slapped Mexico and our other neighbors with a surcharge of 10 percent on their exports to the United States.

Surely the President was correct when he said during the economic package announcement, that the "temporary" surcharge was aimed at trading nations with under-valued currencies. Given that, why did he break his promises to our developing neighbors and levy precisely the same surcharge against them as he applied to the developed nations?

But the levying of the surcharge was not the only broken promise. In order to increase the drama involved in announcing such a comprehensive economic package, President Nixon broke his express promise to have "advance consultation on trade matters" which he made in the Inter-American Press Association speech.

In a speech delivered yesterday before the U.S. Governors' Conference in San Juan, P.R., OAS Secretary General Galo Plaza stated:

The new economic policy announced by the United States Government last month has, understandably, not been well received in Latin America. The surcharge on imports seems to undercut both the general U.S. commitment toward freer trade and the specific U.S. commitment to help Latin America expand and diversify its exports.

I find Secretary General Galo Plaza to be most diplomatic indeed. He might have stated simply: "President Nixon lied to us."

I would remind President Nixon and the Members of this body of one or two economic facts of life:

First, Latin America is the only major world area in which the United States maintains a favorable trade balance.

Second, That favorable trade balance amounted to \$790 million last year.

Third, The United States exported almost \$5 billion worth of goods to Latin America in 1969.

Fourth, The old days when the Latin American nations had nowhere else to go for their imports are over. West Germany, Japan, France, Great Britain, and even the Soviet Union are accelerating their exports to Latin American nations. As an example, in a recent closed session

of the Foreign Relations Committee in one of the houses of the Brazilian Congress, the Foreign Minister of Brazil stated that last year, for the first time in its history, Brazil traded more with the Common Market nations than it did with the United States.

This morning the Washington Post published an editorial which is very germane to the subject of the impact of the 10-percent import surtax on our southern neighbors. The editorial entitled, "Who Pays the Tariff?" follows:

WHO PAYS THE TARIFF?

In the current pushing and shoving among the world's great trading nations, a lot of small countries are getting hurt. Latin America illustrates the point. The United States did not really intend to harm the Latin economies last month when it imposed its 10 per cent surtax on imports. The truth is that the White House and the Treasury were not thinking about Latin America at all. But intentional or not, the damage is real and the consequences are going to be serious.

President Nixon worked out his economic program with the advice of a special committee of able and experienced citizens, headed by Albert Williams, whose report has now been published. But in the matter of tariffs the President overrode this committee, which urged him to move toward removal of all barriers to international trade. The Williams committee is right on this issue, and the President is wrong. The evidence is already visible to the south.

The Latin Americans protest, with good logic, that it is unjust to make them pay a surtax designed to remedy a trade crisis in which they played no part. Latin America has traditionally bought more from the United States than it sells here. The Latins are not the people to see about revaluing the yen and the Deutschmark. But the United States meets all objections with a shrug and the observation that it can't start making exceptions now.

Mr. Nixon attempted this week to placate the Latins with the decision that, for them alone, he would cancel the 10 per cent reduction in foreign aid; it had originally been part of the program announced a month ago, with the surtax. But the countries getting the most aid are not those hardest hit by the surtax.

The extreme examples are Mexico and Brazil. Mexico does more business with the United States than any other country in Latin America and will be more severely damaged by the surtax than any other. But Mexico takes no direct aid from the United States. On the other hand, the United States gives more aid to Brazil than to any other Latin country. Brazil does half as much business with the United States as Mexico does. Since coffee is exempt, the surtax applies only to about 15 per cent of Brazil's exports to this country. But it applies to fully 50 per cent of Mexico's exports here.

Less than two years ago Mr. Nixon delivered a glowing speech on this country's responsibilities to Latin America. "They need," he said then, "to be assured of access to the expanding markets of the industrialized world." He promised them advance consultation on trade matters, and he also promised to pursue, worldwide, "a liberal system of generalized tariff preferences." They got no consultation on the surtax, obviously, and now they see the United States taking the lead in raising tariffs. Unfortunately the price of these moves comes high, and much of it is ultimately paid by small nations that cannot afford their large neighbors' mistakes.

BILDERBERG: THE COLD WAR INTERNATIONALE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions during recent months, I called the attention of our colleagues to activities of the Bilderbergers—an elite international group comprised of high Government officials, international financiers, businessmen and opinionmakers—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 13688-13689 of May 5, 1971, entitled "Bilderbergers' Woodstock Meeting;" pages 14189-14195 of May 10, 1971, entitled "U.S. Dollar Crisis—A Dividend of Internationalism;" pages 16698-16704 of May 24, 1971, entitled "Secret Bilderberg Meeting and the Logan Act;" and pages 25649-25650 of July 16, 1971, entitled "Bilderberg Case: Reply From U.S. Attorney Generals' Office."

This exclusive international aristocracy holds highly secretive meetings annually or more often in various countries. The limited information available about what transpires at these meetings reveals that they discuss matters of vital importance which affect the lives of all citizens. Presidential Adviser Henry Kissinger, who made a secret visit to Peking from July 9 to 11, 1971, and arranged for a Presidential visit to Red China, was reported to be in attendance at the most recent Bilderberg meeting held in Woodstock, Vt., April 23-25, 1971. The two points reportedly discussed at the Woodstock meeting were "the contribution of business in dealing with current problems of social instability" and "the possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequences."

Following these secret discussions, which are certainly not in keeping with the Western political tradition of "open covenants openly arrived at," the participants return to their respective countries with the general public left uninformed, notwithstanding the attendance of some news media representatives, of any of the recommendations and plans agreed upon as a result of the discussions—or for that matter even the occurrence of the meeting itself.

Because the American people have a right to know of any projections for a change in America's role in the world and because Henry Kissinger and other Government officials and influential Americans met with high Government officials and other powerful foreign leaders, I sought to have more information about the recent Bilderberg meeting made public by raising the question to the U.S. Attorney General of a possible violation of the Logan Act by American participants and asked if the Justice Department anticipated taking any action in the matter.

The reply from the Justice Department, in effect, was that all of the elements constituting a violation of the Logan Act were present and that the Department contemplated no action but

would consider requesting an appropriate investigation if they received a specific allegation or specific information indicating a violation of the Logan Act. Apparently, the announced topics for discussion were not specific enough.

So that a specific allegation or specific information indicating a violation by American Bilderbergers of the Logan Act may be presented to the Justice Department in order to warrant an investigation, it is necessary to know more about what goes on in their secret sessions.

Additional facts relating to the Bilderberg meetings were recently brought to my attention by Eugene Pasymowski who, with Carl Gilbert in 1968, revised and updated an earlier article of theirs which first appeared in the Temple University Free Press.

The authors have provided lists of participants for six meetings plus a summary list of names of all having attended from 1954 to 1966; and a list of the month, year, and place of each of the 17 meetings held from May 1954 through April 1968. For this same period, they give names of U.S. participants who served in a capacity of honorary secretary general, chairman, cochairman, advisory committee member, or steering committee member. It is significant that every U.S. participant, without exception, who served in one of the above planning and leadership positions was a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Drawing upon confidential correspondence and foreign-procured confidential documents printed by the Bilderberg secretariat, including an unpublished confidential report on Bilderberg meetings containing minutes of discussions, the authors have provided considerable heretofore little-known information about the Bilderberg meetings from the initial one in 1954 through the meeting of April 1968.

So that our colleagues may have more complete information about the secret and influential international group known as Bilderbergers, I insert in the RECORD at this point the article of Eugene Pasymowski and Carl Gilbert entitled "Bilderberg: The Cold War Internationale," including the appendices giving Bilderberg meetings, locations, and dates 1954 through 1968, the lists of Bilderberg steering committees—United States and European—and the list of Bilderberg participants, 1954-68. The material follows:

BILDERBERG: THE COLD WAR INTERNATIONALE
(By Eugene Pasymowski and Carl Gilbert)

In spite of the historical rivalries and conflicts of Western European nations and the entrenched tradition in the United States of isolation from Europe, the North Atlantic countries have experienced unprecedented cooperation within the past two decades. The dream of a completely united Western Europe has not yet been achieved, but the conflicts have been kept within manageable limits. The Common Market and NATO have been successful. Perhaps the present problems in Western Europe are more a product of the success of NATO rather than anything else.

This unprecedented period of cooperation is more than a product of simple "nation state" diplomacy. One of the key institutions

that has fostered unity and cooperation within the Atlantic Community beyond the old concepts of the "nation state" has been the Bilderberg Group.

WAS IST EIN BILDERBERG?

Oosterbeek is a small town in Eastern Holland. Three days in May 1954 transformed that town into a meeting place for the power elite of Europe and the United States. The facilities and location of the town's Hotel de Bilderberg were ideal for a very private conference.

Heading the list of dignitaries were David Rockefeller and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. Also in attendance were prime ministers, diplomats, socialists, intelligence agency representatives, international bankers and industrialists from all of the NATO countries. The conference was named the Bilderberg Meeting.

Here the various "leaders" of the Atlantic community were collaborating, yet their popular constituencies knew nothing about the meeting. Only those directly concerned with their activities knew that the meeting even existed. Part of the explanation for this is that the host government for the conference provided top security. In addition, the key international newspapers and wire services cooperated by maintaining a press blackout on the conference.

Within the context of such tight security, one observer noted "this conference is considered so important, even the 'leaks' are watertight."¹

The story of Bilderberg is not just about this one meeting but rather an entire series of meetings that started in 1954 and have continued to this day. Meetings have been held at least once a year under top security at some of the most remote spots in the Atlantic countries.

A good example of press cooperation to make non-news of the Bilderberg meetings was the memorandum that Cecil King, chairman of the (English) Newspaper Proprietors Association wrote to his fellow publishers about the meeting at St. Johns College, Cambridge in 1967. According to *Private Eye*, "the memorandum 'reminded' NPA that on no account should any report or even speculation about the content of the conference be printed."² This is the major explanation why the Bilderberg meetings would still come as a surprise to you. The *New York Times* has published three minor articles on the meetings and a few stories have appeared in the *Washington Post*. There has been no mention of Bilderberg in either the major weeklies or radical publications. In addition to the significant absence of press accounts, these meetings are not mentioned in any of the major scholarly works on American foreign policy and international relations. Considering the scholars and newspapermen who have attended these meetings, the situation is even more puzzling.

The people attending these meetings came from the strategic elites which dominate both the political and the socio-economic systems of the various countries. However, the public actions of these individuals would not reveal the common basis of their cooperation in private.

These meetings were an additional confirmation of the "end of ideology" between the West European ruling classes and the so-called "Socialist" opposition. Leading "Socialists" such as Hugh Gaitskell, Gaston Defferre, Guy Mollet and Fritz Erler sat down and cooperated with their alleged political and class opponents. They did not publicize these activities to the rank and file membership but rather attempted to hide their actions just as the "Socialist" government of England attempted to avoid disclosure of the biological warfare program that the Labour Government was developing. Within

the context of Bilderberg, it is less surprising to learn that many of the operations and programs of these "Socialist" parties have been paid for by the United States' Central Intelligence Agency.³

The Bilderberg Meetings have remained unknown for the past sixteen years as have the C.I.A.'s ubiquitous subsidies and activities in the democratic Socialist Left of Europe.

Before examining the structure of Bilderberg and the development of the American section, let us first turn to the historical context that led to the creation of this unique super-national organization.

AMERICA'S HOLY CRUSADE

With the end of the Second World War and the death of FDR, the "internationally" minded individuals who controlled the commanding heights of the national economy and the executive branch of the government aimed at the creation of a new world order under the guidance of American leadership and the slogans of the United Nations. They warned that the mistake of isolationism of the post World War I period must not be made again. The key objective of the new American policy was the restoration of the old socio-economic systems in Europe with slightly new window dressing, containment of the Soviet Union and Communism and, in general, an attempt to make the entire world safe for American investment and influence. Under this grand strategy the United States, in a sense, would become the England of the nineteenth century in the twentieth without a direct colonial system.

This policy was to be a two-edged sword: one edge of the blade offered massive economic aid to Europe while the other created a massive military machine with atomic weapons to keep the Russians and their Communist allies in Western Europe "in their place." The first edge of the sword, despite the humanitarian rhetoric, was essentially a measure to guarantee markets for American trade that within the next two decades would lead many of the important economic institutions in Europe to be under American corporate control.

The second side of the blade could not be developed until the late 1940's and the Korean War, when the American people were made aware of the fact that the Russians were the enemy leading the forces of evil against the so-called free peoples of the world. When in 1945, the Truman Administration attempted to use atomic diplomacy to oust the Russians from Eastern Europe and applied economic pressure, the American people were not aware of the conflict. Because of the "ignorance" of the people, Truman was unable to carry off the intended massive program of keeping troops in Europe and setting up a program of universal military training to supplement the atomic bomb. Despite this failure, the administration still had a "defense" budget of thirteen billion dollars, and was able to expand the atomic weapons program.

With the program of opposition to the Soviet Union becoming public, combined with a domestic attack which employed the smear label "communist" against all those forces which opposed the Truman globalism, the "international" leadership was able to have the people accept the Cold War, the massive defense expenditures, and the rebuilding of Germany and Japan under American hegemony. The coupling of domestic reaction and foreign expansion allowed the "internationalists" to co-opt the former anti-communist isolationist Congressmen into supporting the Marshall Plan. However, this was still an uneasy alliance, and the measures to station troops in Europe had to be initiated by the President with Congressional approval coming after the fact. The one serious challenge to the "internationalists'" control of the executive branch of the government was not by the "Left," which was

Footnotes at end of article.

smashed after the Henry Wallace debacle in 1948, but rather by the attempt of Senator Taft to win the Republican nomination in 1952. This was effectively stopped by key members of the Eastern Establishment getting Dwight D. Eisenhower to run for the Presidency. The evidence indicated that the key issue which persuaded Eisenhower to run was not the "conservative" domestic policy of Taft, but rather the refusal of Taft to change his views on international questions i.e., the Western alliance and aid to Europe.

With the defeat of Taft, American policy became locked into the globalism of the Truman Administration, and all attempts to question the policy were essentially viewed as acts of disloyalty until the 1960's, when some types of dissent came to be tolerated. The Democratic candidate in 1952 and 1956, Adlai Stevenson, presented no challenge to the basic program of the Truman Administration, and could even find kind words to say about Chiang Kai Shek. (In retrospect, it was difficult to call Stevenson a "liberal." Perhaps he was considered one because liberalism was so bankrupt.)

Instrumental in the development of the new American policy toward the world was the Council on Foreign Relations, which helped "educate" Presidents and businessmen into the virtues of Pax America. Coupled with the Council on Foreign Relations was the entire umbrella of Eastern banking and financial interests which had major investments overseas and in another era had no moral qualms of building pre-World War II Germany.⁴ The two leading firms which supported Germany before the war were the law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell and the investment banking firm of Dillon, Read and Company. From Dillon, Read came the first Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze and Secretary of the Treasury, C. Douglas Dillon; from Sullivan and Cromwell, Allen and John Foster Dulles.

The American strategy effectively rebuilt Western Europe, and all those forces which opposed the dominant socio-economic order were eliminated from power. In Greece, the prototype for the first Viet-Nam, the British Army crushed the Left, while in England the Left of the Labour Party was made impotent. In other countries, the United States Government and the business community supplied funds for the conservative parties and for the Social Democrats to aid them in purging the Communists and Socialist Left. The new empire was functioning, yet there were major problems. The European client states of America could not understand the domestic hysteria caused by the late Senator McCarthy and there was some uneasiness about rearming Germany.

In Europe it was clear that the end of ideology had occurred, i.e., the Socialist Parties had dropped all the nasty Marxist phrases and now competed with the Capitalist parties on the basis of who could make the existing systems function more effectively. There were no major differences over the NATO alliance. The bureaucratic structures of the old order and bureaucracies of the Social Democrats still had differences of style, but these disputes were minor.

In the United States the holy crusade against Communism used by the liberal Democrats to defeat Wallace had gotten out of hand. In the early 1950's the witch hunters in the Republican Party were attacking the very formulators of the Cold War Strategy with the charge of treason and being soft on Communism. In its worst forms the ultra right accused such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations and Rockefeller of both being soft on Communism and in league with the Kremlin.⁵

This was part of a larger problem in Amer-

ica, where there was not a sufficiently large elite which could approach world developments with a more internationally oriented frame of reference. In addition, the business community, in reaction to the New Deal, was turning its back on more sophisticated economic measures to employ at home. This situation caused Charles E. Wilson to say at a convention of the National Association of Manufacturers in the mid-1940's, "I tell you frankly that I am deeply alarmed today over the possibility that a right-wing reaction may draw some sections of capital so far away from our traditions as to imperil the entire structure of American life as we know it."

One of the key organizations in educating major sections of the business elite concerning European problems was the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and its study groups. But this was not enough. It was imperative that the American leadership understand the more sophisticated approaches and techniques of the Western European elite in order to modify domestic extremist tendencies.

With these various problems, it became clear that a new forum outside of the formal nation-state structures was necessary for the ruling elites of Western Europe and the United States to get together and clear up some of their "misunderstandings" in order to develop further means of cooperation. Such an interlocking system would permit the new transnational groupings to communicate in private and make the necessary decisions to manipulate the formal political structures on both sides of the Atlantic. Consequently, the Bilderberg Meeting was initiated to address the strategic issues of collective security.

MEET THE BILDERBERGERS

The first Bilderberg Meeting in Oosterbeek witnessed many of the divisions between the ideologies of the participants. Political and economic rivals were together at one meeting in the hope that at Bilderberg there could be recognition of common interests and goals of allegedly opposing political rivals between Europe and America.

The dominant fear among the European participants at the first Bilderberg Meeting was the issue of Senator Joseph McCarthy. Partly due to their misconceptions of the American political system, some of the European participants believed that America was slipping towards the political "Right" and a fascist government was in the offing. To allay these fears, C. D. Jackson addressed the Bilderberg Group. He attempted to explain how, occasionally, the American political system will create a "supercharged, emotional freak from time to time." He then made a prediction:

"Whether McCarthy dies by an assassin's bullet, or is eliminated in the normal American way of getting rid of boils on the body politic, I prophesy that by the time we hold our next meeting he will be gone from the American scene."

Ambassador George McGhee noted that "the really bad misunderstanding between Europeans and Americans were dissipated at the first Bilderberg. Since then there has never been a sharp division between us and Europe."⁷

The participants of the first Bilderberg Meeting recognized the usefulness of gathering the NATO elite in one place. Hence, the Bilderberg Group collectively agreed to continue meeting on an annual basis.

The authors have obtained from several foreign sources confidential documents printed by the Bilderberg Secretariat. They include historical sketches on the group, several minutes of discussions by participants, lists of participants for six meetings plus a summary list of all that have attended Bilderberg from 1954 to 1966. All the documents are quite illuminating, revealing much

concerning the structure and ideology of the NATO elite.

The historical report illustrates the development of an organization structure which coordinates the effort of both the American and European power elite. Two years after the first Bilderberg Meeting a Steering Committee was formed, consisting of thirty-nine members (fifteen from the United States). The Steering Committee is "composed of persons who have proved particularly valuable to Bilderberg."⁸ In 1959 the Advisory Committee, an inner core group of the Steering Committee, was formed. Its *raison d'être* was "to ensure a still closer cooperation and understanding between members of the Steering Committee on both sides of the Ocean." All the Americans on the Steering Committee are members or officers of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) in New York City, an organization that has a more than symbolic relation with the Rockefeller-Standard Oil empire. It is understandable then, that the American members of the Steering Committee have been associated with many aspects of the Rockefeller financial, industrial and political empire. Indeed, four members of the Steering Committee were also members of the National Finance Group of the "Nelson Rockefeller for President Committee." No Goldwaterites are Bilderbergers!

The best represented industry at Bilderberg is banking. The presidents of the Chase Manhattan Bank, David Rockefeller, and the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, Gabriel Hauge, are both Steering Committee members. Walter B. Wriston, president of the First National City Bank (James Rockefeller is Chairman), has been a Bilderberg participant. Three directors of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company have been participants at Bilderberg and one of them, Robert D. Murphy, chairman of Corning Glass International, is on the Steering Committee. Although a traditional rival of the "Rockefeller banks," the du Pont-Roosevelt founded Chemical Bank. New York Trust Company has had one of its directors participate in four Bilderberg Meetings. Within this context it is understandable that the present Secretary of the Treasury and former chairman of the board of Continental Illinois Bank and Trust Company in Chicago, David Kennedy, appeared at a recent meeting.

A disproportionate share of the participants at the Bilderberg Meeting in Mont Tremblant, Canada, were international bankers. The list included: Wilfrid S. Baumgartner, honorary governor, Banque de France; Louis Camu, president, Banque de Bruxelles; C. Douglas Dillon, president of Dillon, Read and Company and former Secretary of the Treasury; Allen T. Lambert, chairman and president, the Toronto Dominion Bank; Robert McNamara, president of the World Bank; Louis Rasminsky, governor, Bank of Canada; Baron Edmond de Rothschild of the House of Rothschild; and Marcus Wallenberg, vice-chairman, Stockholms Enskilda Bank and a member of the Bilderberg Steering Committee.

The industrialists from both sides of the Atlantic are equally impressive. Officers and directors representing General Motors, Standard Oil (N.J.), Ford, General Electric, du Pont, Alcoa and Allied Chemical were able to confer with their "competitors" in Europe. Likewise, European industrialists represented such giants as Royal Dutch Shell, Fiat, Pirelli, August Thyssen-Hütte A.G., I.C.I., K.L.M., Unilever, Beys Consolidated Mines Ltd., to name but a few.

LOBBY LAWYERS' UNDISCIPLINED POWER

"Lobby lawyers, fixers for a fee" as one Washington columnist calls them⁹ are regular participants at Bilderberg. Two members of the Steering Committee, George Ball and Arthur Dean are of particular interest to anyone interested in studying the dynamics

Footnotes at end of article.

of international jurisprudence and diplomacy.

Until 1961, Ball was a partner in the firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen and Ball, a firm with intimate establishment entrees. With the advent of the "New Frontier" Ball joined with other "Bildenberg Alumni",¹⁰ as C. D. Jackson termed them, to dominate the highest policy-making levels within the Kennedy Administration.

In his book *The Discipline of Power* Ball underscored his diplomatic orientation stating "... ways and means must be found to reshape the structure of power to permit a more effective sharing of world responsibilities." For Ball and his Bildenberg colleagues these were not hollow words. Ball and Marcus Wallenberg, vice-chairman of the Stockholms Enskilda Bank, together advanced the interests of a joint American-Swedish combine, the Grangesberg industrial complex. The president of Grangesberg was Bo Hammarskjold, brother of the late Secretary General of the United Nations. Bo relied on the financial support of Wallenberg and the legal footwork of Ball's law firm to "reshape the structure of power" in the Congo. The prize was mineral-rich Katanga Province whose mining industry was under control of Societe Generale de Belgique. Utilizing a United Nations "rescue mission" the Bildenbergs achieved their imperialist designs, forcing the Belgian interests to grant major concessions to the Rockefeller and Swedish Grangesberg industrial complex.¹¹

Lobbying lawyer Arthur Dean has been co-chairman of the Bildenberg Group since 1957, while also serving on the Steering Committee. Since 1929, he has been a partner in the Wall Street law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, whose senior partners were Allen and John Foster Dulles. Through the liaison work of Dr. Gerhart A. Westrich, Hitler's financial agent, and S & C's representative in Europe, the law firm during the 1930's acquired as clients three of the largest German cartels including I. G. Farben.¹² Allen Dulles maintained, until 1944, a directorship of the Schroeder Trust Company in New York City, part of the banking empire of Baron Kurt von Schroeder. The Baron was instrumental in the accession to power of Adolph Hitler, channeling almost unlimited funds into the Nazi regime. For his generous devotion to the Fatherland, the Baron was made SS Gruppenfuhrer, the equivalent of general.¹³ It is less surprising that under the co-chairmanship of Mr. Dean, the Bildenberg Meetings have invited many German members of banking and industrial combines that were collaborators before and during the war with the Nazis as well as English Schroeder interests.

When they were in the government, many of the American members of the Bildenberg played instrumental roles in sabotaging the denazification program in Germany after the war by limiting the prosecutions and in helping to free many of the convicted economic leaders of the Reich.

PHILANTHROPIC MISANTHROPES

Recently more attention has been given to the tax-exempt foundations, universities and "research" organizations and their relation to the national power structure. The linkages between these institutions and national policy formation have become increasingly more evident. The dimensions of this have been well documented in the case of the CIA and its use of foundations as conduits of funds for some of its covert activities.

The CIA, unlike the F.B.I., is not a monolithic organization with a single leadership elite but rather since its creation under the National Security Act of 1947 has represented ideologies of both New Deal Liberalism and militant anti-Communism. After World War

II, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), an emergency planning and espionage agency created by FDR during the war, was to be dissolved. However, with the creation of the CIA in 1947, a significant number of OSS staff made a lateral move into CIA who then formed a core group within CIA. Their ideology was one of corporate liberal internationalism, the theme of the New Deal. Added to this group were members of wartime military intelligence agencies, a group that shared an ideology of militant, theistic anti-Communism. Their perception of the world was one of Christianity assuming the burden of fighting the "holy war" against the Zionist "conspiracy" on one front and atheistic Communism on the other. Thus an inherent ideological conflict within CIA became an impediment to the agency's policy-making function. This is illustrated by the funding pattern CIA implemented in its program of subsidies to organizations.

Articles in the *Nation*, *Ramparts* and the *Washington Post* have documented the affiliation of foundations and organizations with international operations to the covert activities of the CIA. The subsidized organizations had a liberal ideology which was a good "cover" for the spy agency. An interesting question is whether or not the "right wing" group within the CIA engaged in similar operations. One would assume that the liberal faction of CIA was deeply committed to the support of the National Student Association (NSA) and the African American Institute (AAI). AAI is of particular interest because the conduit foundation used to channel funds into it was the Rubicon Foundation. Rubicon is the family foundation of the Hadley family. Many members of the Hadley family are trustees of Rubicon, one being Morris Hadley. He is a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation and a partner in the Rockefeller-Standard Oil law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hadley and McCloy. McCloy was chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank and a Bildenberg participant.

For fourteen years the National Student Association received its CIA money via the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs (FYSA).¹⁴ President of FYSA is Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., who is a director of Corning Glass Works and trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. Amory Houghton, Jr., is a trustee of FYSA and is board chairman of Corning Glass Works. Another director of Corning Glass Works is Robert D. Murphy. Murphy is chairman of Corning Glass International and is a member of the Bildenberg Steering Committee.

Murphy is also on the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities, commonly known as the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (FIAB).¹⁵ With Murphy on the FIAB have been William L. Langer, a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and William O. Baker, a trustee of the Rockefeller Institute. Edward L. Ryerson, another trustee of the Carnegie Endowment, was also a member of the FIAB during the Eisenhower Administration. With Ryerson on the FIAB was former Secretary of Defense, Robert A. Lovett, a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Lovett is a partner with Averell Harriman in Brown Brothers, Harriman and Company. President Nixon's latest appointment to the FIAB was Nelson Rockefeller, David Rockefeller's brother.

John Foster Dulles had been the chairman of the board of both the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, whose past president was Alger Hiss. Joseph E. Johnson, the Secretary General of the American Bildenberg Group, former chief of international security affairs in the State Department and director of the Council on Foreign Relations is now CEIP president. Given the inter-relationships be-

tween these two foundations, one must conclude that, in terms of the foreign policy "establishment," this is where it's at.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has spent its earnings supporting the Bildenberg Group as well as the Foreign Policy Association and Brookings Institution. In attendance at Bildenberg Meetings have been two trustees and one staff member of the Foreign Policy Association (FPA) which is housed (rent free) in the New York City headquarters building of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The Brookings Institution, located in Washington, D.C., has been represented at Bildenberg by two trustees and its chairman Eugene R. Black former president of the World Bank, a trustee of the Ford Foundation and a member of the boards of both Harvard University and Johns Hopkins University. Black is a director of the Chase Manhattan Bank, American Express Co., International Telephone & Telegraph, Communications Satellite Corp., Royal Dutch Petroleum and The Atlantic Council. Both Brookings and the FPA have a significant input into foreign policy analysis. Brookings in particular advises the State and Defense Departments and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Rockefeller Foundation is located in the Time-Life Building, of which the Rockefellers own 55%. The Foundation's assets are \$854 million. Add to this \$210 million tucked away in another tax exempt organization, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and a "cool" billion dollars are safe from ever being taxed. Dean Rusk, former president of the Rockefeller Foundation and Secretary of State, was until 1961 a member of the Bildenberg Steering Committee.

The Ford Foundation has done three times as well with total assets of three billion dollars and has played an equally significant role within the Bildenberg Group. Ford made a moderately successful attempt to extend the concept of "Encuentros Siglo XX" in the mid-1960's. Patterned along the Bildenberg model, Encuentros Meetings have focused their attention on Latin America.¹⁶

Among the leading foundations the Ford Foundation has had the largest representation at Bildenberg Meetings. McGeorge Bundy, president of the foundation, has participated in several meetings while the former chairman of the foundation, John J. McCloy, has attended one meeting. A former president of the foundation, Paul G. Hoffman, is presently administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, a trustee of the University of Chicago and a member of the Business Council. Don K. Price, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and trustee of the Rand Corporation, is a vice-president of the Ford Foundation. Both Hoffman and Price have been Bildenberg participants. Shepard Stone, former director of international affairs at Ford and now president of the International Association for Cultural Freedom is a Bildenberg Steering Committee member.

From the various foundations that Andrew Carnegie created there have been eleven trustees attending Bildenberg Meetings of which five are members of the Steering Committee. The Asia Foundation which is a major CIA conduit foundation has three trustees and its president, Robert Blum, involved with the Bildenberg Group's conference.

The university as a strategic institution within American society provides both the technical manpower and the ideological justification of warfare-welfare state capitalism. Since the legal and political power of the university system clearly rests in the hands of the ruling class it follows that as an institution the university's primary function is to serve the interest of wealth and power rather than free inquiry. Aside from the myriad of schools that serve essentially parochial power structures, it is the handful of elite universities that supply the academic

Footnotes at end of article.

mercenaries for the prosecution of the Cold War. These mercenaries form the academic procession to Bilderberg each year. They have included the presidents, trustees and faculty members of Harvard, M.I.T., John Hopkins, University of Chicago, Columbia, Yale and Cornell, to name a few. The last three mentioned universities had their presidents, Andrew Cordier, Kingman Brewster, Jr., and James Perkins respectively, as Bilderberg participants.

One of Harvard's "overseers", David Rockefeller, is a member of the Bilderberg Steering Committee and also manages to be a life trustee of the University of Chicago and chairman of the Rockefeller University. Another overseer of Harvard is C. Douglas Dillon, a Bilderberg participant and a trustee of the Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA). Four other Bilderbergers are also IDA trustees, one being James Perkins, president of Cornell University and a trustee of the Rand Corporation, the leading military "think tank" in the United States. Other Rand trustees at Bilderberg have been Lauris Norstad, chairman of Owens-Corning Fiberglass; Philip E. Mosley, director of the European Institute at Columbia University; and Don K. Price, dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

THE AMERICAN PRESS

The key media of mass communications have been well represented at the Bilderberg meetings. The major newspaper of record, the *New York Times*, has sent several key individuals to the conferences. The list included the late Arthur Hays Sulzberger, C. L. Sulzberger, James Reston, Max Frankel and Thomas Wicker. The chairman of the board of the *Washington Post*, Frederick S. Beebe, has attended one meeting. C. D. Jackson of Time, Inc. played an important role in the early Bilderberg Meetings, Gardner Cowles of Cowles publications (*Look* magazine) has been at several, and in addition, such newsmen as Joseph Kraft and Joseph C. Harsch have attended. From this description of the strategic elites represented at Bilderberg and their interrelationships, let us now turn to the actual meetings and their effect on the political process.

BILDERBERG FORMAT AND AGENDA

The meetings are held for three days in rather remote locations offering many of the major comforts of life. With the exception of the Prince's family and possible staff, the participants in the conference are all male. At the conference the participants are housed in one location (usually a hotel) and are protected by a vast security network. The format of the meeting has the participants seated in alphabetical order. Prince Bernhard sits at the center of a large table in the front of the room, flanked by officials of the organization. With the aid of red-yellow-green traffic light device that indicates time limits, the Prince chairs the meeting. It is the rule that each speaker has to limit his remarks to five minutes, but this rule is obeyed at the discretion of the Prince. One important speaker at a recent conference spoke for over fifteen minutes without being interrupted. The discussions are organized around previously arranged topics, and a few background papers are sent to each participant. Over the years the topics discussed have centered around the political, economic, and military problems of the Atlantic alliance. The issues of the third world and the question of underdevelopment have been discussed at Bilderberg. Despite the inclusion of the problem of the third world, one participant who is an expert in this area indicated that the participants were not really interested. The following are the agenda's from two Bilderberg Conferences:

1963

I. The balance of power in light of recent international developments. This item will

cover changes in power relations—political, economic and military—between the Communist and Western countries and inside each group.

II. Trade relations between the U.S.A. and Europe in the light of the negotiations for Britain's entry into the Common Market.

III. Trade relations between the Western world and the developing countries.

1967

I. (a) Do the basic concepts of Atlantic co-operation remain valid for the evolving world situation? (b) If not, what concepts could take their place?

II. The technological gap between America and Europe with special reference to American investments in Europe.

To really understand the discussions, one has to understand more than the place of the individuals in their respective power structures. Despite the amount of real and potential power presented at Bilderberg, the people attending usually do not make blatant displays. Their rhetoric is one of moderation. Despite the position of some people, they seem not to understand their role. The late A. H. Sulzberger wrote in his notes from the 1957 conference:

"As a newspaperman, I feel like the little man who wasn't there, and since I am not an economist, and have never received a government check except as a 2nd Lieutenant of Field Artillery—I don't know quite why I am here. I am possibly like the parachuter who when asked by his superior officer if he liked to jump replied, 'No, but I like to associate with people who do.'"

Some participants are clearly out of place at these meetings. One wealthy European who more properly is a member of the jet set was obviously bored since the topics did not include making money or women. The private nature of the talks allow speakers to make remarks that would best be said in private. For example, at the Cambridge conference, Mr. Robert Murphy made the remark that article two of the NATO treaty was "window dressing."

"The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them" (text of article two, NATO Treaty).

Within the narrow political limitations on the invitations, i.e., "anyone who belongs to a country that believes in defending Western ethical and cultural values, and himself shares these ideals" the political debate can be quite varied. In the discussion of point one at the 1967 meeting, one report indicated, "that 98 interventions (speeches) occurred among 72 speakers, consisting of 86 different positions, the number of conflicting positions is greater than the number of speakers but not all the speakers managed to defend the same position twice."¹⁸ However, this division took place before the Russian actions in Czechoslovakia and the winds of détente were changing the Cold War images of the world.

The conferences are many things to different people. Some individuals who are on the Steering Committee have been at nearly every one. While some others have found the meeting slightly interesting, but could never imagine going to another since it would be so boring. The discussions at Bilderberg are limited in scope since some participants are still afraid to make known their opinions and the people invited generally share a common point of view. Some

Footnotes at end of article.

participants who do not believe in German reunification have been afraid to make their views known during discussions on Germany. The American delegation to Bilderberg seem to be the most monolithic as compared to other countries. Individuals that have major moral objections to Vietnam or NATO policy have never been invited. One key official on the American Steering Committee who is a president of a major foundation that is ostensibly dedicated "to hasten the abolition of international war..." said he would never invite Linus Pauling to a Bilderberg Meeting because of Pauling's manner in objecting to the war in Vietnam during a conference sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.¹⁹ While making the statement this member of the Steering Committee could not find the time to raise any moral objection to the activity of the American military forces in Vietnam.

The participants are invited because they are known to the Steering Committee through similar activities and life style. The backbone of the American group seems to have been the vast Rockefeller interests, which have been consistently hawkish on most questions of foreign policy. In the Eisenhower period and the early sixties, those individuals that were part of this web of interests were more concerned about developing new weapons, testing atomic bombs, and increasing the defense expenditures, i.e., the myth of negotiating from strength. This program meant trying to convince the American people that radiation from atomic weapons was not a major health hazard and atomic warfare was a method to defend freedom, i.e., "the willingness to engage in nuclear war, when necessary is part of the price of our freedom"²⁰

Within this type of thinking, the major advances in policy that the Bilderberg Meetings have created have been in the area of European integration directly contributing to the Treaty of Rome and the Common Market.²¹ The major stress of the Bilderberg conferences has been in pushing increased cooperation and unity within the Atlantic Community.

Towards this end the Bilderberg Group has involved itself directly in the domestic politics of the NATO countries. Of special interest to the Bilderberg Group during their 1963 meeting was the issue of French President de Gaulle's opposition to the British entry into the Common Market. It has been charged by one French periodical that the following year the Group, meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia, decided to intervene in French politics.²²

Faced with the problem of a nationalist heading France, the Bilderbergers chose to actively support an opposition candidate to de Gaulle. The Group selected as their candidate a participant of the 1964 Bilderberg Conference, "socialist" mayor of Marseilles, Gaston Defferre. They viewed Defferre as possessing a more correct internationalist orientation that would be consistent with the broad objectives of the Bilderberg Group.

American graduates of the Bilderberg Meetings have played important roles in the making of American policy. This has been particularly evident in the Kennedy Administration, where Bilderberg "alumni" included Dean Rusk, George W. Ball, George McGhee, Walt Whitman Rostow, McGeorge Bundy, Arthur Dean and Paul Nitze. These individuals have all played a consistent role in stressing the hard line and seem unaware of the dangers of the "military industrial complex."

In understanding the importance of Bilderberg, it is important to remember that this is not just a series of meetings. All the people who have attended the conferences get annual reports, and have almost automatic entree into additional contacts with fellow participants. To help this process along, the

organization provides up to date addresses of all participants in the meetings. Hence, Bilderberg has contributed to the creation of a transnational or international group. Perhaps Bilderberg has been more important in creating new forms of organization beyond economic cooperation.

Bilderberg participants comprise a self-conscious elite which takes the position that "political decisions of great magnitude are rarely understood by the public at large,"²³ hence, the Bilderberg group has become a intervening factor that has helped maintain the Atlantic Community. Unfortunately the more basic issue of peace in the world and disarmament have not been aided by the Bilderberg group. Against the madness of the arms race and atomic weapons, the agents for peace have been the anti-war groups and such international conferences as Pugwash.²⁴

The political limitations placed on the Bilderberg Meetings has meant that individuals and groups seeking significant change in the Atlantic Community that would have either brought the world closer to peace or limit the military industrial complex were not invited. Compare the function and membership of the Bilderberg Meetings with the Pugwash Conferences sponsored by Cyrus Eaton. The Bilderberg Meetings are a place where the sophisticated members of the ruling elites and their retainers can meet and do their thing.

"L'EMINENCE GRISE"

Generally regarded as the "gray eminence"²⁵ of European diplomatic circles, Joseph H. Retinger contributed much towards the intrigues of secret negotiations and organization of power at the highest levels of statecraft. The eulogies bestowed upon him after his death in 1960 affirmed the notion that "he knew almost everyone that (sic) mattered in Europe and the United States." "I remember," recalled Sir Edward Beddington-Behrens, "in the United States his (Retinger) picking up the telephone and immediately making an appointment with the President; and in Europe, he had complete entrée in every political circle, as a kind of right, acquired through trust, devotion, and loyalty he inspired."²⁶ Such a view was not shared by all in Europe, however.

Given an anti-Catholic tradition in European political circles, the "gray eminence" evoked suspicion within certain quarters. He was viewed as an agent of the Vatican in liaison between the Pope and the Father General of the Jesuit Order, the "White" and "Black eminences" respectively.²⁷ Although such allegations may be rejected out of hand, it must be recognized that Retinger contributed to and was a strategic catalyst for many of the major diplomatic and political initiatives occurring within Western European circles. His most significant contribution was the founding of the European Movement, which was directly responsible for the creation of the Council of Europe.²⁸ Retinger's commitment towards the development of European unity after World War II, had its roots early in his political career.

During his youth in Cracow, Poland and later at the Sorbonne, where he was awarded

a doctorate, Retinger identified himself with the policies of the Vatican as well as advancing his vision of a unified Europe. He once proposed to Premier Georges Clemenceau a plan, the goal of which was to foster unity in Eastern Europe. Retinger argued that a unified and durable political structure would be best achieved by merging the states of Austria, Hungary and Poland into a tripartite monarchy under the guidance of the Jesuits. Recognizing the Catholic tradition in all three nations, he reasoned that such a religious heritage could form the base for a viable political structure. Clemenceau suspected Retinger of being an agent of what appeared a Vatican-inspired plan and immediately rejected the notion.²⁹

During the same period, Retinger's intrigues included eleven trips to Mexico where initially he was instrumental in the organization of trade unions in the mid-1920's. Utilizing his extraordinary facility of operating effectively with personages of conflicting ideologies and social class, Retinger gained the confidence of the Mexican Government. Retinger was critical of capitalism before the coming of the welfare state and consequently formulated a plan to nationalize the United States oil interests in Mexico. The Mexican Government was so receptive to the concept that it charged Retinger with the mission of engaging in secret negotiations with Washington on the oil question.³⁰

During World War II, Retinger held the post of political aide to General Sikorski and also served as the representatives to the Soviet Union from the London based Polish Government in Exile.

His most spectacular feat during the war was a clandestine mission to Poland in August, 1944. At the age of 58 he parachuted into Nazi occupied territory, West of Warsaw, successfully executing the mission on the eve of Polish liberation from the Germans, in spite of the fact that he incurred permanent physical disability from the jump.³¹

He delivered several million dollars to the Polish partisans as well as securing an operating governmental unit for the Polish Government in exile, to prevent the Soviets from instituting a Communist Regime in Warsaw in the wake of the German retreat. Although the Soviet Army was encamped along the Eastern bank of the Vistula River and within close proximity of Warsaw, the Russians chose to do nothing. Left without Russian military support, the Poles engaged in armed struggle against the Nazi war machine for two months.

By mid-century, Retinger had engaged in a career that was to merit the credentials and stature of a statesman appropriately titled the "gray eminence" of Europe. His early "leftist" views opened the doors of the anti-communist socialist leaders while his church connection gave him entree into Catholic parties of the political center. Yet his most consuming vision of a united Europe, a concept shared only by intellectuals and a handful of statesmen, was less a reality than ever. After the war, Retinger added an additional factor to his equation for unity: America. However, the political realities in Europe and its concomitant anti-Americanism were, in Retinger's mind, the seeds for a conflict that

would engulf Europe ". . . within three months to three years." Consequently, he renewed with even greater zeal his refocused plan for the development of an "Atlantic Community." Towards this end he sought out a potential ally and a key member of the House of Orange-Nassau, H.R.H. Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands.

It was Retinger who approached Prince Bernhard in 1952 with a novel concept, a conference that would bring together leaders of the NATO community in a very private meeting conducted in an "off the cuff" manner. No reporters would be permitted to attend and no public statements concerning topics discussed would be made by any of the participants. It was believed that such an environment would allow the participants to engage in a more "meaningful dialogue" than would be possible in an open international meeting. On a grand scale, this meeting would implement group dynamics techniques to formulate a low keyed international "T" group, whose purpose was to sensitize the less "enlightened" of its membership towards the new transnational diplomacy of the Cold War.

Retinger's idea obtained immediate endorsement by Prince Bernhard. A nucleus of ten Europeans was formed to study the possibility of arriving at a concrete plan for the meeting. Having accomplished this in September, 1952, Bernhard then proceeded to establish a corresponding group in America where he found many members of the Truman Administration, including Averell Harriman, particularly receptive to the idea. However, it was not until the newly elected Republican administration took office that the American counterpart was established. General Walter Bedell Smith, director of CIA, and C. D. Jackson, then special assistant to the President and later publisher of *Life* magazine, were instrumental in aiding Bernhard. When John S. Coleman, president of Burroughs Corporation, was elected its chairman, the American group was officially created. When both the European and American groups met in formal conference at the Hotel de Bilderberg, they adopted the name of the hotel, calling themselves the "Bilderberg Group."

BILDERBERG MEETINGS HELD SINCE 1954

- May 1954, Oosterbeek, Netherlands.
- March 1955, Barbizon, France.
- September 1955, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany.
- May 1956, Fredensborg, Denmark.
- February 1957, St. Simons Island, United States.
- October 1957, Fluggi, Italy.
- September 1958, Buxton, United Kingdom.
- September 1959, Yesilkoy, Switzerland.
- May 1960, Bergenstock, Switzerland.
- April 1961, Quebec, Canada.
- May 1962, Saltsjobaden, Sweden.
- March 1963, Cannes, France.
- March 1964, Williamsburg, Virginia, United States.
- April 1965, Como, Italy.
- March 1966, Weisbaden, W. Germany.
- March 1967, Cambridge, England.
- April 1968, Mont Tremblant, Canada.

Footnotes at end of article.

United States Bilderberg participants	Council on Foreign relations	Bilderberg meetings						
		1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Honorary Secretary General (United States): Joseph E. Johnson.	Member, Director.....	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Chairman: 1954-55: John S. Coleman.	Member.....	X						

United States Bilderberg participants	Council on Foreign Relations	Bilderberg meetings						
		1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Co chairman: 1955-57:								
Dean Rusk.....	do.....	X	X				X	
Gen. Walter Bedell Smith.	do.....							
Co chairman: 1957-present:								
Arthur H. Dean.....	Member, Director.....	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Henry J. Heinz II.....	Member.....	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

United States Bilderberg participants	Council on Foreign relations	Bilderberg meetings						
		1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Advisory Committee:								
Henry J. Heinz II	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
George Nebolsine	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Steering Committee:								
George W. Ball (resigned 1961)	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Emilio G. Collado	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gardner Cowles	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Arthur H. Dean	Member, Director	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
John H. Ferguson	Member	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gabriel Hauge	Member, Treasurer	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Henry J. Heinz II	Member	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

United States Bilderberg participants	Council on Foreign relations	Bilderberg meetings						
		1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
C. D. Jackson	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Robert D. Murphy	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
George Nebolsine	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
David Rockefeller	Member, Vice President	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dean Rusk (resigned 1961)	Member	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gen. Walter Bedell Smith	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Shepard Stone	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
James D. Zellerback	do	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

¹ Cumulative list for period 1954-66.

European Bilderberg Participants	Bilderberg meetings						
	1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Chairman: H.R.H. Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands							
Honorary Secretary General for Europe:							
Joseph H. Retinger (1954-60)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ernst H. van der Beugel (1960-68)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Honorary Treasurer:							
Paul Rykens (1954-64)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Johannes Meynen (1964-68)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Deputy Secretary General for Europe: Arnold T. Lamping (1960-68)							
Advisory Committee:							
Rudolf Mueller, Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pietro Quaroni, Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Paul Rykens, Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Steering Committee:							
Agnelli, Giovanni, Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Airey, Sir Terence, United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Arlottis, Charles C., Greece	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Baumgartner, Wilfrid S., France	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bennett, Sir Frederic, United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Birgi, M. Nuri, Turkey	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Boveri, Walter E., Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

European Bilderberg Participants	Bilderberg meetings						
	1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Cavendish-Bentnick, Victor, United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Christiansen, Hakon, Denmark	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Duncan, James S., Canada	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Erlar, Fritz, Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fanfani, Amintore, Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hagie, Jens C., Norway	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Healey, Dennis W., United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hoegh, Leif, Norway	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
van Kleffens, Eelco N., E.C.S.C.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Maudling, Reginald, United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mueller, Rudolf, Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Quaroni, Pietro, Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ryken, Paul, Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sarmento Rodrigues, Manuel M., Portugal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Schmid, Carlo, Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Snoy et d'Oppeurs, Baron, Belgium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Taverne, Dick, United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Terkelsen, Terkel M., Denmark	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Valletta, Vittorio, Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wallenberg, Marcus, Sweden	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wolff von Amerongen, Otto, Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

¹ Cumulative list for period 1954-66.

Bilderberg participants	Bilderberg meetings						
	1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Australia: Officer, Sir Keith	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Austria:							
Czernetz, Karl	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lendavi, Paul	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Molden, Fritz P.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Portish, Hugo	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Thurn, Max	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Withalm, Hermann	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Zimmer-Lehmann, Georg	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Withalm, Herman	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Belgium:							
Ansiaux, Hubert	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bauwens, Marcel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Becu, Omer L.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Boël, Baron Rene	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bonoisin, Baron Pierre	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Camu, Louis	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cool, Auguste P.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dehousse, Fernand	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Drapier, Jean	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fayat, Henri	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guillaume, Baron J.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kerchove d'Ousselghem, Nicolas W. de	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lefevre, Theo	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Motz, Roger	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ryckmans, Pierre	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Segers, Paul W.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Simonet, Henri	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Solvay, Jacques	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Spaak, Paul Henri	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Vallee Poussin, Etienne de la	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Willems, Jean	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Zeeland, Viscomte Paul van	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Canada:							
Allard, J. V.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bassett, John W. H.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Beaton, Leonard	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Belanger, Michel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bruce, Fraser W.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cadieux, Marcel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Coldwell, M. J.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Davidson, Ian D.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Deutsch, John J.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dodge, William	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Duncan, James S.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dunton, A. Davidson	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dupuy, Pierre	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Eayrs, James	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Faribault, Marcel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fleming, Donald M.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Foulkes, Charles	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Bilderberg participants	Bilderberg meetings						
	1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Gibson, J. Douglas	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gordon, Walter L.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Griffin, Anthony G. S.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Heaney, Arnold D. P.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Holmes, John W.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lambert, Allen T.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lamontagne, Maurice	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Leger, Jules	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lesage, Jean	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Marchand, Jean	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Martin, Paul	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
McKinnon, Neil	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
McLean, William F.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Michener, Roland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Molson, Hartland de M.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Parizeau, Jacques	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pearson, Lester B.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rasminsky, Louis	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ritchie, Ronald S.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Robertson, Norman A.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ronning, Chester A.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ryan, Claude	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sauve, Maurice	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Stanfield, Robert L.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Stone, Thomas	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Thornbrough, Albert A.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wilgress, Dana	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Winters, Robert H.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Denmark:							
Axel of Denmark, H.R.H. Prince	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Christiansen, Hakon	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Haekkerup, Per	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Knudtson, Harald	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kraft, Ole B.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Krag, Jens O.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Matthiasen, Neils	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sorensen, Svend O.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Norgaard, Ivar	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Finland: Nykopp, Johan							
France:							
Andre, Robert	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Aron, Raymond	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Baumel, Jacques	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
de Baumont, Guerin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bourbon-Busset, comte de	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Brutelle, Georges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Casanova, Jean C.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Chalandon, Albin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Clement-Cuzin, René	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Commin, Pierre	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Croissillier, Francois	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Footnotes at end of table.

Bilderberg participants	Bilderberg meetings						
	1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Heckscher, Gunnar					X		
Holmberg, Yngve						X	
Iveroth, Axel					X		
Jacobsson, Per			X				
Kling, Herman				X			
Lange, Gunnar					X		
Lundvall, Björn							X
Ohlin, Bertil					X		
Palme, S. Olof J.		X					
Sandler, Rickard					X		
Tingsten, Herbert L. G.					X		
Waldenstrom, Herbert L. G.					X		
Switzerland:							
Brogini, Gerardo						X	
Burckhardt, Charles J.		X					
Jolles, Paul							
Petitpierre, Max				X			
Reinhardt, Eberhard					X		
Rougemont, Denis de		X					
Schaffner, Hans							
Schwarz, Urs						X	
Umbricht, Victor H.					X		
Turkey:							
Alpakartal, Nureddin F.						X	
Ariburun, Tekin						X	
Belge, Burnham						X	
Diker, Vecdi						X	
Eczacioglu, Nejat F.				X			X
Esenbal, Melih							
Gidel, Nail							
Sarper, Selim							
Tokay, Selahattin							
Tokus, Ahmet							
Türkmen, Ilter							X
United Kingdom:							
Astor, the Honorable David			X			X	
Barran, David H.							X
Baddington-Behrens, Sir Edward						X	
Boothby, the Lord		X					
Bridgeman, Sir Maurice R.							X
Brown, George A.						X	
Buchan, the Honorable Alaster					X		X
Buzzard, Sir Anthony		X					
Callaghan, James				X			
Chambers, Sir Paul			X				X
Clitheroe, the Lord		X					
Cochrane, Sir Ralph							
Cohen, the Honorable							
Crowther, Sir Geoffrey		X					
Davies, Clement		X					
Delmer, D. Sefton		X					
Dundee, the Earl of				X			
Edinburgh, H.R.H. the Prince Philip, Duke of						X	
Elliot, Sir William		X					

Bilderberg participants	Bilderberg meetings						
	1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Foster, Sir John		X					X
Franks, the Lord		X					X
Gaitskell, Hugh		X					
Geddes, Reay							X
Geddes of Epsom, the Lord		X					
Gladwyn, the Lord							X
Glendevon, the Lord							X
Grimond, Joseph							X
Gubbins, Sir Colin		X	X	X	X		
Hall, Sir Arnold							X
Hall Patch, Sir Edmund							X
Harlech, the Lord							X
Heath, Edward R. G.				X			X
Hogg, Quintin							X
Hope, the Lord John		X					
Hyde, H. Montgomery		X					X
Jay, Douglas P. T.							X
Jellicoe, the Earl					X		
Kearton, Sir Frank							X
Keswick, John		X					X
Kilmuir, the Earl of			X				X
Kipping, Sir Norman							X
Kleinwort, Cyril							X
Knollys, the Viscount							X
Mountbatten of Burma, the Earl							X
O'Neill, Sir Con							X
Oppenheim, Sir Duncan		X					X
Pilkington, Sir Harry		X					X
Plowden, the Lord							X
Powel, J. Enoch							X
Richardson, Gordon							X
Robens of Woldingham, the Lord		X					X
Roberts, Sir Alfred							X
Roll, Sir Eric					X		X
Shawcross, Lord					X		X
Shonfield, Andrew A.							X
Slessor, Sir John		X					X
Smith, A. H.							X
Steel, Sir Lincoln							X
Stevens, John M.			X				X
Stewart, Michael					X		X
Tennant, Peter F. D.					X		X
Tiarks, Henry F.							X
Turner, Sir Mark							X
Warburg, Sir Siegmund							X
Wheeler, Sir Charles							X
Williamson, the Lord		X					X
Wilson, Harold							X
Woodhouse, the Honorable Montague							X
Woodhouse, Christopher M.							X
Wren, Walter T.			X				X
Younger, Kenneth							X

¹ Cumulative list for period 1954-66.

United States Bilderberg participants	Council on Foreign Relations	Bilderberg meetings						
		1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Acheson, Dean G.	Member				X		X	
Achilles, Theodore C.	do							
Anderson, Robert O.				X				
Barbour, Walworth								
Beebe, Frederick S.	Member						X	
Bell, David E.	do							X
Bell, Elliott V.	Director, treasurer							X
Bingham, Barry		X						
Black, Eugene R.	Member		X					
Blum, Robert		X						
Bolling, Richard								X
Bowie, Robert R.	Member		X					
Brademas, John								X
Brandt, Karl								X
Brooke, Senator Edward								X
Brewster, Jr., Kingman	Member							X
Brown, Irving	do	X						
Bruce, David K. E.	do							X
Brzezinski, Zbigniew	do							X
Bundy, McGeorge	do		X		X			
Burgess, W. Randolph	do							X
Cabot, Louis W.	do				X			
Case, Senator Clifford P.	do							X
Cisler, Walker L.	do	X	X	X	X			
Cleveland, Harlan	do							X
Cleveland, Harold Van B.	do			X				X
Cole, David L.	do							X
Cook, Donald C.	do							X
Copeland, Lamot du Pont	Member			X				
Cordier, Andrew W.	do							X
Deming, Frederick	do							X
Dewey, Thomas E.	do		X					
Diebold, John	do							X
Dillon, C. Douglas	Director							X
Dodge, Joseph N.	do	X						
Donovan, Hedley	Member							X
Finletter, Thomas K.	Director							X

United States Bilderberg participants	Council on Foreign Relations	Bilderberg meetings						
		1955	1957	1963	1964	1966 ¹	1967	1968
Flanders, Senator Ralph E.	Member	X						X
Ford, Jr., Congressman						X	X	
Gerald R.								X
Ford II, Henry								X
Foster, William C.	Director							X
Frankel, Max	Member							X
Frelinghuysen, Congressman	do				X			X
Peter H. B.					X			X
Fulbright, Senator J. William			X					X
Gallagher, Congressman				X				X
Cornelius E.								X
Garner, Robert L.	Member	X						X
Gilpatric, Roswell L.	do							X
Golden, Clinton S.		X						
Goodpaster, Andrew	Member							X
Gordon, Lincoln	do		X					X
Gossett, William T.				X				X
Gruenther, General Alfred M.	Member	X						X
Hafstad, Lawrence R.	do		X					X
Harris, Senator Fred								X
Harsch, Joseph C.	Member							X
Hays, Congressman	do			X				X
Brooks								X
Heilperin, Michael A.	do	X	X					X
Herter, Christian A.	do				X			X
Hewitt, William A.	do				X			X
Hickenlooper, Senator					X			X
Bourke B.								X
Hochschild, Harold K.	Member							X
Hoffman, Paul G.	do	X	X					X
Hoffman, Stanley	do							X
Hollifield, Congressman	do				X			X
Chet								X
Horning, Donald F.								X

Footnotes at end of table.

United States Bilderberg participants	Council on Foreign Relations	Bilderberg meetings						United States Bilderberg participants	Council on Foreign Relations	Bilderberg meetings						
		1955	1957	1963	1964	1966	1967			1968	1955	1957	1963	1964	1966	1967
Irwin, Donald J.							X	Norstad, Lauris	do							X
Jackson, Senator Henry M.					X	X	X	Parker, Cola G.		X						
Jackson, William H.	Member		X					Patterson, Morehead			X					
Javits, Senator Jacob K.	do			X				Payne, Frederick B.	Member						X	
Jay, Nelson Dean	do	X						Perkins, George W.		X						
Katz, Milton	o							Perkins, James A.	Director			X		X	X	
Kaysen, Carl	Studies							Petersen, Howard C.	Member					X	X	
Keener, Jefferson W.								Peterson, Rudolph A.						X	X	
Kennan, George F.	Member	X	X			X		Piel, Gerard	Member						X	
Kennedy, David M.								Piore, Emanuel R.							X	
Kissinger, Henry A.	Member		X		X	X		Price, Don K.	Member		X				X	
Knoppers, Antonio T.	do						X	Rabi, Isidor I.	do						X	
Kraft, Joseph	do						X	Reston, James B.	do						X	
Lindsay, Franklin A.	do				X	X		Reuss, Henry	do						X	
Litchfield, Jr., Lawrence					X	X		Reuther, Walter P.	do						X	
Littlejohn, Edward		X						Roberts, Henry Lithgow	do		X				X	
Maillard, William S.								Roosa, Robert V.	Director						X	
Martin, Edwin M.	Member							Rostow, Eugene V.	Member						X	X
Mason, Edward S.	do	X		X		X		Ryan, John T.	do							X
Mathias, Jr., Congressman							X	Samuelson, Paul A.								X
Charles Mc.								Schmidt, Adolph W.	Member							X
McCloy, John J.	Chairman, board				X	X		Schnitzler, William F.		X						X
McCormack, James	Member							Scott, Senator Hugh								X
McDonald, David J.			X					Shulman, Marshall D.	Member, Committee						X	
McGee, Gale W.	Member							Smith, Admiral H. Page	Member					X		X
McGhee, George C.	do	X	X	X	X	X		Spang, Joseph P., Jr.		X					X	
McGill, Ralph E.		X						Sparkman, Senator John							X	
McNamara, Robert	Member						X	Spofford, Charles M.	Director	X	X				X	
Strange								Sulzberger, Arthur Hays	Member		X				X	
McNaughton, John T.							X	Sulzberger, Cyrus L.	do						X	
Monroney, Senator A. S.								Tuthill, John W.	do						X	
Mike								Vernon, Raymond	do							X
Morse, F. Bradford							X	Vorys, Congressman								X
Mosley, Philip E.	Member						X	John M.			X				X	
Moyers, Bill D.	Director						X	Wicker, Thomas G.								X
Nash, Frank C.			X					Wilcox, Francis O.	Member	X					X	
Neal, Alfred C.	Finance Committee						X	Wilde, Frazar B.	do		X				X	
Newhouse, John							X	Wiley, Senator Alexander			X				X	
Nitze, Paul H.	Member	X	X	X		X		Wohlstetter, Albert	Member						X	
								Wriston, Walter B.	do				X		X	

¹ Cumulative list for period 1954-66.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ "Even the Leaks are Watertight", *Daily Sketch* (London), April 3, 1967.
- ² *Private Eye* (London), April 14, 1967, p. 13.
- ³ "Aid by C.I.A. Put in the Millions: Group Total Up", *New York Times*, February 19, 1967, p. 1.
- ⁴ George Seides, *Facts and Fascism* (New York: In Facts Inc., 1943), pp. 153ff.
- David Lasser, *Private Monopoly: The Enemy at Home*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945) pp. 129ff.
- Gabriel Kolko, "American Business & Germany 1930-1941", *Western Political Quarterly*, (December, 1962).
- ⁵ Gary Allen, "The C.F.R.: Conspiracy to Rule the World", *American Opinion* (Belmont, Mass.: April, 1969).
- ⁶ Alden Hatch, *H.R.H. Bernhard Prince of the Netherlands* (London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1962), p. 218.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁸ Joseph H. Retinger, *Bilderberg Meetings* (unpublished confidential report, November 1966), p. 14.
- ⁹ Edith Kermit Roosevelt, "Lobby Lawyers: Hidden World of Secret Pressures", *Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader*, October 31, 1968, p. 20.
- ¹⁰ Hatch, op. cit., p. 223.
- ¹¹ Edith Kermit Roosevelt, "Lobby Lawyers: Dominance in World Economics", *Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader*, Oct. 31, 1968, p. 20.
- ¹² James Stewart Martin, *All Honorable Men* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1950), pp. 53, 67, 250.
- ¹³ Fred J. Cook, "The C.I.A.", *Nation*, June 24, 1961, p. 537.
- ¹⁴ *New York Times*, loc. cit.
- ¹⁵ "President Revives Intelligence Board", *New York Times*, May 5, 1961, p. 3.
- ¹⁶ *Encuentros Siglo XX, II Meeting, Paracus, Pisco, Peru, June 2-5, 1966*, Confidential report and minutes of meeting.
- ¹⁷ Retinger, op. cit., p. 8.
- ¹⁸ "Max Kuhnstamm's Summary of Discussion Which Took Place at the Bilderberg

- Conference in Cambridge, England—April 2, 1967", Confidential correspondence from Max Kuhnstamm to H.R.H. Bernhard.
- ¹⁹ From interview with Joseph E. Johnson, August 15, 1968.
- ²⁰ *Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report*, 1958.
- ²¹ Hatch, op. cit., p. 223.
- ²² Roger Mennevee, "Les Influences Americaines 'Le Groupe de Bilderberg' et La France", *Les Documents Politiques, Diplomatiques et Financiers* (Paris: October, 1967), p. 10.
- ²³ Retinger, op. cit., p. 4.
- ²⁴ Barbara Ward Jackson, "A Stevenson Memorial", *Saturday Review*, July 9, 1966, p. 19.
- ²⁵ Hatch, op. cit., p. 213.
- ²⁶ *The Times* (London), June 13, 1960, p. 12.
- ²⁷ Roger Mennevee, "Les Eminences Grises de la Politique Mondiale: Nouveaux Documents sur M. Retinger et le Groupe de Bilderberg." *Les Documents Politiques, Diplomatiques et Financiers* (Paris: December, 1967), p. 6.
- ²⁸ Hatch, op. cit., p. 214.
- ²⁹ Mennevee, op. cit., p. 5.
- ³⁰ Mennevee, op. cit., p. 11.
- ³¹ Hatch, op. cit., p. 213.

of the committee after I was elected to Congress and assigned to the committee. She had worked for many years for the chairman of the committee, the late Honorable John E. Rankin, who came from her hometown. She was possessed of an exceedingly pleasant personality and was in sole cooperation with me and with all other members of the committee during the years of her service.

Prior to the 80th Congress, she had served not only as clerk of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation but also had seen service in the office of the chairman, Mr. Rankin. When the Legislative Reorganization Act was placed into effect on January 1, 1947, she was assigned to the professional staff of the committee. She remained on the staff of the committee until she retired in 1960. I am sure that all the Members who are here today and who had personal contact with "Miss Ida" will be sorry to know of her passing and will sympathize to the loss that I have since another friend has left us.

MISS IDA ROWAN

LACK OF ADEQUATE HOUSING

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF TEXAS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that I call to the attention of the House the death of Miss Ida Rowan of Tupelo, Miss., who for many years was associated with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. She was one of the first persons I met on the staff

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing the people of Alaska today is the lack of adequate housing. This is especially true in the bush area where temperatures average 20 or 25 degrees below zero during the long winter months.

For Alaska, the problem seems twofold. First, it is quite clear that there are not enough houses to adequately shelter the people of the villages of Alaska. Often people must live in houses that cannot provide enough heat to keep them warm or the crowded conditions make it uncomfortable for six or seven people to live in a one- or two-room house.

The second problem facing Alaskans in regard to the housing situation, is that there are not enough houses being built to meet the ever-increasing demand for adequate housing.

The council of the native village of Anaktuvuk Pass is greatly aware of these problems and has requested help in building four new homes, adding 12 rooms to existing homes and finishing interiors, exteriors, and insulation in existing homes. I strongly believe the council resolution deserves the attention of the Members of Congress:

RESOLUTION NO. 71-1 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE NATIVE VILLAGE OF ANAKTUVUK PASS

Whereas, the Council of the Native Village of Anaktuvuk Pass is the elected governing body and spokesmen for the village and its membership; And

Whereas, four families are still living in sod houses which are too small and are impossible to keep sanitary and ventilated and are contributing factors in sickness; And

Whereas, even though the majority of the families have built new frame houses at their own expense they did not have the funds to build large enough homes or properly insulated ones to adequately house their families in comfort and good health.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the Native Village of Anaktuvuk Pass that the various agencies and organizations who have the responsibility in assisting in housing are hereby requested to help our people in building four new homes, adding a minimum of twelve (12) rooms to existing homes, and finishing interiors, exteriors and insulation in existing homes which number eighteen in addition to the request for four new homes.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Alaska State Housing Authority, Alaska Federation of Natives, Arctic Slope Native Association, Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Governor of Alaska and the Alaska Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C.

LATEST DEVELOPMENT ON THE OPERATION KEELHAUL CASE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision on the so-called Pentagon papers has provided a basis for another lawsuit in the area of governmental information availability according to Mr. Julius Epstein, the research associate at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, whose first case concerning the Operation Keelhaul files was denied certiorari by the Court in June 1970. The complete legal record of this case appeared in the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 27, page 36711.

"Operation Keelhaul" was the code name used by the U.S. Army to describe the massive program of forced repatriation of unwilling Soviet nationals in 1944 through 1947 who resided in German camps when the Nazi regime collapsed. At the least, 1 million Soviet citizens were turned over to the U.S.S.R. authorities by the American and British forces, some of whom committed suicide rather than place their fates in the hands of the ruthless Soviets. The story of this operation was a well kept secret as far as the American public was concerned until Mr. Epstein accidentally ran across a reference to it in his research in 1954. Since that time he has doggedly sought to have the information released to the public and has publicized this tragic case at every turn. The position taken by the Department of Army at the outset was that the information was classified, because of national security and foreign policy reasons and because Operation Keelhaul was a joint U.S.-British operation and, therefore, required the concurrence of the British Government before it could be declassified.

A giant step was accomplished during the Nixon administration when Mr. Epstein was informed that the national security and foreign policy basis for classification was no longer considered a factor but that British concurrence, later requested and denied, was the sole obstacle.

Prior to this development Mr. Epstein had carried his case to the Supreme Court only to be denied certiorari, but with the elimination of the national security-foreign policy argument and the Court's decision in the Pentagon papers case Mr. Epstein feels his chances of success have been enhanced. He is at present filing his second round of legal actions in the court of appeals here in Washington.

The following items are an indication of the determined effort put forth by Mr. Epstein to inform the American public on the Operation Keelhaul issue and to effect a successful resolution to the case.

The first two insertions comprise the exchange of letters between the Secretary of the Army and Mr. Epstein relating to the Pentagon papers decision and its bearing on Operation Keelhaul issue.

The third and fourth insertions are the texts of letters exchanged between the White House and Mr. Epstein also on the Pentagon papers decision by the Supreme Court.

The fifth item contains remarks made by Mr. Epstein before the National Archives Conference here in Washington this past June and reprinted in the Washington Post of June 20, 1971.

On June 28 of this year Mr. Epstein was again back in Washington, this time to testify before the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. This testimony appears as the sixth item.

The seventh item is an article by the veteran newsman and columnist of the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, who

points out that Mr. Epstein played a major role in bringing to public view the true story of the hideous Katyn Forest massacre by the Soviets near Smolensk, Russia, in the early 1940's.

I insert the above-mentioned items at this point in the RECORD.

HOOPER INSTITUTION ON WAR, REVOLUTION, AND PEACE, Stanford, Calif., July 1, 1971.

HON. ROBERT F. FROEHLKE, The Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the Supreme Court decision of yesterday, June 30, 1971 in the case of the New York Times and the Washington Post I herewith respectfully request the immediate release of the "Operation Keelhaul" files to which I unsuccessfully tried to get access since 1954.

Since release of the "Operation Keelhaul" files cannot endanger our national defense or military security as distinct from the Vietnam Papers which are now in the public domain, maintenance of further classification of "Operation Keelhaul" cannot any longer be justified.

Respectfully yours,

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, Washington, D.C., July 19, 1971.

Mr. JULIUS EPSTEIN, Hoover Institution, Stanford, Calif.

DEAR MR. EPSTEIN: Secretary Froehelke has asked me to reply to your letter of 1 July 1971 concerning the "Operation Keelhaul" files.

As you will recall from our earlier correspondence, there is no objection to declassification of the records from a United States Government viewpoint. The records were created, however, by a combined British-American organization and British concurrence is necessary prior to declassification action.

We have requested British concurrence in declassification on two occasions within the past two years. In both instances, the most recent in May 1971, the British authorities have expressed their inability to agree to declassification and release of the "Operation Keelhaul" documents. Since the records are owned and controlled jointly by the British and U.S. Governments, we must honor their decision on this matter.

I am sorry that I cannot reply more favorably to your request.

Sincerely,

VERNE L. BOWERS, Major General, USA, the Adjutant General.

HOOPER INSTITUTION ON WAR, REVOLUTION, AND PEACE, Stanford, Calif., July 7, 1971.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I'm enclosing a copy of my statement made before the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations on June 28, 1971.

In view of the Supreme Court decision of June 30, 1971 in the case of the New York Times and the Washington Post, I herewith respectfully request the immediate release of the "Operational Keelhaul" files to which I unsuccessfully tried to get access since 1954.

Since release of the "Operation Keelhaul" files cannot any longer endanger our national defense or foreign policy, according to the White House letter to me of October 22, 1970, as distinct from the Pentagon Papers which are now in the public domain, maintenance of further classification of "Operation Keel-

haul" cannot any longer be justified by the argument that the British Government has to give its permission to the release of purely American documents, classified twenty-one years ago by American military authorities.

Most respectfully,

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., August 24, 1971.

Mr. JULIUS EPSTEIN,
Hoover Institution, Stanford University,
Stanford, Calif.

DEAR Mr. EPSTEIN: The President has asked me to reply to your recent letter concerning the declassification of the "Keelhaul" documents.

As Mr. Tom Huston of the White House informed you in his letter of October 22, 1970, the joint US-UK origin of the Keelhaul documents requires that we have British agreement to their declassification. They have not agreed. The latest British review of the documents was undertaken as the result of a letter that you wrote to Prime Minister Heath last spring. Following that review the British told us that they still do not agree to declassification of the documents, and we understand that the British Ministry of Defense wrote to you directly to that effect. Under these circumstances, I regret that we cannot grant your request.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL B. SMITH,
Staff Assistant.

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1971]

AND A SCHOLAR GOES TO COURT

(The following remarks were delivered by Julius Epstein, a historian at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, at a National Archives conference last week in Washington.)

I'd like to make a few remarks concerning the accessibility to government documents dealing with World War II. I'll restrict myself to one single example—"Operation Keelhaul."

(Under "Operation Keelhaul," a million or more Soviet nationals in German POW camps at the end of the war were handed back against their will to Soviet authorities by the United States and Britain. It is commonly believed that they were given long camp terms, if not executed, by Stalin.)

In 1954, I discovered the existence of a documentary dossier "Forcible Repatriation of Displaced Soviet Citizens—Operation Keelhaul" in the Historical Records Section of the Army, Alexandria, Virginia. When I ordered the dossier, I was told by an embarrassed librarian that it was classified and the index card should never have been placed in the catalogue.

Since that day, I have waged a battle for the access to the Operation Keelhaul files. I was, of course, unsuccessful.

Then, the horizon brightened when President Johnson signed the so-called "Freedom of Information Act" on July 4, 1966. It went into force on July 4, 1967. I decided to test the Act in the American courts.

I filed my complaint in the District Court of San Francisco against the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stanley Resor. I maintained that the "Operation Keelhaul" file was improperly classified Top Secret and that therefore, it should be de-classified and released to the American people.

When Judge Carter raised the question in the District Court what the intent of Congress was when it created the Freedom of Information Act, I suggested to Rep. John E. Moss (D-Calif.), the main sponsor and author of the Act, to submit a sworn affidavit to the Court, Congressman Moss did this.

In his affidavit, he said, and I quote: "It was the overriding concern of Congress that disclosure be the general rule, not

the exception, that the burden be on the agency to justify the withholding of a document and not the person who requests it, that individuals improperly denied access to the documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the Courts, and that in general the statute be a disclosure statute and not a withholding statute; specifically, it was the intent of Congress to grant to the District Court the broadest latitude to review all agency acts in this regard, including the correctness of a designation by an agency bringing documents within an exemption found in Section "(e)" of the Act; and that the powers granted to the Court and the burdens placed upon the Government in Section "(c)" were meant to include rather than exclude the exemptions."

The Top Secret classification of the "Operation Keelhaul" dossier was mainly based upon President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10501, of Nov. 5, 1953, which provides that this classification, and I quote:

"... shall be authorized . . . only for defense information or material which requires the highest degree of protection. The Top Secret classification shall be applied only to that information or material the defense aspect of which is paramount and the unauthorized disclosure of which could result in exceptionally grave damage to the nation such as leading to definite break in diplomatic relations affecting the defense of the United States, an armed attack against the United States or its allies, a war, or the compromise of military or defense plans, or intelligence operations, or scientific or technological developments vital to the national defense."

I maintained in my lawsuit against the Secretary of the Army, the first of its kind in American history, that de-classification of the "Operation Keelhaul" file and release to the American people could not result in "exceptionally grave damage to the nation such as leading to a definite break in diplomatic relations" or in "outbreak of war or in the compromise of military or defense plans, or intelligence operations or scientific or technological developments vital to the national defense," the only reasons for the use of the Top Secret classification.

It was of no avail. I lost in the District Court, I lost in the Court of Appeals. Then, I filed my petition of certiorari with the Supreme Court.

On June 15, 1970, I was informed by the Supreme Court:

"The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Mr. Justice Douglas is of the opinion that certiorari should be granted. Mr. Justice Marshall took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition."

On April 22, 1971, Congressman Ashbrook of Ohio introduced House Resolution 399, asking for the creation of a Select House Committee to investigate forced repatriation, past and present and especially the unwarranted secrecy classification of the "Operation Keelhaul" file.

This resolution, now pending in Congress, may also lead to an amendment of the Freedom of Information Act in order to prevent its misinterpretation by the courts.

STATEMENT BY JULIUS EPSTEIN

Mr. Chairman: I welcome this opportunity to make a brief statement about my more than 17 year old endeavor to get access to the so-called "Operation Keelhaul" file originated in 1948. It is the official record of the American Army concerning the American-British forced repatriation of probably more than two million Soviet nationals who, under no circumstances wanted to return to Stalin's Soviet Union.

This forced repatriation, code-named by the U.S. Army "Operation Keelhaul" was, according to the Nuremberg principles, a war crime as well as a crime against humanity. It remained to this very day unredeemed.

The "Operation Keelhaul" dossier was immediately classified as Top Secret.

When the "Freedom of Information Act" was enacted in 1967, I gathered fresh hope to be allowed to see the Keelhaul dossier. I decided to test this new law in the courts.

I filed my complaint in the District Court of San Francisco.

My lawyers pointed out in their brief that classification of the Keelhaul file cannot be justified by reference to Executive Order 10501 which specifies the reasons for Top Secret classification as follows:

"(a) Top Secret. Except as may be expressly provided by statute, the use of the classification Top Secret shall be authorized, by appropriate authority, only for defense information or material which requires the highest degrees of protection. The Top Secret classification shall be applied only to that information or material the defense aspect of which is paramount, and the unauthorized disclosure of which could result in exceptionally grave damage to the Nation such as leading to a definite break in diplomatic relations affecting the defense of the United States, an armed attack against the United States or its allies, a war, or the compromise of military or defense plans or intelligence operations, or scientific or technological developments vital to the national defense."

How anybody could maintain that release of the "Operation Keelhaul" file could result in the breaking out of a war or in a break of diplomatic relation or in any other specified results of disclosure as provided by Executive Order 10501 seemed to be absurd.

Judge Carter of the San Francisco District Court was—rightfully—interested in finding out what the intent of Congress was when it was creating the Freedom of Information Act.

To answer this question, I asked Congressman Moss the Sponsor and main author of the Act to submit to the court a sworn affidavit in which he would explain what, in his opinion, the real intent of Congress was.

With the chairman's permission, I would like to read the brief Affidavit and thereby put it into the record.

I quote:

"AFFIDAVIT

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: SS

"John E. Moss, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

"That I am a United States Congressman from the State of California; that on June 9, 1955, a House Government Information Subcommittee, with myself as Chairman, was established to investigate charges that Federal agencies had withheld information from those entitled to receive it; namely, the American public; it was discovered by the subcommittee that agencies, in refusing to permit public disclosure, were citing as authority 5 U.S.C. Section 301, (as codified) which provided that the head of each department was authorized to establish regulations concerning the performances of his department and the use of its records; Congress amended that statute in 1958 to make it clear that the statute could not be relied upon as legal authority for the withholding of information from the public; the agencies, however, then began relying on the restrictive reading of Section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 552, as codified) to deny this disclosure; subsequent hearings on the availability of Government information were held by my subcommittee and by the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure; since 1957, each succeeding Congress had before it a bill to substantially revise Section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act; after nine years of hearings and debate before the two Subcommittees, Congress passed a new Public Information Law; it was the overriding concern of Congress and adopted by the Attorney General in his Memorandum on the Publication Information Section (June 1967) that dis-

closure be the general rule, not the exception, that the burden be on the agency to justify the withholding of a document and not the person who requests it, that individuals improperly denied access to the documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the Courts, and that in general the statute be a disclosure statute and not a withholding statute; specifically, it was my intent as the principal coauthor of the legislation to grant to the appropriate District Court the broadest latitude to review all agency acts in this regard, including the correctness of a designation by an agency bringing documents within the exemption found in Section '(e)' of the Act; and that the powers granted to the Court and the burdens placed upon the Government in Section '(c)' were meant to include rather than exclude the exemptions.

JOHN E. MOSS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27 day of August, 1968.

*Notary Public in and for the
District of Columbia.*

The District Court disregarded Congressman Moss' Affidavit and found that, and I quote, "the circumstances were appropriate for the classification made by the Department of the Army in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy." Unquote.

On February 19, 1969 Judge Carter pronounced his verdict in which he granted the Army's motion for a summary judgment in favor of the defendants.

How a court could find that "the circumstances were appropriate for the classification made by the Department of the Army in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy" without having seen a single document of the "Operation Keelhaul" file remains a mystery in American Judicial history.

At this point, I want to point out it seems to be clear from the legislative history that the Freedom of Information Act was intended to have the broadest and most liberal interpretation to achieve its goal of full disclosure to the public. To hold that the District Court must accept without review a Department's classification of documents so that it falls within one of the exemptions of the statute totally emasculates the statute's effect and thwarts its intended purpose. The history of the Government agencies in opposing the enactment of the Freedom of Information Act is well known and the specific documents sought in my legal action "Epstein vs. Resor" seem to be withheld more to avoid embarrassment to the Government than for legitimate reasons. But possible embarrassment is no valid reason for maintenance of classification.

After I had lost in Judge Carter's District Court, I filed my appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco.

The question before the Court of Appeals was whether the Army's claimed exemption was "arbitrary or capricious." In other words, the Appeals Court had to ascertain whether the executive has exercised its decision making prerogative in a reasonable manner.

The Ninth Circuit agreed with the District Court that the Army's claim to exemption was neither arbitrary nor capricious. The Appeals Court held that "judicial inquiry . . . does not warrant . . . in camera examination." Thus, the Ninth Circuit ruled, as did the District Court, in reaching its decision on the Army's own conclusion that it is entitled to the exemption for secrecy in the interest of national defense or foreign policy.

On February 6, 1970, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit rendered its verdict.

The Circuit Judges Merrill, Koelsch and Hufstедler, confirmed the Judgment of the District Court.

At this point, I had only one more legal

possibility. I filed a petition for a writ of certiorari in the hope that the Supreme Court of the United States would review "Epstein vs. Resor," the first test of the Freedom of Information Act in the American courts.

In the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit as well as in my petition for a writ of certiorari I was supported by the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California. The Civil Liberties Union filed Amicus Curiae briefs in both courts.

On June 15, 1970, almost exactly one year ago, my lawyer, Mr. Paul M. McCloskey, Menlo Park, California, was informed by the clerk of the Supreme Court, that, and I quote: "The Court today entered the following order in the above entitled case:

"The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Mr. Justice Douglas is of the opinion that certiorari should be granted. Mr. Justice Marshall took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition." Unquote.

By denying certiorari, the Supreme Court affirmed the miscarriage of justice in the lower courts and declared the Freedom of Information Act a dead letter.

What is to be done?

First of all, to revive the Freedom of Information Act, it should be amended by Congress.

It should be made explicitly clear in the text of the law that the exemption of non-disclosure in the interest of national defense and foreign policy can only be claimed if the classification has been properly applied. To give you one example for the obvious overclassification of documents, I want to tell you that on August 23, 1969, I received the following letter from the office of the Adjutant General Kenneth G. Wickham. I quote: "Dear Mr. Epstein: The review of the "Operation Keelhaul" file referred to in my letter of 20 December 1968 has been completed. It has been determined that four documents may be declassified. These have been declassified and copies are attached herewith for your use.

"I regret to inform you that the other documents in these files must remain classified as determined again by this latest paper-by-paper review and thus are exempt from release under the provisions of paragraph 10a AR 345-20 9 copy attached.

"If you wish, however, you may submit a final appeal in writing to the Secretary of the Army. If you decide to do this, please send your appeal to this office for transmittal to the Secretary.

"Sincerely,

"KENNETH G. WICKHAM,

Major General, USA, The Adjutant General.

The first document, declassified after twenty-one years Top Secret in the interest of national defense and foreign policy in accordance with President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10501, is a message from the Allied Command in Rome. I quote:

"Reference operation Keelhaul conversation between Captain Prall this Headquarters and Lt. Colonel Pateugill, ALCOM in Rome indicates the following:

"ALCOM is unable to furnish interpreters at Separation Points or any person who will be able to identify individuals wanted; imperative that individuals qualified to perform the above mentioned duties be furnished that Headquarters in order that mission may be accomplished." Unquote.

The "mission" referred to in the document, was, of course, the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communists to Stalin's executioners and slave labor camps.

Now, this request for more Russian interpreters was for twenty-one years considered so sensitive that it could not be declassified in the interest of foreign policy and national defense. That means that the Pentagon was for twenty-one years of the opinion that release of this ALCOM memorandum could result in immediate outbreak

of war, or in breaking of diplomatic relations, or in the compromise of intelligence data or of American technology.

If classification of a simple request for more Russian interpreters twenty-one years after it was written was not "arbitrary" and "capricious", I do not know what "arbitrary" and "capricious" means.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I would like, with your permission, to put into the Record the draft amendment, to the Freedom of Information Act as printed in the Congressional Record by Congressman Roman C. Pucinski of Chicago, on September 24, 1970.

In conclusion, I want to call your attention to House Resolution 399, introduced by Congressman Ashbrook on April 22, 1969.

H. Res. 399 asks for a full-fledged Congressional investigation of past and present forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communists to Stalin's Soviet Union.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I herewith put it in the Record.

In conclusion, I'll read the preamble of H. Res. 399 which enumerates the reasons why Congress should investigate forced repatriation which was a crime, a hundred times bigger than the massacre of My Lai. I quote:

"Whereas Operation Keelhaul (the forced repatriation to Soviet-controlled countries of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians by American military and civilian authorities in the years 1944-1947 in Germany and in other countries) brought death and misery to untold millions of these anti-Communists before Soviet firing squads, on Soviet gallows, and in the Siberian slave labor camps; and

"Whereas Operation Keelhaul cannot be justified by the agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war and civilians signed at Yalta on February 11, 1945; and

"Whereas Operation Keelhaul was in violation of the rulings in implementation of the Yalta agreement on prisoners of war and displaced persons, made public by the Department of State on March 8, 1946; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation of prisoners of war who had enlisted in the enemy's army was in contradiction to the opinions of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, as expressed during the last fifty-five years; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians represents an indelible blot on the American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation and annihilation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians of Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, Hungarian, Baltic, and other origin is still poisoning our spiritual relations with the vigorously anti-Communist peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and is therefore impeding our foreign policy; and

"Whereas the Operation Keelhaul files assembled by the Combined Chief of Staff twenty-three years ago are still classified and therefore cannot be released to the American people; and

"Whereas the legal action Epstein against Resor based upon the Freedom of Information Act and instituted to bring about the declassification and the release of the Operation Keelhaul file did not succeed; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States denied plaintiff's petition for a writ of certiorari, thereby, in effect negating the Freedom of Information Act; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has removed the main obstacle to the declassification of the Operation Keelhaul files by declaring that "The United States Government has absolutely no objection (based on the contents of the files) to the declassification of the 'Operation Keelhaul' files, however, given the joint origin of the documents, British concurrence has not been received. Thus, we have no alternative but to deny your request."; and

"Whereas the Operation Keelhaul files con-

sist to a large extent of American documents, classified by American military authorities; and

"Whereas no foreign government should have the power to deprive the American people of the opportunity to learn their own history based upon documentary evidence concerning events which occurred more than twenty-five years ago: Therefore be it Resolved, . . ."

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 19, 1971]
HISTORIANS BATTLE FOR DOCUMENTS
(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—For some 200 historians of wide renown, virtually ignored as they assembled here this week, there was a peculiar irony attached to the debate raging over the propriety of the New York Times' publication of secret papers tracing American involvement in the Viet Nam war.

All of them have been rebuffed over the years in seeking access to government records dating back to the 1930s, '40s and '50s. They arrived to find the Capitol excited over a massive 47-volume leak of classified studies covering a period in the '60s.

From Paris, London, even Moscow, these experts had been summoned to attend a conference on research problems connected with writing of the history of World War II. They met for two days in the stately edifice housing the National Archives, discussing the very issues now agitating high officials and commanding the front pages and the networks. Nobody paid them any attention.

A typical example of government obduracy was discussed by Prof. Julius Epstein of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University.

Epstein has a reputation for poking around in the dark corners and unearthing historical episodes most governments would like to conceal. Back in the '40s, his tenacity played a major role in the establishment of a select committee to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre.

In 1954, poring over records in the Army's historical records branch, Epstein discovered an index card marked "Forcible Repatriation of Displaced Soviet Citizens—Operation Keelhaul."

When he asked for the dossier, an embarrassed librarian told him the index card should never have been placed in the catalog. It dealt with "top secret" material.

"Keelhaul" means to drag a man under the keel of a moving ship. It is a form of torture and thus an apt and vivid label for the forced repatriation, from 1943 to 1947, of millions of anti-Communists, thereby doomed to slave labor camps in Stalin's Russia. British and American authorities, under orders from on high, helped carry out this degrading exercise.

In pursuit of the records, Epstein sued the Secretary of the Army all the way to the Supreme Court, losing at every step. He cited, in vain, the Freedom of Information Act of 1966, which decreed release of all records except those which could cause "exceptionally grave damage" to the nation.

When the Supreme Court refused to review adverse decisions in the lower courts, Epstein told the historians, it "declared the Freedom of Information Act a dead letter."

Last October, he saw a glimmer of hope. The White House informed him that President Nixon had no objection to declassification and release of the "Keelhaul" files. But there was a catch: Since the British were involved, their concurrence would have to be obtained.

Epstein is still waiting.

"Since the files contain many purely American documents," Epstein said, "I hope to persuade the administration that these American documents should be released. If this is denied, it amounts to admission that a foreign government has still the power to

prevent the American people from learning their own history."

Epstein's hopes now lie with a House resolution sponsored by Rep. John M. Ashbrook [R., Ohio] which would create a select committee to investigate "Operation Keelhaul."

Such an inquiry was necessary before the record could be set straight about the slaughter of thousands of Poles by the Soviets in the Katyn Forest.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems in the health field that received extensive discussion at the hearings I held in Minneapolis was the one concerning alcoholism.

Mr. William Brooks, an attorney representing the Hennepin County Task Force on Alcoholism and Inebriety, remarked that insurance programs now in effect force doctors to keep those receiving treatment for alcoholism in hospitals. It is Mr. Brooks' strong conviction that treatment centers can be established away from hospitals and at reduced cost to the community and at which those alcoholics wanting and needing treatment can receive attention. He related the three stages of treating those suffering from alcoholism to the problem of drug dependency. There is a three-stage program needed: Detoxification is the first step for alcoholism programs; a treatment program; and a supporting care program.

As Mr. Brooks pointed out, the Public Health Service has categorized alcoholism as the No. 3 public health problem in the United States today. It is apparent from Mr. Brooks' testimony that flexibility in dealing with this problem is essential since the old approach is obviously not working.

Mr. Luther Wynn also testified in support of creation of detoxification centers. He stated that 15 percent of the beds in mental hospitals are occupied by alcoholics. There are, according to his calculations, 10 million alcoholics in this country alone. In his presentation, Mr. Wynn pointed out that medical schools, in his opinion, do not train doctors to deal with the mental problems of alcoholics. It is his belief that doctors deal with physical expressions of alcoholism and are not trained to deal with the psychological aberrations that accompany these physical defects. In his observations, Mr. Wynn recommended the creation of detoxification centers throughout the United States. Present alcohol treatment tends to force men and women into hospital situations that are socially damaging. A detoxification center, according to Mr. Wynn, would be a place where an alcoholic could go to dry out and receive some initial counseling followed by further counseling later on. At present, insurance companies, according to Mr. Wynn, will not insure known alcoholics. Changes in treatment will require parallel changes in insurance coverage.

The cost for the 800 detoxification centers Mr. Wynn proposes would run approximately \$180,000 per center per year. Although in the long run this could be a substantial cost, it by no means approaches the cost borne by our society from alcoholism.

AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY ON THE ECONOMY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, a high administration official recently called AFL-CIO president George Meany a plumber. He meant the remark disparagingly, but unfortunately he does not know George Meany.

The fact is George Meany is a plumber. As a young man he was instrumental in organizing the plumbers and the rest of the laboring men of this country into a viable organization that is now able to deal with big business on an even basis. The fact that he worked at an honest trade as a young man is a credit to him and a point of pride. It is also a sign to those who deal with him that he is tough. He will not take verbal gobbledygook from big business or big Government.

Mr. Speaker, his remarks to the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry in Denver, Colo., August 2, shows this touch-minded, no-nonsense attitude of George Meany.

His statement points out in clear and precise terms exactly what has happened to the U.S. economy since January 1969. It is a sad story, indeed, and one that portends future hardship for the wage earner and working people of this Nation unless broad action is taken.

In light of the recent announcements of the President which clearly favor big business over the working man, I am sure my colleagues will find this statement of benefit.

I am proud to commend to this the remarks of my distinguished constituent, Mr. George Meany.

The statement follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL
ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, D.C., August 6, 1971.

HON. MARIO BIAGGI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARIO: It occurred to me that when you return from the recess you might want to put the enclosed speech by a distinguished citizen of the Bronx in the Congressional Record.

All the best.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,

Director, Department of Legislation.

Enclosure.

FOLLOWING IS AN ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AT THE CONVENTION OF THE UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPEFITTING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, IN DENVER, COLORADO, ON AUGUST 2, 1971

Let me say to you at the outset quite simply that I take the greatest pride in my

membership in the United Association and I am proud to be here today as a delegate representing Local No. 2 of the City of New York.

I am also happy to extend on behalf of the AFL-CIO greetings to the United Association, which is, in my opinion, one of America's outstanding trade unions—an organization which places the welfare and interests of its membership in the front line, and devotes its energies and its knowledge, during these times of tremendous scientific and technological advances, to keeping the skills of the members of the United Association abreast of the times and able to meet every demand upon them; an organization which plays its full part in developing the highest possible standards for the trade; an organization which plays its full role as part of the American trade union movement, through its membership in the AFL-CIO and through the contributions of its chief officer as a member of the Executive Council of that organization.

The number one problem that is facing the American people today is the national Administration in Washington.

It is my good fortune to be in a position for many years to observe the conduct of national affairs in Washington during the Administrations of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, and I can truthfully say to you that we have in Washington today the worst economic mess since the Hoover depression of 1930.

I must, however, in fairness give a plus to President Nixon on his Vietnam policy. He is winding down the war, which seems to the American people as a whole, something we should have never gotten into. He is winding it down; turning over the affairs of that nation to the Vietnamese people, and he must get a plus on that. But that is the end of the pluses.

He has brought home 225,000 of our troops since he took office and what kind of an economy is he bringing them home to? What are the plans for conversion to peacetime activities? What does the economic situation offer the returning veteran?

Well, let's take a good look at just where we are.

Unemployment in this country today, the national average, is over six per cent. The average for returning veterans is 13 per cent; the average for construction workers over 10 per cent; the average for blacks, over 10 per cent; the average for the new workers, or the teenagers that we should be bringing into our work force every year, the average for them is over 15 per cent.

We find the cost-of-living escalating at the highest rate in many, many years, and still going up. Interest rates hit the highest rate in over 100 years. They dropped a little during the spring, but they are now charging up again.

Of the five million people that are unemployed, literally tens of thousands are out of the market as consumers because they have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

Well, what is the attitude of this Administration toward this situation? "Everything is O.K. 1971's going to be a very good year, 1972's going to be a better year."

We hear this from the President. We hear it from Mr. Hodgson, the Secretary of Labor; from Mr. Shultz, the Budget director; and from Mr. John Connally, the friend of the oil business down in Texas—a fellow who doesn't know much about poor people.

There is no bad news of an economic nature as far as these people are concerned. No matter how bad the economic indicators come out, we are told that everything is all right, that we are on the right track.

For instance Hodgson announced a few weeks ago that there had been a reduction of six-tenths of one per cent in unemployment from the month of May to the month

of June. After some digging by some of our economists, he admitted that this was a deceiving figure, because there were 1,100,000 more people out of work in June than there were in May, and let me say to you that these figures, these official figures, do not reflect the real situation.

For instance, a person who is working part-time, he is down on the record as being fully employed. Those who have become disgusted, after months and months of seeking employment and no longer register at the employment agencies, they are put down as being employed. So, the real figure is not six per cent on a national basis. In my opinion it is more like eight or eight and a half per cent.

Let's go back a little bit and see how we got into this mess.

In January 1969, when President Nixon took office, we had reached the culmination of 94 consecutive months of continued prosperity by every economic indicator that is used in this field.

In other words, from April 1961, every month up to January 1969, showed an increase in the prosperity of this country. Unemployment was at a low figure of three per cent. 2,700,000 people were out of work out of a work force of 80,000,000.

Inflation, in 1968—the last year of President Johnson—was at 4.2 per cent. Interest rates at that time, for people purchasing homes, 5¼, 5½, 5¾ per cent. Then came Mr. Nixon, and a man by the name of Arthur Burns. Arthur Burns sits in his ivory tower. He has these theories of how things should be run and evidently he had the complete confidence of Mr. Nixon. He sat in the Cabinet meetings. He was an adviser to the President, with Cabinet rank, according to the official announcement, and he had an economic theory. The big bugaboo was inflation. Something had to be done about inflation. Something very, very drastic had to be done. So, his theory was to restrict credit; cut down on the money supply; cut budgets to the bone. But, they were going to do this without causing additional unemployment. Despite the fact that by every rule of the game when you cut down on business activity, when you restrict credit, when you make it more difficult for corporations to expand because of the cost of money, you cause more unemployment. But, oh, no; these were the miracle men; they were going to do this without causing any more unemployment.

Mr. Nixon sent a letter to the AFL-CIO Executive Council in the first week of February, 1969, two weeks after he took office, in which he spelled out in so many words that this game plan was going to stop inflation, stop the inflationary rise of prices, and it was going to do it without causing any additional unemployment.

So he signed his name to that document. At the same time, of course, he reminded us that he had promised us, too, five million new jobs in four years if he got elected.

Well, what happened? Recession set in almost immediately. Millions of people started to lose their jobs. The inflation rate, from 4.2 percent in '68 went to 5.4 percent in '69, to 5.9 percent in 1970 and at this reading it is going up at an annual rate of over 6 percent.

Interest rates, as I said, were up, making it impossible for millions of people to buy homes. We have reached an intolerable situation in the housing industry in this country where there is ten and eleven percent money—and that is what it amounts to when they add on the points. This ten percent money makes it impossible for a man with a family of four making \$15,000 a year to buy his own home. To me this is a national disgrace.

The industrial capacity of this country today is running at a rate of 75 percent. In other words, 25 percent of our tremendous industrial capacity lies idle at a time when millions of people are looking for work. The highway program is bogged down because of

lack of funds, because of a squeeze by the national Administration.

We now have 25 million people in this country living below the official government poverty level. Just think of that, 25 million people living below what the government says is the poverty level.

By the end of 1970 it was quite obvious to everybody, except the people in the White House, that the Nixon economic game plan had been a complete, miserable failure.

What about Dr. Burns, the architect of all of our troubles? What happened to him? Did he get fired for his failure, with all of the misery that it brought to millions of Americans? No. He got promoted. He was made Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

If he had been the chief economic commissioner in the Soviet Union he would have been promoted to Siberia for his failure.

Did he have the decency to apologize to the American people for the harm that was done through his plan? Did he explain the reasons for his failure? Oh, no. He doesn't even talk about it any more. He has a new technique, and in a way it's not really a new technique. He's trying to divert attention from his own mistakes and his own failure by finding a scapegoat. Who is the scapegoat? The scapegoat is organized labor, especially the building trades. We're the ones that are causing inflation. There is some irony in this situation where this egghead decides that the people who suffer most from inflation, who are the victims of it, that they are responsible for it.

Burns now tells us that unions are solely responsible for high prices. He wants the Davis-Bacon Act repealed. He wants compulsory arbitration. He wants to destroy the right to strike for all national unions. He wants to amend the minimum wage laws so that teenagers can be given jobs at something less than minimum wages, say maybe a dollar an hour; in other words, to give employers a new source of cheap labor. And all the time this is going on, we find President Nixon still sticking to his so-called game plan. In making an announcement a week or so ago, Secretary Connally said there is no change in the plan, everything is going to be okay.

Well, it reminds me of a fellow by the name of Hoover who said back in the early Thirties that prosperity was just around the corner. We got around the corner about eight years after we got rid of him.

This situation in Washington would be funny except for the tragic consequence of this stupid policy of the Administration, with more to come. As to Dr. Burns' present campaign, he seems to be saying that America's future can be based on a low-wage economy.

Well, if this should happen it would spell the end of the United States as a first-class world power. America's standing in the world today is based on its ability to produce, on a productive capacity greater than that known to any nation in all of history. That capacity enabled the United States to turn back the threat of Hitler and his mighty military machine in World War II. We supplied not only the industrial needs of our fighting forces in that war, we supplied all the industrial needs of all of our allies all over the world.

And what has been the base of this great and tremendous industrial capacity? Why have we been for so many years able to boast about the high standard of life in this country, higher than any other country in the world? Because we had in the hands of the great mass of the American people the purchasing power that is needed to buy the things that we are able to produce. That purchasing power is based on decent wages for the American workers, and what instrumentality has been responsible for that situation? The American trade union movement made the American people the best customers of American business over this last

century in this country. This policy of low wages and at the same time a policy of destroying the instrumentality that brings about decent wages in this country is something that we as trade unionists will not buy.

This situation in Washington must change or we are in real deep trouble, much more than we have seen to date. The President has the power granted by Congress two years ago to cope with many of these problems. To date he has refused to use the powers granted to him in December of 1969 by the Congress.

For instance, he could channel all of the existing credit to projects that mean jobs. He could, with these powers, bring about in a matter of hours the ceiling on interest rates. I think if there is anything this country needs, it needs a 6% ceiling on interest rates. That is enough for anybody's money.

The President is sitting on \$12 billion worth of Congressional appropriations, and Congressional authorizations for much needed work all over this country. He refuses to loosen up on these authorized funds on the ground that now is not the time to spend money in the construction industry. I have a suspicion that Mr. Nixon thinks that next year might be the right time to let this money out and create some jobs so they might have some favorable effect before November of 1972. But as far as we are concerned if the President does not act, we are going to continue to make our demands on Congress to take actions that will get us out of this economic mess.

America's future, in a word, depends on jobs. Everything we do depends on jobs. You can't have pension funds unless you have jobs, you can't have Social Security unless you have jobs, you can't have old age pensions and Medicare, you can't have schools and hospitals, you can't have housing unless there are jobs, because this is where the wherewithall comes from, both private and public, in the form of taxes, so that we can do these things.

Whether we move forward as a nation to solve these many problems, problems of clean air, clean water, housing, hospitals, schooling, depends on whether we get our industrial capacity up to where it belongs, over 90 percent, and the answer is jobs for American workers.

American labor has a stake in all of this, and we are not about to adopt the idea that low wages can bring prosperity. We know too well that the opposite is true. In addition to having a stake in maintaining this way of life, American labor has a responsibility. We are no longer a small, downtrodden minority. American labor is big business. American labor represents, with the families of our members, a substantial portion of the nation's population. We owe it to our members, yes, and we owe it to the community of which we are an integral part, to use our resources to get America moving forward again. We must of necessity, as the largest organization of private citizens in this nation, take the lead in this overall effort.

The AFL-CIO is aware of its responsibility to the society of which we are a part. We accept the challenge that presents itself in the economic mess which the Nixon Administration has brought about by its stupid and stubborn adherence to a policy that has failed.

1972 is not so far away. We have the membership, we have the will, we have the desire and we have the militancy to carry this fight to those that are leading us down the road to ruin. And we have the machinery in our COPE organization to make some changes next year. The COPE organization has done a better job each year for each of the last 16 years, and it's going to do a better job in 1972 than it did in 1970. That machinery is going to be used.

So President Nixon says 1972 is going to be a good year. COPE, I think, is going to

make that prediction come true, a good year for the people of America.

I'm sure that this great union, with its long record of contribution to the society of which we are a part, with its long record of building up the standard of life for its membership and for the neighbors of its membership, that this organization under the leadership of Marty Ward and those associated with him, are going to play their part in this overall AFL-CIO effort.

Thank you.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION IS CRITICIZED

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department's ADR—depreciation—regulations have been criticized by a dozen noted tax law authorities as being an unlawful encroachment on the congressional taxing power by the Executive. A lawsuit has been instituted in Federal District Court—Civil Action No. 1337-71, Washington, D.C.—which is to be argued by the dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, Bernard Wolfman.

The ADR regulations, if legal, would cost an average of \$3.9 billion a year and reduce corporate taxes by 6 percent, according to Treasury estimates.

In response to a letter from Ralph Nader, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has undertaken a study of the effects of ADR on Pennsylvania State tax revenues. The Commonwealth's Department of Revenue, in its letter of response to Mr. Nader, notes that ADR will cost Pennsylvania \$8 million in fiscal year 1972 and substantially more thereafter.

As the department of revenue observes with respect to ADR:

This administrative decision was made without consultation with state tax administrators. It reflects a lack of desire for meaningful federal-state relationships.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the letters from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Revenue and Ralph Nader:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Harrisburg, Pa., August 26, 1971.

Re Internal Revenue Asset Depreciation Range (ADR) Adopted and Filed with the Federal Register on June 22, 1971, as Section 1.167(a)-11.

RALPH NADER, Esquire,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NADER: Your recent correspondence and enclosures have received the consideration, evaluation and study of key personnel on my staff so that my reply could be comprehensive as well as constructively critical. This administrative decision was made without consultation with state tax administrators. It reflects a lack of desire for meaningful federal-state fiscal coordination and can create discordant federal-state relationships.

The following is submitted in the hope that some long-term change in attitudes and concepts may be accomplished:

1. *Basic Fiscal and Monetary Considerations.*

Depreciation, as an allowable deduction, is

a necessary ingredient of a net income tax system. However, depreciation, unlike a flexible rate structure, is not an appropriate fiscal ploy for national economic stimulation or retardation. Neither should it be used because there is an international problem with the parity of the dollar and the foreign trading currencies.

The state and certain local governmental revenues are dependent upon corporate net income tax levies so that sudden, violent changes in allowable depreciation must cause acute state and local fiscal problems. Certainly economic, fiscal and monetary methods permit national policy changes without creating damage to the states. At the very least, the federal government should not unilaterally, without consultation with the states, adopt major tax changes which have a significant deleterious effect upon state revenues.

2. *Analysis of the Asset Depreciation Range (ADR).*

The Internal Revenue Service development of ADR is a historical offshoot of the depreciation guidelines established in Revenue Procedure 62-61. Insofar as ADR and Revenue Procedure 62-21 were and are intended to reduce conflict between tax officials and taxpayers over individual asset lives by the development of approximately seventy-five (75) industry groups, we agree this is a step in the right direction. However, coupled with this effort, is a substantial liberalization of depreciation rates by approximately twenty percent (20%) reduction in the allowable life span of the assets. It is this latter change and accelerated first year write-off that will have the greatest impact upon state corporate net income tax revenues; this should not have been prepared without prior consultation with the affected states and interim funding or "block" grants to the states.

The ADR also reduces salvage value thereby increasing the total amount of potential asset depreciation base. This has been a constant source of dispute between I.R.S. agents and taxpayers and has certain beneficial tax administration reasons behind its implementation. The ADR also permits a percentage formula for allowance of certain repairs to depreciable assets and this likewise eliminates a vexatious area from contention between taxpayers and I.R.S. agents. The two changes discussed in this paragraph have substantial merit from a tax administration viewpoint and are sustainable administrative decisions. (The change regarding the tax-free sale of certain depreciable assets is minor in revenue impact.)

3. *Basic Policy and Political Considerations.*

The first defect is that administrative rule making instead of congressional enactment was used for major non-tax considerations. This is a method that deprives the state governments and other affected groups and persons from recourse to their elected groups and persons from recourse to their elected representatives and meaningful public hearings. The net result of such conduct is to deepen public suspicion of the conduct of important matters by the executive branch of the federal government. Certainly Congress would have been more responsive to and more responsible toward the sovereign states and their indicated needs.

4. *Revenue Impact Upon the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.*

Our Division of Research and Statistics advises that in the 1971-1972 fiscal year the corporate net income tax is reduced by approximately eight (8) million dollars (twenty million dollars in 1972-73 fiscal year and increasing to approximately sixty million dollars in 1975-76 fiscal year.)

5. *Summary and Conclusion.*

While certain aspects of the ADR are administratively feasible and fiscally sound, the liberalization of rates and accelerated first

year write-offs are not sustainable using sound tax administration concepts. Even if the international and national fiscal and economic goals are necessary, the means used to obtain them are unreasonable, unnecessary and represent an unwarranted impingement upon state revenue raising sources.

If we can be of any further assistance, please advise me.

Sincerely,

VINCENT X. YAKOWICZ,
Deputy Secretary for Taxation.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE NATION'S GOVERNORS,
MAYORS, AND COUNTY EXECUTIVES

GENTLEMEN: The national debate over the Treasury Department's accelerated depreciation (so-called "ADR") regulations has focused on the Treasury's authority to cut Federal corporate taxes by three to four billion dollars annually without congressional approval. In effect, the ADR regulations allow corporations to write off machinery much faster than it is actually used up. One aspect that has not received the attention it deserves is the effect of Federal accelerated depreciation on State and local corporate tax revenues and local property tax revenues.

The corporate income tax is an extremely important State revenue source. In 1969 it yielded \$3.2 billion to all State governments. Although the Treasury has conceded that its new regulations will cut Federal corporate income taxes by about six percent, it has neglected to calculate the additional State and local tax loss.

For instance, the State of California Franchise Tax Board, in its statement of opposition to ADR, estimated that the new regulations may deprive California of 30 to 40 million dollars annually in corporate tax revenues. Thirty-two other States also have corporate tax systems based on the Federal Internal Revenue Code and Regulations. Some of these States provide alternative depreciation provisions which may be selected by the Taxpayer. For example, California stands to lose the 30 to 40 million dollars because of inevitable claims by corporations that the ADR system is a reasonable depreciation allowance. As one California Franchise Tax Board official explained, the State will most probably concede the point rather than have the entire matter in doubt during protracted litigation. Cities with corporate taxes patterned after the Federal Code may also lose sizeable revenues.

In other words, unilateral Federal action is about to cost States a large amount of revenue each year, without meaningful participation by the States in that decision. Indeed, there was not even any notice of the impact—the minimum intergovernmental courtesy that could be expected.

Less obviously, but just as importantly, ADR could also deprive localities of substantial property tax revenue. Treasury officials and private economists estimate that the ADR regulations will allow assets to be depreciated about four percent per year more quickly than at current rates. Although the practice is questionable, assessors frequently use IRS depreciation values for property tax purposes.

Therefore, the nationwide tax base loss for depreciable business property—the decrease of taxable property—could be substantial. Furthermore, the loss will not be spread evenly. Rather, it will be concentrated in heavily industrialized areas such as Chicago, Gary, Cleveland, and Newark.

It is almost impossible for the concerned citizen, however well informed, to calculate the overall loss to State and local governments because of Treasury's decision to impose ADR without statutory authority and meaningful public participation. Even knowledgeable assessors, for example, are unable to determine precisely the effect of

ADR on property evaluation across the nation. On the basis of conservative estimates, the State and local corporate and property tax revenue loss may be over \$220 million a year, but this must be accepted as a rough calculation.

I urge you to request the Treasury Department to calculate precisely how much money the ADR regulations will cost State and local governments, broken down by State. In view of the Treasury decision of June 22 to issue the regulations in final form, your request should be expedited.

Furthermore, I would urge that you insist that the Treasury inform routinely State and local governments of the costs to your tax systems of future tax proposals by the Treasury. The close relationship between the Treasury and its small group of corporate constituents should not be allowed to continue such decisive and secret determination of tax decisions affecting all the people. Our States and local governments, and the American public in general, have a right to be fully informed about the consequences of the Treasury's regulatory reshaping of our tax systems. Your comments and suggestions with regard to the above matter are most welcome.

Sincerely,

RALPH NADER.

APPENDIX

A. Corporate income tax

The following calculations are based on rough estimates. Nevertheless, they are in substantial accord with the initial projections of several State Directors of Revenue. The Treasury Department will be able to provide more accurate figures.

The California Franchise Tax Board estimates that ADR will cost the State 30-40 million dollars in corporate income tax revenues. In 1969, California derived 593 million from this source. Therefore, the loss represents 5% of annual corporate tax revenues.

In California, 35 million dollars is enough revenue to finance:

- the budget for the free textbook program for over one year
- the budget of the California Department of Justice for two years
- the budget of the Department of Parks and Recreation for two years
- 40% of the budget of the California State Highway Patrol for one year.

A 5% loss would deprive the following States of the indicated amounts of revenue:

State	Revenue lost per year	Total revenue, 1969
New York.....	\$32,000,000	\$610,000,000
Pennsylvania.....	14,000,000	284,000,000
Michigan.....	11,000,000	217,000,000
Massachusetts.....	9,000,000	185,000,000
New Jersey.....	8,000,000	157,000,000

Using conservative figures, the total corporate income tax lost to all States would amount to 155 million per year.

B. Property Tax

Knowledgeable assessors do not know precisely how ADR will affect local property tax revenues. The total effect depends entirely on how many taxing jurisdictions use IRS depreciated value as the base value for property tax purposes. For example, in Indiana, the regulations of the State Tax Commission provide that IRS depreciated value shall be used to determine the value of depreciable assets for property tax purposes. Assessors admit that this procedure is followed in practice in other states. Only Treasury has the resources to determine precisely how much this practice is used around the United States.

Assuming that IRS depreciated value is used in some taxing jurisdictions, accelerated

depreciation could affect local tax revenue in the following way.

In 1970, local revenue from property taxes on business personally came to approximately \$3 billion. Suppose only 75% of this revenue were derived from depreciable assets, and only 75% of these depreciable assets were located in areas using IRS depreciated value. This would leave \$1.7 billion of revenue potentially affected by ADR. By using an average national property tax rate of 2.5%, one can see that the tax base from which this revenue was derived is close to 70 billion dollars (\$1.7 billion is 2.5% of \$70 billion). ADR will reduce this tax base. Treasury officials estimate that ADR will reduce tax values by 4%. Thus, the tax base will decline by 2.8 billion per year (4% of \$70 billion). The annual revenue loss to all local governments will therefore be \$70 million (2.5% of 2.8 billion).

C. Therefore, based on a first order approximation, ADR will create a total State and local revenue loss of over 225 million dollars per year.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
FRANCHISE TAX BOARD,
Sacramento, Calif., April 8, 1971.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Internal Revenue Building,
Washington, D.C.

Attention: CC:LR:T:

Pursuant to the Notice of Proposed Rule Making published in the Federal Register on March 12, 1971, we offer the following comments with respect to the regulations entitled "Depreciation Allowances Using Asset Depreciation Range System" which you propose to prescribe.

We submit that the proposed regulations are inconsistent with sound tax policy. It has long been recognized that the fundamental principle underlying depreciation is to spread the cost of a depreciable asset over the period which the asset is expected to be useful to the taxpayer. The function of this principle is to reflect accurately the taxpayer's income for the taxable year, based upon rational and accepted methods of depreciation accounting. This principle has been recognized by the Internal Revenue Service, the business community, the accounting profession and eminent scholars of income tax law. The proposed regulations, if adopted, would destroy this basic principle and would establish an undesirable precedent of using depreciation allowances as a tool of fiscal policy.

One of the reasons given for the proposed regulation is to promote economic growth. The reason is based on the assumption that liberalization of depreciation, as proposed, will produce the desired result. Whether this is true or not, it does not seem equitable to, in effect, give a tax cut to a special group without specific statutory authority.

Once promulgated, the regulations will become permanent with the consequence that they will be extremely difficult to eliminate. The result would be the perpetuation of an undesirable tax policy similar to the percentage depletion given to the extractive industry.

The depreciation provisions of the tax laws of the State of California are patterned after Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code. It is possible that California may be required to allow comparable depreciation if the proposed regulations are adopted. The ramifications of such allowance for California will be an annual loss of revenue ranging from 30 to 40 million dollars. There are many other states which have a similar problem.

For the reasons expressed above, we respectfully urge that adoption of the proposed regulations be rejected.

MARTIN HUFF,
Executive Officer.

**NASHVILLE RESIDENT RECEIVES
THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED
CROSS' HIGHEST AWARD**

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for a second time this week, I was pleased to learn that a Nashvillian will be receiving the American National Red Cross' highest award for life-saving heroism, the Certificate of Merit.

On July 25, 1971, Tennessee State Trooper Herchel W. Winstead was patrolling Highway I-24 when a motorist stopped him, asking help for his 19-month-old son. The child had been running a high fever, began convulsing, and stopped breathing. Trooper Winstead, a 7-year patrol veteran whose training had included Red Cross mouth-to-mouth resuscitation methods, put his training to use and revived the boy. When the ambulance carrying the infant reached the hospital, the crisis was passed. The child was breathing on his own.

Trooper Winstead could not say definitely how long it took to restart the boy's breathing.

"Maybe 8-10 seconds, but it seemed like forever," he said. "I was just glad I could save the boy's life."

The attending physician said Trooper Winstead's actions did just that.

They "allowed this child to continue life as a normal youngster," he noted.

When asked his feelings concerning his action and the award, Trooper Winstead took a humble view.

"Sometimes on things like this my emotions get choked up. I'm just glad to be worthy of the award and glad to have done this thing," he said.

Trooper Winstead's act truly deserves this recognition. Saving a life must surely be the greatest service any man can render.

THE AMERICAN
NATIONAL RED CROSS,

Washington, D.C., September 7, 1971.

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Once again I write to call your attention to a meritorious action taken by another one of your constituents. In this instance, State Trooper Herchel W. Winstead, 158 Tusculum Road, Nashville, Tennessee 37211, has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. You will recall this is the highest award given by the American National Red Cross to a person who saves, or attempts to save, a life by using skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft, or water safety course. Presentation will be made by the Nashville-Davidson County Chapter in Nashville.

On July 25, 1971, Trooper Winstead, who has been trained in Red Cross first aid, was patrolling Highway I-24 when he was stopped by a motorist whose 19-month-old child was suffering from a high temperature, had gone into convulsions and stopped breathing. The Trooper gave mouth-to-mouth resuscitation immediately, and revived the child. An ambulance transported the baby to a hospital. The attending physician stated: "The rapid institution of emergency measures and resuscitation have allowed

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

this child to continue on as a normal youngster."

This action by Trooper Winstead exemplifies the highest ideal of the concern of one human being for another who is in distress.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. ELSEY.

SAME OLD STORY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Department of Economic Development recently made a job projection for our State for 1980.

Many of our people, including Editor Curtis Warnke of the Wood Lake News, were shocked by the figures revealed in the study. It showed, for instance, that while jobs in Minnesota would show a 23-percent increase in 1980 over 1968, agricultural employment is expected to show a 33-percent decrease.

Mr. Speaker, as Editor Warnke points out, this trend must not be allowed to continue if we are to save our countryside.

I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues and all of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

SAME OLD STORY!

With the flashy news headlines of the past week, you quite likely missed it, but it's just as significant to us here in Wood Lake as is the flight to the moon, the railroad strike, the threatened steel strike, or any of the other sensational news stories being told. We refer to the new report put out by the Minnesota Department of Economic Development on employment trends in this state.

We were not overly shocked by their prediction of fewer farmers in Minnesota by 1980—but we were quite shocked by their predicted percentage decrease. It should be cause for alarm on all of our parts—those of us who make a living and live in rural Minnesota.

The report states that employment in Minnesota will reach 1.91 million in 1980, a 23 percent increase over 1968. This 1.91 million job projection for 1980 means there will be a net increase of 362,000 jobs over 1968. The report goes on to point out that this figure rises to 498,000 when shifts in employment patterns are taken into account.

What are these shifts they refer too? Well, pure and simple agriculture will be the heaviest loser. In agriculture, employment is expected to drop from the 1968 total of 157,000 workers to 121,000—a 33 percent decrease. Now if that isn't cause for alarm, we don't know what is!

It continues to amaze us that our federal government continues to cry crocodile tears for the giant trusts and corporations, but won't lift one finger to help out the little fellow who really needs it. When the Penn Central Railroad goes bankrupt, people in high places jump on the band wagon to bail them out—even though it's a gigantic multi-million dollar operation that should be in a position to help themselves. Now certain "higher-ups" are clamoring to borrow Lockheed Aircraft millions and millions of dollars worth of taxpayers dollars to bail them out of their financial mess. The story goes on and on, and on—it just makes us sick!

If a good share of the people who were forced off the land and into the big cities were still farming we wouldn't be in the mess

September 15, 1971

we are today! It's strange our great leaders can't see this—at times it almost looks like they don't want to!

We don't care what kind of a direct payment subsidy the federal government would have to set up to reverse this trend—all we want is for them to do it, and the sooner the better!

Moon flights, big city strikes, open-air rock festivals, baseball, corporation bankruptcies, and a visit to Communist China—these get the headlines. In the meantime rural America, which is still the backbone and strength of this Republic, continues, unsensationally, to smother economically!! We dislike painting pictures of gloom, and never have liked saying: "We Told You So!"; but that's exactly what's going to be the case—just as sure as we are sitting here in a small country print shop, in Wood Lake, in Minnesota, in rural America—and even though we all have the eyes, ears and brains to see it coming! Don't you think it's time we woke up?

CURTIS B. WARNEK.

POLAND

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that almost a third of a century has passed since World War II began. On September 1, 1939, the forces of Nazi Germany invaded neighboring Poland. This invasion occurred but 9 days after Communist Russia and National Socialist Germany had signed a nonaggression pact, the alliance that gave Adolf Hitler a green light.

Poland's fate was inevitable, despite the heroic resistance put up by her fighting men against the overwhelmingly superior might of her powerful neighbor. Not only was she doomed from the start, she was caught between the jaws of a closing vise, for Nazi Germany's ideological bedfellow, the Soviet Union, invaded Poland from the East on September 17.

Declarations of war on September 3 against Germany by the erstwhile appeasers, Great Britain, and France, had no effect as far as the victim of invasion was concerned. Polish resistance ended on October 5. Six long years had to elapse before national socialism, along with fascism, came to an inglorious end. Unfortunately for Poland, one form of totalitarianism was replaced by another, as the Soviet Union, the chief beneficiary of the Yalta agreements, soon added Poland to its collection of satellites.

While the country where World War II began was freed from domination by Nazism as a result of the defeat of Hitler, it has suffered for five times as long under Stalin and his successors. The most important difference between the Nazis and the Communists is that the former were eliminated after 6 years, while the latter are firmly in command in Poland 32 years after its invasion from both East and West.

Mr. Speaker, history teaches us, not to despair, but to hope. Communism, like nazism, fascism, and other evils that have gone down to final defeat, will eventually learn that its days, too, are numbered. Like other Satanic forces, it contains the seeds of its own destruction.

THE COMMUNIST INTRIGUE
IN CYPRUS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, just over 11 years ago, Cyprus, the fabled "island of Aphrodite" won independence from the British Empire. In stark contrast to its idyllic heritage, the divided republic has suffered continual strife between its Greek and Turkish communities. Undoubtedly the biggest gainer from the past decade of tumultuous self-government is the island's powerful Communist movement, whose activities go largely unreported in the United States. Smoothly infiltrated into virtually every aspect of Cypriot life, the movement is spearheaded by AKEL, the Progressive Party of the Working People, one of the strongest free world Communist parties completely loyal to the Soviet Union. This little known story has now been told in a book by T. W. Adams entitled "AKEL: The Communist Party of Cyprus," recently published by the Hoover Institution Press of Stanford University.

An obvious mark of Russia's interest in Cyprus—called by some pessimists the "Cuba of the Mediterranean"—as well as the Soviet concentration on the shifting military balance in the middle sea, was Archbishop Makarios' state visit to Moscow this past June. The visit showed how necessary it is for neutralist Cyprus to acknowledge the legitimate interests of Communist power in that part of the world. It was also dramatic evidence that the Greek-Cypriot controlled government will travel a long road to keep its independent status precariously balanced as it is between the big power blocs.

Cyprus has increasing strategic significance to Soviet policymakers as they try to spread their influence and simultaneously deny that of America—westward through the Mediterranean, to Malta and Arab North Africa among others. A legal and respected Communist movement in a politically sensitive area redounds to the prestige of the Soviet Union. Cyprus has one of the two legal parties in the Eastern Mediterranean—the other is in Israel—and Moscow seldom misses a chance to use Cypriot comrades in very subtle ways to fan the fire of the island's crisis in the face of U.S. diplomats. How the U.S.S.R. exploits a legal Communist Party both inside and outside of a key nonaligned country, is one of the critical subjects Dr. Adams analyzes in his new book "AKEL: The Communist Party of Cyprus."

The book is the first comprehensive study in English by an author who is neither Greek nor Turk in his ancestry. Thus this book contains none of the usual ethnic bias, but rather concentrates on the lessons to be learned from a little-known microcosm of Communist activity in the Middle East. It not only provides a fascinating history of the movement since the early 1920's, but also gives an in-depth analysis of the party's

strategy and tactics during its stormy life in the island. The author unravels the secret organization of the party and its web of front groups—such as AKEL's control of the largest and most effective labor union. He vividly describes the personalities of party leaders and their active interests in the island's press and business life. Dr. Adams lucidly dissects Communist political strategy in confronting such thorny and unresolved issues as:

1. *enosis* (union with Greece);
2. cooperation with the nationalistic government of Makarios;
3. appealing to the Turkish community that comprises 18% of the island's population; and
4. relations with the Soviet Union, the East European bloc and with other non-ruling communist parties in the world.

Statistically AKEL is remarkable in several respects. It polled 40 percent of the total vote in the second island-wide parliamentary elections in 1970 which increased its seats by 80 percent, from five deputies to nine in a 35-member legislature. Admittedly there was voter apathy, but these results stand as a grim reminder that AKEL is the best organized political party in Cyprus and can routinely turn out its sympathizers to vote.

If one can trust the claims as far as card carrying members are concerned, AKEL may well be on a percentage basis the largest Communist Party in the free world today. Published figures show that some 14,000 Cypriots are supposedly dues-paying members of AKEL and the figure is stable, not having changed appreciably in the last 5 years.

Divided by recent estimates of the adult population, the size of the Cypriot party would be 4.1 percent, which is larger than that of the Communist Party of Italy and approaches that of some Communist control countries. If correct, then Cyprus might well have over 50 percent of all the admitted Communists living in the Eastern Mediterranean today. Why so big and influential a party in so small a country is a good question. Dr. Adams is able to show in the findings from his exhaustive field research just how the Communists were able to appeal so effectively to a largely bourgeois population in one of the richer developing countries.

In the larger picture of the Mediterranean power equation, Cyprus offers the Russians several advantages. First, it is potentially a lethal wedge that can be driven between the mainland mother countries of Greece and Turkey or what now amounts to the southeastern flank of NATO. Second, Cyprus is conceivably a targeted port of call for Soviet military vessels in the Eastern Mediterranean which have grown an estimated tenfold in the last 5 years, while the U.S. 6th Fleet has struggled to keep its same size. If the Makarios government is anxious to keep up its good relations with Moscow, they may have to pay a price in the future, the least of which may well be "coaling station" rights for Russian ships in Cypriot ports. And third, the Russians will do all they can to bring pressure to bear on the Makarios government to keep up its campaign against the two British bases on Cyprus, which

were retained by the United Kingdom as "sovereign areas" at the time of Cypriot independence.

These bases were used by the British to land troops in Jordan during the crisis of 1958, when American marines were landed in Lebanon. After the British withdrawal east of Suez at the end of this year, the two bases in Cyprus will gain even more importance as staging areas for the defense of British, and American interests, in the Middle East.

Recent high-level NATO talks in Lisbon between Athens and Ankara are rumored to have arrived at a solution for Cyprus that, if necessary, will bypass the Archbishop. This probably caused understandable uneasiness with Makarios and brought about his "policy of despair" that inspired his visit to Moscow. After securing Russia's diplomatic support, President Makarios disclosed that the Athens government had tried to force him to accept a Hobson's choice solution which would have honored most of the Turkish demands regarding local autonomy for its community in the island.

If developments lead to the introduction of the Soviet Union as the defender of Cypriot independence, then it may be too late for everyone—American, British, Cypriots, Greeks, and Turks—to find an answer to the most painful question: How and why have things gone so far?

Dr. Adams concludes that a political setback in Cyprus would indeed be a matter of concern for the West. Heightening tension in the island compounded by the Soviet element places the already powerful Communist movement in Cyprus in a new and critical light. The importance of the Soviet involvement in Cyprus, and how this fits in with their overall strategy for the Mediterranean, is a subject that must be made known if the American public is to understand the urgency of the threat of communism to vital Western interests in this region of the world.

SOVIET MILITARY RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT—PART XI

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in presenting evidence in support of the existence of a military research and development gap between the United States and the Soviet Union the Defense Department has stated that—

The Soviet space program, according to our best information, has remained at an essentially constant level since about 1968.

It is claimed that all increases in Soviet R. & D. funding since 1968 have gone into rapidly expanding R. & D. in the military sector, "after a period of about 6 years in which the growth went into the space sector." The hypothesis of a leveled off or declining Soviet space effort is thus a crucial part of DOD's theory that the Soviets are today outspending the United States by some \$3 billion in military R. & D.

Officials of the National Aeronautics

and Space Administration take a somewhat different attitude toward the Soviet space program from that of the Defense Department. For example, Dr. George Low, Acting Administrator of NASA, told the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences on March 17, 1971, that—

It seems fair to say that they are maintaining and increasing their program effort.

Dr. James C. Fletcher, Administrator of NASA, informed the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 23, 1971, that—

All that we have been able to learn about Soviet recent space endeavors suggests continued growth.

In order to try to obtain a clearer picture of Soviet space budget trends and to stimulate further examination of this question and the associated issue of Soviet military R. & D. funding, I have asked Dr. Charles S. Sheldon II, Chief, Science Policy Research Division, Congressional Research Service, to prepare a preliminary assessment of possible growth trends in the Soviet civil and military space program. Dr. Sheldon is a widely respected authority on Soviet space activities and perhaps the best informed American expert in this field outside of the intelligence community.

Dr. Sheldon's paper is an exercise in budget estimation with a minimum of detailed information to support his calculations, and hence the conclusions are tentative and heavily qualified and need to be read in terms of the significant limitations that are inherent in such estimates. With that understood, it is interesting to note Dr. Sheldon's conclusions:

The fundamental point is that the record of Soviet flights continuing to occur in both civil and military categories does not reflect any downward movement in level of activity; it continues to grow. There is no evidence from these data to encourage a belief that either the Soviet civil or the Soviet military space budget has turned downward . . . The conclusion in this analysis supports a view that the Soviet space budgets, military and civilian, are still growing.

It may be hoped that Dr. Sheldon's paper will encourage wider discussion and lead to additional clarification and refinement of estimates of Soviet space and military R. & D. funding.

In addition to Dr. Charles Sheldon's analysis of September 8, 1971, "Possible Overall Trends in the Soviet Space Program: A Preliminary Assessment," I am inserting in the RECORD the statements of NASA officials Dr. George Low and Dr. James C. Fletcher on this subject. It should be noted that several charts contained in these materials could not be reproduced in the RECORD:

POSSIBLE OVERALL TRENDS IN THE SOVIET SPACE PROGRAM

A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT
(By Charles S. Sheldon II)

A. INTRODUCTION TO METHODOLOGIES FOR COMPARISONS

1. Physical comparisons

People frequently ask for a measure of the size of the Soviet space program for purposes of comparison with that of the United States. Some overall approximations in physical terms can be derived because the counts

on number of successful launches are precisely determinable. Qualitative comparisons are more difficult because the transition from number of launches, to rocket thrust and payload weight, to payload complexity, to scientific findings and practical values of flights become progressively more difficult, for reasons both of sparser data and of wider latitude in judgments of an arbitrary nature.

2. Monetary comparisons

An alternative is to attempt a monetary approach to comparisons between nations and to evolutionary trends over time. This is even more difficult, both for reasons of dearth of data and because of conceptual problems in making such measures. If it could be done, consolidated figures in dollar equivalents would have the advantage of outward simplicity by obscuring the "apples and oranges" comparisons which in fact must be made.

Despite these shortcomings, overall comparisons between the United States and the Soviet Union make some sense because both countries are conducting large space programs with essentially the same technology and with much the same overall scope of program aims and flight missions undertaken. This is true even if there are some differences of design philosophy and of individual priorities within their respective programs.

Even if the Russians did publish ruble data, one would have to be aware that their pricing system is different from ours in that the prices applied to physical resources and labor in one part of their economy may not be the same as in another part; the Soviet Government can fix such prices for its own accounting purposes as a way of allocating resources and manpower not linked to the market mechanisms used in this Nation.

Hence, although ruble figures, if available, would have some meaning, they would not have the same meaning as do corresponding financial data in the United States. And further, if one were to attempt a conversion of such ruble data into dollar equivalents, that would be made extremely difficult because no single dollar/ruble exchange rate would reflect either the real values or the actual resources employed on a comparable basis.

3. Budget comparisons

Recently, despite these inherent difficulties in making financial comparisons between the two countries, some analysts believe they have found new insights into this mysterious world of intangibles by a study of the Soviet budget, even though the specific amount spent for space has not been separately identified by the Russians. Overall figures have been published for Soviet science which may be meaningful (but subject to the cautions expressed above). Some other related specific figures are given in the Soviet budget. By a process of matching and subtracting known amounts, there remain some unaccounted-for residuals in the larger totals, which presumably represent a lump sum for the more secret work in military R & D and in space. These analysts have apparently examined visible physical space activity and concluded that roughly from 1961 to 1967, such heavy allocations must have been made to space that the remaining share for military R & D was virtually constant during these years. They believe that from 1967 to 1971, following an apparent Soviet decision not to race the United States to land men on the Moon, the civilian space component leveled off at about \$5 billion a year (a hypothetical figure, considering the conceptual problems already enumerated), and the substantial growth in the science budget and budget residuals reflected a renewed upward push in military R & D.

One cannot really challenge the budget analysis approach without much more data, and it certainly seems to be one more useful tool in analyzing what is inherently obscure and difficult. But one can feel a certain con-

cern that the division of part of the Soviet budget between civilian space work and military R & D may ultimately depend upon subjective judgments as to Soviet space intentions. These intentions, interpreted to mean that previously growing Soviet ambitions in space exploration have been cut back, could be matched by contradictory evidence both of Soviet declarations of determination to expand their space program and to continuing appearance over the last four years of new programs and hardware in support of these growing ambitions. However, judgments either way with regard to coming years can only be tested over time by study of actual launches and flights as they unfold.

4. Mixed physical and derived monetary comparisons

Still another approach is to draw inferences between space launches and the related budget data. One difficulty in linking the known and visible record of actual launches with the financial measures of resource commitment is that varying leadtimes may exist between program onset and ultimate space launch. Only if the beginning of expenditures and end results in launches have a degree of regularity and consistency can a wholly meaningful set of relationships be developed which can be applied in different years and in different national programs. The U.S. program, even with its shifting priorities, does have a noticeable and fairly regular link between size of space expenditures and number of space launches over time. The question is: If the United States data shows a linkage which seems almost to transcend the differences in leadtimes and the sharp changes of decisions to pursue certain programs, can we infer a similar parallel in the Soviet space program? In other words, having analyzed the relationship between launches and budget dollars in the United States, can we approximate the trends, if not the absolute size, of the Soviet space budget from the number of actual launches conducted?

Such an indirect approach is necessitated because the Russians do not publish either ruble figures for their space budget, or any overall physical index of space activity. The techniques about to be described do not necessarily contradict the recent budget analysis studies. But they do offer an alternative approach to coping with the unknown—the real Soviet budget for space. The methodology which will presently be applied is not defended as giving a real measure; but perhaps it can represent one more look at the Soviet mystery. It is not offered as a way to translate Soviet space investments into dollar equivalents. But to the extent that a pragmatic correlation has been found between U.S. space launches and U.S. space expenditures, then perhaps we may at least obtain a feel for trends in the Soviet space budget from their published data on space launches. This analysis is offered as an exercise in such comparisons.

5. Pricing Soviet programs in U.S. terms

The approach just referred to is far less ambitious in analysis time and effort than a study of budget data, or than cumulating the price in dollar equivalents of each known or estimated Soviet program element to show what they would cost if conducted in this country. Pricing in U.S. terms the elements of the Soviet program has some virtues for overall comparisons, but faces its own difficulties because of differences in practice between the two countries. For example, the Soviet program may have some economies from less duplication in research, manufacturing, and facilities, as compared with the United States where many companies and several agencies all battle for the available programs. On the other hand, the Soviet economy overall has a lower productivity than does the U.S. economy, with possible

negative consequences for the resources and labor costs of their space program. This latter disadvantage probably is offset in part by the high priority given to such activities as space which result in the assignment of the more productive factors in the Soviet economy to space work.

6. Comparison of GNP shares related to space

One other general approach to the direct comparison question can be limited to estimating the relative shares of GNP which each nation generates in its respective space program. This falls well short of the detailed pricing of programs. Under this more general analysis, it is noted that most studies infer the size of the Soviet GNP as slightly less than half that of the United States. In 1966, the U.S. space program was at its financial and operational peak, and then was accounting for about one percent of U.S. GNP. Today, the Soviet space program, whether measured in terms of number of launches or the weight of payload, is running as high or higher than did the U.S. program before it was cut back. Hence, in real terms, it may be that the Soviet program is absorbing as much as two percent of Soviet GNP, recognizing there is an area of uncertainty as to the true percentage. Certainly as a share of the resources available to the total Soviet economy, their space program is given an even higher priority than the U.S. program once commanded, because of the greater relative share of resources assigned to it.

7. Division of space programs between civil and military components

The easiest approach to study of the national space programs of the two countries is to compare them as totalities. The division between civilian and military efforts is somewhat arbitrary because such work is often interwoven. The same rockets, the same facilities may be pointed toward both military and civil work, and even a given flight may serve both objectives. Certainly much the same technology can support both kinds of efforts. The arbitrary nature of the division into military and civilian space work applies to a degree in the United States, and for this reason, our Government conducts various coordinated and shared programs in the interests of economy of effort. In the Soviet case, we know less about the specifics of their detailed space organizational structures, but we are aware of both civilian and military participation.

Over recent years several studies published by Congress have attempted to find ways to provide a separation of Soviet space launches between military and civilian goals, and the results while imperfect and only approximate probably give us a general indication of missions for these two broad categories. The approach generally has been to argue that those missions of the U.S. Department of Defense which since late 1961 have not publicly been described in detail must serve specialized military purposes, while another smaller group of DoD launches are accompanied by detailed press releases describing the technology or science goals or applied purposes, such as for communications, which have close parallels in the civilian space program.

These latter types can be lumped with the launches of NASA as not inherently military. Then by examining the Soviet space program, which for the most part does not include a detailed description of the specific purposes of their ubiquitous Kosmos launches, one can build tables of probable flight missions whose orbital characteristics and flight performance most closely resemble the repetitive character without published findings of the DoD "sensitive" programs. This makes it possible to provide a rough idea of what proportion of each nation's launch activity goes into "civil" and "military" categories. Such ambiguous flights as for communications in either country are counted as civil, even if they serve both purposes. This is admittedly arbitrary, but is about all that we have.

B. DEVELOPMENT OF COMPARISON TABLES

1. An overall comparison

Let us examine in Table 1 the actual record by years of total launch "successes" of the United States and of the Soviet Union. These are firm data. Let us also add the U.S. data on actual space expenditures (by fiscal years, but still roughly corresponding in time), which are also fairly well established. We could, of course, attempt a conversion of number of launches into pounds of payload by a study of the estimated capabilities of each U.S. and Soviet launch vehicle, figuring this capacity to some nominal orbit. This has not been attempted in this paper directly, because this involves another set of assumptions in the absence of published data in both the United States and the Soviet Union. Further, pounds of payload may not necessarily correlate exactly with costs of programs any more than number of flights do.

As a partial corrective to reflect in some degree the changing complexity of space programs and the growth of ambitiousness of flights, the U.S. launches for each year have been divided into the corresponding budget total for the matching fiscal year, to arrive at a prorated budget share per launch. This is not the same as the cost of the flight, because the prorated cost includes all overhead charges and also reflects other non-launch activities. There is, of course, an element of general price inflation also entailed. Launch costs per pound of payload have gone down over time because of launch vehicle progress to offset the price inflation, although this is not revealed in these data. Even so, this prorata calculation tells something about the trends in the U.S. program.

The next step in analysis entails perhaps a leap in logic. It assumes that the fairly close correlation between the number of launches in the United States and the size of the U.S. space budget may be matched by a corresponding relationship in the Soviet Union. The parallel nature of the two programs in terms of growth of capabilities and size of effort gives us an excuse, at least, to test what such a logic does to the calculations. Having developed an annual prorated budget-share-per-launch trend for the United States, it is assumed a similar trend, estimated by the inspection of the U.S. data, but smoothed in the interest of simplicity, may exist in the Soviet program. Deliberately no such label as "dollar equivalent" or

"ruble" has been applied to the Soviet hypothetical prorated trend column, to minimize the temptation to make a direct quantitative financial comparison between the two countries. The physical comparison of number of flights is the only direct comparison which is offered. Rather, the goal is to find one more clue toward the possible Soviet space budget trend within that one nation. By multiplying the prorated trend column figures by the number of flights, a hypothetical budget comparison calculation results. It, too, eschews any dollar or ruble identification. It has the obvious flaw of reflecting the uniform progression in the prorated costs and irregular launch record, when in fact a more realistic picture would include fitting a smoothed trend curve to the estimated budget data and then working back to introduce irregularities in the prorated costs to reflect the more erratic changes in actual launches. Also, another artificiality in the prorated approach is the fact that the United States has recently been cutting back its space launches faster than it can pare overhead costs of the space program, so that the prorated budget share per launch is rising more rapidly than would otherwise be the case. Hence, a trend on prorated costs derived from the U.S. program may not be wholly applicable to a Soviet program which does not at this time show any downward movement in number of launches.

Table 1 accordingly attempts the foregoing comparisons, and it is accompanied by Chart 1, which is limited to showing only the data which are firm, without these hypothetical financial extrapolations. Another word about Chart 1: There is a natural temptation to extrapolate data into the future on the basis of historical records. One could argue that the U.S. program to date has the appearance of a bell-shaped standard distribution. The curve extended into the future would reflect the process of phasing out, as a result of its steady downward movement since the peaks of 1966. One could argue that the Soviet Union, whose program is still moving upward is only lagging behind the U.S. pattern and will show the same decline and phase out, too. But the data so far suggest the best fit Soviet curve would be an S-shape, which climbed slowly at first, then accelerated, and later will level off in about 1975 at perhaps 105 flights per year. Actually, public policy in this country may turn around the decline in the U.S. program in some future year, and the Soviet trends may change, too, depending upon what values each nation decides it derives from space work. This is the real heart of the issue of extrapolation: Trends in both countries in the first instance depend upon some fairly arbitrary national decisions which are subject to change.

Finally, the number on flights for 1971 are necessarily incomplete. By mid-August, compared with the corresponding cumulative counts of the year before at the same time, the U.S. launches were running 10 percent behind, and the Soviet count was running 10 percent ahead. The end-of-year totals have been extrapolated reflecting these same trends, for purposes of completing the charts and tables of this analysis.

TABLE 1.—UNITED STATES AND SOVIET SPACE LAUNCHES SHOWN WITH RESPECTIVE ACTUAL AND HYPOTHETICAL BUDGETS FOR EACH YEAR—OVERALL COMPARISON

Year	U.S. expenditures for space (billions)	U.S. space launches (number)	U.S. prorated budget share per launch (millions)	Hypothetical Soviet prorated budget share per launch	Soviet space launches (number)	Hypothetical Soviet expenditures for space
1957	\$0.15	0		30	2	0.06
1958	.25	5	\$50	40	1	.04
1959	.43	10	43	50	3	.15
1960	.89	16	56	60	3	.18
1961	1.47	29	51	70	6	.42
1962	2.39	52	46	80	20	1.60
1963	4.08	38	107	90	17	1.53
1964	\$5.93	57	104	100	30	3.00
1965	6.89	63	109	110	48	5.28
1966	7.72	73	106	120	44	5.28
1967	7.24	57	127	130	66	8.58
1968	6.67	45	148	140	74	10.36
1969	6.33	40	158	150	70	10.50
1970	5.45	29	188	160	81	12.96
1971	4.89	[26]	[188]	170	(89)	(15.13)

2. Breaking out civil and military components

Although one can see some conceptual difficulties in making a clean-cut distinction between military and civil space flight, the next step is to introduce such a separation into the analysis. Table 2 which follows sub-

divides Soviet flights in accordance with the ground rules discussed earlier in this memorandum. (The actual numbers are those used in the coming report prepared for the U.S. Senate, with some updating.) But the U.S. subdivision retreats slightly by taking a simple split between DoD flights and NASA

flights, in order to match the DoD total space expenditures against all other U.S. space expenditures. This is not believed to result in a serious distortion of the results for the purpose of this study.

TABLE 2.—UNITED STATES AND SOVIET SPACE LAUNCHES AND HYPOTHETICAL BUDGET TREND ESTIMATES DIVIDED BETWEEN MILITARY AND CIVIL PURPOSES

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Year	United States				Soviet Union			
	DOD space budget (billions)	Civilian space budget (billions)	DOD launches (number)	NASA launches (number)	Military launches (number)	Civil launches (number)	Military space "budget"	Civil space "budget"
1957	\$0.05	\$0.10				2		\$0.41
1958	.14	.11	5			1		.20
1959	.34	.09	5	5		3		.61
1960	.52	.37	11	5		3		.61
1961	.71	.76	19	10		6		1.22
1962	1.03	1.36	34	18	5	15	\$0.28	3.05
1963	1.37	2.71	28	10	7	10	.39	2.03
1964	1.56	4.37	35	22	16	14	.88	2.84
1965	1.59	5.30	40	23	29	19	1.60	3.86
1966	1.64	6.08	43	30	28	16	1.54	3.25
1967	1.67	5.57	32	25	46	20	2.53	4.06
1968	1.89	4.78	26	19	53	21	2.92	4.26
1969	2.10	4.23	19	21	53	17	2.92	3.45
1970	1.76	3.69	17	12	57	24	3.14	4.87
1971	1.58	3.31	15	11	64	25	3.52	5.08

Adding up all DoD expenditures for space, and all DoD successful launches, the prorated cost per launch is \$55 million. Adding up all NASA and other civilian agency expenditures for space and all NASA successful launches, the prorated cost per launch is \$203 million. This difference reflects the fact that the Department of Defense is involved in a larger number of repetitive type Earth orbital launches, while the civilian part of the space program involves a much larger experimental element and a more ambitious undertaking of large, complex operations, including flights to deep space.

Let us assume that although no attempt is made to cross compare costs between the U.S. and Soviet national programs, there may still be a similarity to the United States in the relative cost difference between the Soviet military and civilian space efforts. Their military flights clearly have a very repetitive pattern, and their civilian program includes an even stronger commitment to deep space work than has the U.S. program. (This latter

point may be debated, but our study for the Senate comes to the conclusion.)

Table 2 then arranges in parallel the U.S. launch and expenditure record divided between DoD and other (civilian) space. Then it shows a division of Soviet flights into military and civilian categories, and shows budget share trend figures to match each, by using the same cost ratios as apply between the two halves of the U.S. program. The resulting "budget" figures are a first approximation, and show that probably the Soviet civilian space program costs more than the Soviet military space program, despite the reverse relationship in number of flights in each category. This is the same situation as applies in the United States. But this first approximation does not reflect the trend toward rising costs per flight which almost certainly applies in the Soviet Union as well as the United States.

Chart 2 shows the division of successful launches for the two countries divided between civilian and military categories.

Table 3 accordingly attempts to come closer to the reality of upward movement over time in prorated costs per flight, and should be regarded as a supplement or amendment to Table 2. As was done in Table 1, the actual prorated cost for each year has been calculated separately for the DoD and the civilian space programs. These figures are derived directly from Table 2. Examining the U.S. trends, with their irregularities, the closest fits of hypothetical, smooth trends have been estimated for the military and civilian Soviet space programs, by the same process as was used in Table 1. Then, as with Table 1, these hypothetical trend prorata figures have been used to multiply the actual number of flights in each category to come up with a set of budget trend figures for Soviet military and civilian space. These numbers, if combined, approximate the earlier totals developed in Table 1, but differ somewhat because of variations in the mix year by year between civil and military space work.

TABLE 3.—UNITED STATES AND SOVIET PRORATED SPACE COSTS, DIVIDED BETWEEN MILITARY AND CIVIL EFFORTS, AND THE RESULTING HYPOTHETICAL SOVIET BUDGET TREND CALCULATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

United States					Soviet Union								
Year	Prorated cost per flight, DOD	Prorated cost per flight, civil	Prorated cost per flight, military	Prorated cost per flight, civil	Military space "budget"	Civil space "budget"	Year	Prorated cost per flight, DOD	Prorated cost per flight, civil	Prorated cost per flight, military	Prorated cost per flight, civil	Military space "budget"	Civil space "budget"
1958	28		40	40		.04	1966	38	203	80	200	2.24	3.20
1959	68	18	45	60		.18	1967	52	223	85	220	3.91	4.40
1960	47	74	50	80		.24	1968	73	252	90	240	4.77	5.04
1961	37	76	55	100		.60	1969	111	201	95	260	5.04	4.42
1962	30	76	60	120	0.30	1.80	1970	104	308	100	280	5.70	6.72
1963	49	271	65	140	.46	1.40	1971	105	301	105	300	6.72	7.50
1964	45	199	70	180	1.12	2.24							

C. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the fundamental point is that the record of Soviet flights continuing to occur in both civil and military categories does not reflect any downward movement in level of activity; it continues to grow. There is no evidence from these data to encourage a belief that either the Soviet civil or the Soviet military space budget has turned downward. If the Soviet space budget bears a relationship over time to the number of space launchings as close as that which applies pragmatically in the United States, then we can calculate approximate Soviet civilian

and military space budget trends, even if we cannot with equal ease make direct translations between the costs of the U.S. and Soviet space programs for comparisons of absolutes.

The conclusion in this analysis supports a view that the Soviet space budgets, military and civilian, are still growing and, further, both Soviet programs are now larger efforts in physical terms than their U.S. counterparts. Finally, to translate these conclusions into international financial comparisons is not readily accomplished, and has not been attempted.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES HEARING ON "SPACE COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION," MARCH 17, 1971

(By Dr. George Low)

First, I would like to point out that we have no easy way to compare the total R&D programs of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., much less the specific elements which make them up, such as the space program; the economies of the two societies are far from parallel and we have little solid information from the Soviets about their internal program struc-

ture, objectives, or decisionmaking framework. Therefore, we have to rely on what are often subjective assessments and scattered data points for our comparisons.

What we can say is that there appears to be a well defined long-term Soviet R.&D. investment policy that has been consistently followed and supported for both pragmatic and ideological reasons. An example of that policy is the trend in Soviet R.&D. expenditures over the past decade: in 1960 they were spending at a rate of some 4 billion rubles per year; by 1970, they were spending at a rate of some 13 billion rubles, or an increase of 325%. And this increase has come about through a steady, year-by-year build-up of the national resources devoted to R.&D. rather than through a single large jump in any one year or for any one program. The U.S., on the other hand, starting from a 1960 base of total R.&D. expenditures of \$14.2 billion, has increased R.&D. expenditures only a little over 190% by 1970.

In terms of their total space program, both civil and military, we believe they are investing at least as much effort as is the U.S. and probably more; one measure is their record of successful space launches which first exceeded that of the U.S. in 1968 and continues to do so through the present, when they are launching two or more vehicles to every one of ours. It seems fair to say that they are maintaining and increasing their program effort and that this effort exceeds that of the U.S. It does not mean that they are "ahead" today in the sense of having greater capabilities, skills, or returns from their programs than we have had from ours, it does suggest, however, that, with their apparent policy of steadily increasing R.&D. investment, they will soon match and then surpass the U.S. in both program size and accomplishment unless we act positively and energetically to retain or extend our technological lead.

For this comparison, I am dealing with the combined civil and military space programs of both nations; to try to differentiate between civil and military activities of the U.S.S.R. would be speculative at best.

The most difficult comparison to try to make between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. economies or programs is in terms of absolute costs: each national economy is geared and motivated to produce a different, non-parallel mix of goods and services. But to oversimplify, it would seem that the U.S.S.R. G.N.P. is about one-half of that of the U.S. Therefore, when the absolute effort for a given program in both nations is about equal, it can mean that the U.S.S.R. is by choice emphasizing that program twice as hard as is the U.S., or that the U.S.S.R. economy is able to operate with relative efficiency in that program at the expense of inefficiencies in other sectors. Whichever is the case, there can be little argument in the field of total R.&D. or of the national space program: the Soviet goal is to place very great economic and political importance on a growth investment R.&D. policy.

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARINGS,
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT; SPACE, SCIENCE, VETERANS, AND CERTAIN OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1972, JUNE 23, 1971, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

(By Dr. James C. Fletcher)

Senator ALLOTT. I have some more questions. Some of them have been partially answered. I will submit them and let him answer those that have not been completely answered.

(The questions and answers follow:)

1. Do we have a comparison as to how much we spend on our space program versus how much the Russians are spending on theirs?

A comparison of United States and USSR expenditures on technological efforts including space technology during the last two decades was undertaken by the Department of Defense last year. The results of their study are illustrated in the attached charts.

It is important to note from Chart I that the Soviet Union increased its efforts at a relatively constant rate of ten to thirteen percent per year during the period. The United States growth rate has varied—it was negligible during the time period between 1952 and 1958 until we were spurred into action by Sputnik I. Again in 1966-67, a downward trend in space and military technological effort was initiated and persists today.

Chart II separates inputs to space technological efforts from military technological programs during the decade of the 1960's. It is significant that the Soviet space program grew rather constantly over the decade whereas the USSR military technological effort remained nearly constant until 1966 when it moved rapidly upward. The United States space program grew rapidly until 1966-1967, at which time it moved sharply downward. In 1970, the USSR made 81 launches whereas the U.S. made only 30.

All that we have been able to learn about Soviet recent space endeavors suggests continued growth. For example, in 1971 to date the Soviets have made 39 space launches compared to 33 in the same time period in 1970.

2. Do we know how active the USSR might be in manned space flights during the period between Skylab and our first Shuttle flights?

We, of course, cannot be certain about future Soviet space activities. We can, however, draw conclusions which are supported by past Soviet performance and by their declared intentions. As indicated above, performance in the first half of 1971 connotes continued growth in Soviet Space efforts. Public statements which are indicative of Soviet intentions include the following:

1. Soviet Communist Party Secretary, Leonid Brezhnev—"Soviet science regards the creation of long term orbital stations and laboratories, the decisive means to extensive conquest of space. Orbital stations with changeable crews are the main route into space—become cosmodromes in space—launching platforms for flights to other planets—major scientific laboratories—for study of space technology, biology, medicine, geophysics, astronomy and astrophysics."

2. Professor M. V. Keldysh, President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences—"Creation of space stations is the "new direction in space exploration." Space Station will replace the present need for many unmanned satellites. Orbital station will "replace dozens or even hundreds" of unmanned satellites now used for meteorology, geological reconnaissance, communications, astronomy and geophysics.

3. Aleksei A. Leonov—"The USSR has a plan to land a man on Mars by 1980." The sequence is to put a space station in earth orbit, assemble planetary vehicle, launch cosmonauts to Mars, orbit Mars and make a soft landing."

RICHARD M. NIXON ON RED CHINA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Richard M. Nixon's position on Red China while Vice President, running for the Presidency in 1960, and as a citizen running for the Presidency in 1968, are all mat-

ters of public record and should prove to be the basis for his actions today.

While it might be argued that the American people rejected the Nixon position on communism in 1960 by a small margin, they most certainly bought it in 1968.

I think that the great majority of the American people agree with Mr. Nixon's previous statements of opposition to the Red Chinese admission to the United Nations, and his earlier remarks that the goal of the Chinese leader, Mao Tse-tung, is not merely peace nor compromise, but rather to conquer and rule the world.

Mao Tse-tung has not changed; the Communist international goals of world conquest have not changed; the American people have not changed; only the man, Richard M. Nixon, has changed; and then only after he became President of the most powerful free world nation.

Why he has changed horses in the middle of the stream he has never explained.

I include varied speeches and remarks of President Nixon, before he became President, for the information of our colleagues:

TV PRESS CONFERENCE OF VICE PRESIDENT
NIXON
HONOLULU, HAWAII,
August 3, 1960.

The Press. Mr. Vice President, many of us here in the islands have very strong ties with Asia and we are especially concerned with the growth of Communism in Red China.

If you are elected President, will you make any substantial change in our China policy? Will you extend recognition to Red China? Vice President NIXON. I most certainly would not.

I believe it would not be in the interest of the United States; it would not be in the interest of freedom, and it would not be in the interest of peace for us to extend recognition to Red China or to change our position of opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

There are a number of reasons for this. I can summarize simply by saying that Red China does not qualify to be admitted to the United Nations, which, in its charter, is made up of peace-loving nations. Red China defies the United Nations in Korea at the present time. It is engaged in activities with regard to India and other U.N. members which certainly are provocative and certainly not in the interest of peace. Insofar as its attitude toward the United States and other nations is concerned, Red China is not following the policy which is designed to promote friendly relations in the traditions of the U.N.

If, at this time, we should change our policy toward Red China and recognize them or allow their admission to the U.N. by dropping our opposition to it, I think it would set in motion a chain reaction which would mean that all of Asia would fall into the Communist orbit, or under Communist influence.

Now does this mean that the policy will never be changed? The answer is, "Of course not." The policy can change and the Red Chinese Government can change and become a civilized member of the world community, but until it does that, we cannot make the mistake of recognizing Red China.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON
ALLEN COUNTY COURT HOUSE,

Fort Wayne, Ind., September 21, 1960.

First of all, look at us. We Americans have fought three wars in this century. For what? Talk to your legionnaires, your VFW people,

they'll tell you. We didn't get an acre of territory. We didn't ask for a concession. We fought why? One, to keep our own freedom. Two, because we were interested in the freedom of others, and we realized that when it was threatened, ours was as well.

And today Americans are not interested, and the British are not interested, and the French, none of the other people in the free world are interested in extending our domination over anybody else. What do we want for the rest of the world? Only what we have for ourselves—the right to choose, the right to be independent, the right to be free, and that's what distinguishes us first from the Communist leaders because they don't say that. Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese leader, say, over and over again, we must rule the world and we will conquer the world, and they say, over and over again, we will accomplish this and without war, if we can, Mr. Khrushchev says, but they also indicate that they are going to accomplish this end by any means, if they can. And so, therefore, you are dealing with men who are determined to conquer the world.

How else do they differ from the men in the free world? That means that these men, because they are determined to conquer the world, respect power and they respect strength, and they have nothing but contempt for weakness, they have nothing but contempt for those who are naive in dealing with them. So, if America is to keep the peace, if we are to extend freedom, we must first start by seeing to it that America remains as she is today, the strongest nation in the world militarily and that we will pay the cost to see that America retains this military strength. [Applause.]

THE GREAT DEBATE
WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS,
September 22, 1960.

Question No. 2: In what circumstances would you recognize Red China?

REPLY BY RICHARD M. NIXON

Recognition of Communist China and support for her membership in the United Nations must wait for a basic change in her foreign policy. As long as the Chinese Communists continue their present hostile and aggressive policies toward the free world and refuse to live in peace with the family of nations there can be no question of our recognizing them.

At the present time, Chinese Communist policies are the opposite of what we would find acceptable as a basis for establishing diplomatic relations. The Red armies are seeking every opportunity to stir up world tensions for the purpose of advancing their aggressive ambitions. For example, there is the Chinese Communist aggression against the United Nations in Korea, the brutal suppression of the revolt in Tibet, the attacks along the Indian border, Peiping's cry that she will expel the United States from the Western Pacific by force, and the continued insistence that Red China has the "right" to seize Taiwan (Formosa) by force.

Some ask why we do not recognize Communist China so that we can begin talking with her and perhaps settle our differences.

It is not necessary for us to recognize Red China or support her admission to the United Nations in order to communicate with her. We can do this through channels which already exist. Even now we are negotiating at Warsaw with the Red Chinese diplomats for the release of Americans the Communist Chinese hold prisoner.

Others say we should change our attitude toward Communist China. Perhaps, they say, if we extended recognition the Chinese Communists would be mollified and would abandon their aggressive foreign policies. Such thinking is based on a serious misconception of the Communist character and intentions.

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE MAGAZINE PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

COMMODORE HOTEL,
New York, N.Y., September 28, 1960.

Mr. COWLES (Cowles Magazines, Inc., chairman). Mr. Vice President, I hate to ask you tough questions this early in the day. Unfortunately, we know very little about what is happening in Red China. I think this audience would appreciate it if you would tell us what you feel is happening in Red China, what you feel the present relationships are between Red China and the Soviet Union, and under what circumstances would you favor admitting Red China to the United Nations?

Vice President NIXON. Well, first, my observations with regard to what is happening in Red China would not be worth much more than those on this panel. I, of course, do have access to intelligence information, but the information we have from Red China is limited and, of course, it is mixed.

I would say that looking at that information, considering the other types of information that we get in addition to intelligence information, that these are the conclusions that I would arrive at: Red China has a very dedicated, aggressive Communist leadership in the early stages of the development of communism.

I think perhaps the best way to indicate the difference between the Communist leadership of Red China and the Communist leadership of the Soviet Union is in their attitude toward the use of war as a means of accomplishing the Communist objective of world domination.

Now, there's no disagreement whatever between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Mao Tse-tung with regard to the fact that communism must conquer the world and will. They believe it will. They believe it must, and they will use any means to accomplish that end.

Mr. Khrushchev, however, in recent years, particularly the last 3 or 4 years, has taken the line, as we all know, of saying that they do not have to resort to the use of force and that they will not resort to the use of force. In fact, he has even at times indicated that, and that they can and will accomplish their objective through what he calls peaceful competition between the two systems, communism and the system of freedom.

Mr. Mao Tse-tung, on the other hand, does not go along with this philosophy. He says that, in a nutshell, after the First World War we had the arrival on the international scene of the Communist government of the Soviet Union. After the Second World War, he said the result was the extension of communism to over 600 million people and a third of the earth's world population. He goes further and says that after the third world war, it may be that communism will dominate the world.

Now, when we look at this almost diabolical reasoning, here is what he is saying: He is saying that China with its tremendous population does not fear a third world war, that it would think that they believe that a third world war might result in Communist domination of the world and, while, of course, they would suffer more, and the end result would be the extension of communism and not the extension of freedom.

That brings us to the basic difference between Mr. Mao Tse-tung and Mr. Khrushchev at the present time. When I use these two names, incidentally, I am not, of course, trying to downgrade other Chinese Communist leaders, who may be more influential or as influential as Mao Tse-tung at the present time, but the basic difference is in their attitude toward what means communism will use to dominate the world, and we find here again that Khrushchev is insist-

ing on following the line of so-called peaceful competition. He follows that line because, one, he knows the terrible power of the atomic weapons and he respects our power, despite what those who downgrade our power indicate he thinks of it.

In addition to that, Mr. Khrushchev honestly believes, I think, that he will accomplish more through peaceful means than he would through war in extending communism.

As Adenauer said to me when he was over here, Khrushchev does want to rule the world, but he doesn't want to rule the world of ruined cities and dead bodies. He wants to rule live people. But Mao Tse-tung looks at it differently. So, we find here a basic ideological conflict going on among Communist leaders who do not follow Mr. Khrushchev's thoughts on peaceful coexistence, at least as far as words are concerned; but, nevertheless, compared to Mao Tse-tung's thoughts, extremely peaceful; and this, therefore, has resulted in ideological conflict between the two.

Now, can we base our policy on the assumption that this conflict will result in a split? Here you have a very great disagreement in the international community. There are those who believe on our side that we can assume that China and Communist Russia are inevitably going to break apart and that the line of U.S. policy and free-world policy should be to drive them apart.

Now, two comments on that point: Any obvious attempts to drive them apart would be counterproductive as we can well see, because they are bound together by a strong ideological bond, that is, the Communist ideology, like any religion, binds them together and in some respects binds them together more than any religion has ever bound people together in the history of the world.

And so I say to base our policy on the assumption that they're going to break apart would be an error.

Now, we come to the final point: What, then, should be our attitude toward recognizing Communist China and admitting it to the United Nations?

It has been my position—it is now and it will continue to be in the future, until circumstances change—that we would make a very great mistake to change our position on recognition of Red China to the U.N. or admitting to the U.N. or recognizing it, and the two must and would go together, I believe.

The reason is, when we look at the U.N., for example, that Red China simply does not qualify to belong to an organization which, in its charter says membership, in effect, is open to peace-loving nations.

You can read a statement every day in the papers that Mao Tse-tung or the Peoples' Daily in Communist China, a statement to the effect that they are not a peace-loving nation. They are in an aggressive posture toward the United Nations in Korea today. They are engaging in an aggression, both indirect and direct, all over southeast Asia at the present time. To admit this country, which in addition to these things as far as the United States is concerned—is also holding prisoners, violating all the international laws, as far as we concerned, to admit this country to the U.N., to recognize it, to raise it to the level of a respectable member of the world community would have the effect, I think, of violating, first, basic moral concepts, and, second, it would have the effect of spreading the Chinese Communist influence through the balance of Asia.

Now, what should our attitude be toward the future? Our attitude should not be rigid. We cannot and should not say we will never recognize the Government that rules over this tremendous land mass in Asia and the Government which also rules over 600 million people, but we must say, if we are to maintain moral leadership in the world, if

the United Nations is to mean anything, we must say that this Government cannot be admitted to the U.N., that we will not recognize it, and elevate it to the position of respectability, until it changes its policy of aggression toward the free nations and toward the peace-loving nations of the world.

Once it changes its policies of aggression, then we can consider recognizing it. Until it does that, I believe it would be a great mistake.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY,

Bronx Gym, New York City, October 5, 1960.

And that is true of all American audiences throughout the country. Our concern is the same: How do we keep our freedom? How do we extend it? How do we maintain the peace of the world?

Turning to this point, and looking first at the challenge, there are some obvious conclusions on which we would all agree. First, knowing the man who is the symbol of the opposition to peace and freedom, the one who challenges it, knowing the man, we can reach only one conclusion as to what kind of policies are effective in dealing with him. What does he want? He wants to conquer the world. What means will he use to do it? Any means.

He would prefer to do it without war, as he said over and over again, although his Chinese colleague, Mao Tse-tung, says that he, as far as he is concerned, would use war, because he, Mao Tse-tung, points to the fact that after the First World War came the Soviet Union, after the Second World War came the expansion of communism to many more countries and approximately a billion people in the world, and after the third world war the whole world will be Communist. This is Mao Tse-tung's reasoning, reasoning which Khrushchev at the moment apparently—and we hopefully say—is not following.

But, nevertheless, make no mistake; whether he says peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition, whatever he says, he is determined to conquer the world. He believes that communism should rule the world. This we know and, therefore, the line of American policy, of free world policy, is very clear. We do not want to conquer the world. We do not want to impose our system on anybody else. We have fought 3 wars in the last 50 years. We haven't had an acre of territory out of it. We haven't gotten an economic concession. We have fought these wars—for what? Only so that others might have what we enjoy—independence, the right of people to be free, the right of the world to live at peace. This is what America wants, but this is not what he wants. This is what our allies in the world want, but it is not what he wants.

SPEECH OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

MORMON TABERNACLE,

Salt Lake City, Utah, October 10, 1960.

Let me say this. All of these suggestions are made by men of good will. All of them are made by men who want peace. The trouble is that they are made by men who do not understand what peace demands when you are dealing with a man like Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung, because in dealing with men like this whenever you make a concession to them which they do not deserve, it only whets their appetite, it doesn't satisfy it. It is not the road to peace. It is the road to war or the road to surrender or both.

So that is why the next President of the United States, difficult as it may be, must always stand firm, willing to concede if we get something in return, but never willing to give up principle or territory unless we are getting something in payment for it.

This is the kind of policy which will work. It is the only kind of policy which I think can be adopted in meeting the Communist threat in the diplomatic area.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON TO UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO STUDENTS

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,

October 11, 1960.

But people say, "But, Mr. Nixon, we want peace." And my answer is you're not going to get peace, and you're not going to get freedom by naive statements which in effect invite the Communists to take over anywhere, at any time.

You recall the television debate when Senator Kennedy said, "We ought to take these two little islands off of Formosa, and near the Chinese mainland, and we should give them up." In effect, force our Nationalist allies to give them up. And, apparently, the implication of his remark was that if we did that we wouldn't get into a war about these two islands. And now, of late, he has used the contemptuous phrase "These are a couple of worthless rocks in the Pacific." And so we'll give them up. "Worthless rocks." Just a few people. But may I say that kind of woolly thinking is dangerous for Americans, it's dangerous for world peace. You know what we have to realize. We can't run backward and win over communism, and we have to win over communism, and not just hold the line against communism around the world. [Applause.]

I want to make it clear that I oppose handing over to the Communists 1 inch of free territory. And I want to say why. It's because I'm for peace, and for freedom that I oppose handing it over. Because when you hand over the territory, it does not lead to peace. It does not lead, certainly, to freedom, it gives it up. But it leads either to war or surrender, or both. And that is why we must stand for freedom. We must not give an inch of territory, as I have indicated.

In 1953, I think the American people said once and for all that they were tired of policies that had led to the war in Korea. I think they left them. Now is the time to mount an offensive for freedom, to advance the cause of freedom, and not to return to a policy of retreat and defeat. But then, I know what some of you may have read the statement, "but these two islands over here are indefensible." My friends, if the test of what America will defend is whether an area is defensible or not, may I say that we had better get off of the face of the globe. What about Berlin? Berlin—there isn't even 16 miles as there is between Quemoy and Matsu and the Communists there. The Communists completely surround it. From a military standpoint it's completely cut off from the communications except by air with our own forces. And yet, I say to you, the people of the United States, simply because Berlin is tremendously difficult to defend, are not going to say in advance we're going to give up this island of freedom with 2,500,000 Germans. We can't do that. The people of free Berlin—because if we give up freedom there, then it will mean that they will simply ask for more, and it will go on down the line. [Applause.]

All that I can say in conclusion is that this soothing sirup kind of talk: Give up the little islands. Let the Communists have it and then we'll have peace. Maybe the Senator may believe, or his advisers may believe that this is a cheap and easy way to keep peace. That it might advance his candidacy. I just want to say one thing very clearly today. I have seen the world. I have seen what communism does to people behind the Iron Curtain. I have seen a quarter of a million Poles in the streets of Warsaw, half of them crying with tears running down their cheeks when my wife and I drove through the streets because we represented freedom to a people who wanted freedom and didn't have it. I have seen what it means. I know Mr. Khrushchev. I think I know what his colleague Mao Tse-tung is also like. And I know

as I stand here that the road to war, the road to surrender is the very kind of woolly thinking which says "Just a couple of rocks in the Pacific. Let them go. This will bring us peace."

And I am going to tell you, tonight, that regardless of the political consequences I intend to fight at every opportunity any return to the naive and woolly policies which led to the loss of China and to the war in Korea. And I'm going to do it throughout. [Applause.]

My time is up, and I again express my appreciation to you. But may I conclude with this last word. I have spoken of our military strength, our economic strength, the necessity for a firm diplomacy. I am convinced that that kind of leadership can keep the peace without surrender. I am convinced that that's what Mr. Khrushchev respects. And we must have that from him. But, my friends, we need more than that to win this struggle. And that means that we need idealism, a flaming idealism. I saw every place I went in Russia signs "Work for the victory of communism." We have to realize in this country what America really stands for. You know what it is? Not just military might, and economic strength, but for great ideals that caught the imagination of the world 180 years ago. Our faith in God. Our belief in the dignity of all men. Our belief that the rights that men have, the rights of equality of opportunity, that these rights come from God, that they cannot be taken away from them by men. Our belief that the rights that Americans have for freedom belong not just to ourselves, but to the whole world. These things we must feel deeply, we must believe deeply. And these beliefs must come not just from my stating it, they must come from the hearts and minds of our people. They must be developed in the churches, in the schools, in the homes of America.

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,

October 14, 1960.

Now, if I could turn to one other point, the most important one, and I will be finished. What is more important than jobs and progress and these things that I have been mentioning? Well, of course, you know what it is. It's just being around to enjoy it, because we can have the best jobs and medical care and housing and all that sort of thing that we can imagine, and if we aren't around, we're not going to know it, so, the most important qualification of the next President of the United States must be this: Is he the man best qualified, by experience, by judgment, by background, to keep the peace, keep it without surrender of principle or territory?

This is the great test, and I ask you to apply it.

Now, looking at this issue, let me tell you that if we're going to keep the peace, we must understand the men who threaten it. Now, my colleague and I, Cabot Lodge, know Mr. Khrushchev. We have sat opposite him at the conference table. We know what kind of a man he is. I believe we know how to deal with him and how not to deal with him. I can say, too, that looking at this man—and I use him as an example, because Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese, the other Communists are like him—their philosophies are all the same—there's one thing we must remember above everything else.

If we want peace, if we want peace without surrender, we must remember that in dealing with the Communists, they understand only strength and firmness. They have contempt for weakness militarily, and they have contempt for weakness diplomatically. And if you want peace, there must be strength.

Let me spell it out. First, then, this means America has to be the strongest nation in the world militarily. We are today, and we're going to stay that way, and we've got to pay whatever is necessary, and I pledge that we will do this, because we must never be in a position where the enemies of peace can say: "We're looking down the throat of an American President. We can blackmail him at the conference table."

So, one, America must be strong militarily. Two, we must be firm diplomatically. You heard an argument last night on the television about the situation out in the Formosa Straits, about Quemoy and Matsu, a very complicated situation, it would seem, but not as complicated as it really appeared when you analyze the facts.

Five years ago a resolution passed by the Senate of the United States, a resolution giving to the President of the United States the discretion and the power to use the Armed Forces of this country to defend Formosa and to answer and retaliate against any attack which was directed to Formosa, an ally of the United States.

During the course of the debate, an amendment was introduced by well-intentioned people, one supported by my opponent. Only 12 Senators voted for it, a minority of even the Democrats, as well as a minority of the Republicans, an amendment which said: Defend Formosa, Mr. President, but we say draw a line. Don't include two free islands, Quemoy and Matsu. You can't use the forces of the United States to defend those islands. You must draw a line and say only use the forces of the United States when Formosa itself is under attack.

Walter George, the great Democrat, who was the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in the last word in that debate said: "We cannot tie the hands of the President of the United States. We cannot say to him that the forces of the United States have to wait until the Communists have set foot on Formosa."

As he well pointed out, we must never be in a position where we invite an attack by the Communists by surrendering to them at the point of a gun territory which is free. Now, let me give you a lesson of history. The lesson of history is this: Where a dictator is concerned—and this is true of a Fascist, a Nazi, a Communist, a bully, any kind of a dictator—you must never surrender to him at the point of threat, because when you do, it doesn't satisfy him. It just encourages him to ask for more. Remember Hitler? First, it was the Rhineland; then it was Austria; then it was Danzig; then it was Sudetenland, and all over the world people said, "Don't fight for this; don't fight for that; this is all Hitler wants."

And he said that was all he wanted, and yet, eventually, every time we gave in he wanted more and more and more, until finally he wanted something that we had to fight for, and war resulted.

So, the well-intentioned people who said, "Look, we won't defend this; we won't defend that; we'll bring on war"—they were adopting the policy that led to war, rather than the one that avoided it.

It's the same today. Whenever a President of the United States, whenever the people of this country say to a Communist dictator "Look, we rule out this part of the free world; we will not defend this part of the free world; we're going to telegraph in advance and tell you, 'Look, don't worry about this; if you will just leave this alone,'" what's going to happen? It's going to encourage them to say, "Well, if we got away with blackmail and threats in this case, we might try it again," and they will back up again and again and again.

I say to you, my friends, we tried that in Korea. You remember Secretary Acheson? He said we won't defend Korea, and a lot of people, I know, thought in January of 1950

this means we're not going to get in war in Korea, but the Communists took him at his word. They marched in in June of that year, and 35,000 American boys died and paid the price of diplomatic stupidity and blundering, and we're not going to do it again. We're not going to make that mistake again.

What I am saying here today is that when we stand firmly against the blackmail, against the threats of a dictator, we are standing for peace. We are not taking the course of war. And that's exactly the point we have got to have in mind.

And when the well intentioned, but the naive, people say, "Turn this over; turn that over," they say, "because we want peace," remember, they think they're for peace, but actually they're advocating the very policy that will bring war, because it encourages the dictator to take what he wants.

I was just in the police station in here, incidentally, talking to various people. I saw on the wall a little line, not new. You've heard it. "Crime doesn't pay." That's true of criminals domestically. In other words, if crime paid, the criminals would be encouraged to do more and more and more, but because we've got police stations that say crime doesn't pay, the criminal is discouraged.

Now, in international affairs, it's exactly the same thing. The Chinese Communists at the present time are international criminals. They're threatening us in Formosa. They're threatening free people in Korea. You know what they did to Tibet. And, so, we have got to tell all of those who are international criminals, and that is who use force to extend their aggression, that crime doesn't pay; because, if it does pay, they're going to use it. It's just as simple as that.

So, that's really what we're talking about here. We're announcing to the world that America, a strong, free country, does not want war. We're strong because we want peace, not because we want war. We're firm, not because we want to fight over a couple of islands, but because we know that if we indicate that crime will pay, we're going to get into blackmail and into threats and if we let them have it, this is going to lead to war.

So, I say to you today: We have learned our lesson. We learned it with Hitler. We learned it in Korea, and, therefore, the kind of policy that Cabot Lodge and I stand for is the kind of policy that the President has followed, it has worked for 5 years, and we say this is not the time to change the course that the President has followed, in which the President has, in effect, said: "We will defend this area and we are not going to write off any part of this area in advance, and we will defend Formosa and will answer any attack directed toward it."

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON AT FRIENDS OF NIXON BREAKFAST

COCOANUT GROVE,
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
October 14, 1960.

And, so, I want to say here today why strength and firmness are principles of peace—principles of peace.

Now, let's look first at strength. The United States today is the strongest nation in the world. It's got to remain the strongest nation in the world. We've got to pay anything that's necessary to do it. We have got to pay anything that's necessary to do it, and I can assure you that if I have anything to say about, if there is any doubt on any score, whether it's in the case of the deterrent or striking power or anything that we want that is necessary to maintain absolute level of superiority, that will come first, first above everything, first above the desire to cut taxes, to cut the debt, anything else. Why do I say that, I, a Quaker, coming from a line of people who feel so strongly the other way, or, at least, they seem to?

I'll tell you why. Because I know that we're the guardian of peace. I know that when there are men in the world on the loose who are not for what we are, who are out to conquer the world, by any means, if necessary, by war, if possible, by any means, if necessary, including war, and Mao Tse-tung says that over and over again even now. He says a third world war might bring a Communist world. When you're confronted with people like that, we have to have a strong force which can be a guardian of peace. Why? So long as we are stronger than they are, this deters them from using their power, (1) either to start a war, or (2) what is more likely, using it for blackmail purposes at the conference table, and say, "Look, unless you do this or that or the other thing, we might do something."

So, we must never have a position where a President, Democrat or Republican, ever goes to a conference table, where Mr. Khrushchev or anybody else can say, "I'm looking down your throat." That's why American strength is essential.

EXCERPTS FROM TRANSCRIPT OF SPEECH OF VICE PRESIDENT

WORLD NEWSPAPER FORUM,
BEVERLY-HILTON HOTEL,
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
October 14, 1960.

We speak, for example, of the leaders in Moscow. We can look also to the leaders in Communist China. Their aim, of course, is not the offshore islands. Their aim is not Formosa. Their aim is the world, and we must constantly keep this in mind as we make any decisions or any statements with regard to what we should do.

EXCERPTS FROM TRANSCRIPT OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH

FAIR GROUNDS PAVILION,
TULSA, OKLA.,
October 15, 1960.

And now one other point. In addition to this economic struggle that I have been talking about and the military struggle, there is another phase of it that is more important and perhaps more decisive—I believe more decisive—and that's the struggle for the minds and the hearts and the souls of men. I know that when you think of a man like Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung, a man who does not believe in God, a man who has no ideals, you think: What in the world will it do for us to talk about the things we believe in in the world? How can ideals stand up against military might and economic productivity?

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

WAR MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM,
BUFFALO, N.Y.,
October 17, 1960.

And then there is just one other point along the same line. You have heard a lot about the recognition of Communist China and admitting it to the U.N., and yesterday Mr. Kennedy indicated that he opposed its present admission to the U.N., and yet only 2 weeks ago, Mr. Stevenson, who is his top foreign policy adviser, or at least who is alleged to be one of them, said that he would consider favoring a deal under which we would trade admitting Communist China to the U.N. in favor of a guarantee for Formosa.

Now that's trading one horse for one rabbit, because Formosa is already free, and Communist China isn't in the U.N., and if we're elected, it won't get into the U.N. until it changes its policies with regard to—I say to you tonight it isn't enough for a candidate for the Presidency to say that he personally opposes its admission. The people are entitled to know whether he agrees with his foreign policy adviser, and I again say that

he would disavow this statement, because certainly it isn't possible and it isn't good for his foreign policy adviser to say one thing on a critical issue and for him to say another.

SPEECH, RICHARD M. NIXON, AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION
MIAMI, FLA., October 18, 1960.

Now I would like to turn to a related subject, the subject of our relations with Communist China. Here again we have well-intentioned people in this country who suggest "Why can't we find a formula by which this country of over 600 million people can be brought into the community of nations?" And the line goes something like this: "If we got Communist China into the United Nations, then they might develop along more civilized terms."

Well, first of all, let me say the United Nations was not set up to be a reformatory—and that's a good answer to that. But, secondly, I should also point to the effect the United Nations has had on the conduct of the Soviet Union, which got in because it was a charter member. Certainly it has not had too much effect in making them abide by the rules of the game.

But beyond that, let's look at the suggestions that have been made, and here again we can get some guidance to the future.

Two weeks ago it was suggested that we should change our policy toward Communist China and that we'd make a trade. We would trade our support—we would give them support for admission to the United Nations—for a guarantee by them that Formosa, our ally, would be free.

Now of course, as all of you can quickly see, that's one horse for one rabbit. Formosa is already free, and all we would be doing would be taking a worthless guarantee from a government which has certainly never shown it intends to keep any guarantee of that type.

And then last Sunday another suggestion was made, this time again with the best of intentions, along these lines—that U.N. membership for Red China could be considered if—now listen carefully—if they would renounce their official foreign policy of belief in the inevitability and the desirability of war and if they would disallow hostility to the United Nations.

Now this is naive in the extreme because it ignores something else. When are we going to learn that it isn't what the Communists say but what they do that counts. Of course they will say, "If we say that's the price of admission, they will renounce wars as instruments of international policy. Of course, they will abide by the rules of the United Nations." But look at the deeds of the Chinese Communist government. That's why we oppose their recognition. That's why we oppose their admission to the United Nations.

Let me list them for you: Aggression in Korea; today an open contempt for United Nations resolutions; continued violence against a member of the United Nations, free China today; ruthless seizure of Tibet, a rule of force and genocide there; today, military raids against India and Nepal, and illegal and unprincipled imprisonment of American civilians, which we have been objecting to and which they will do nothing about.

I say today that to seat a regime with this record of gangsterism, regardless of what they said about their good intentions in the future, would make a mockery of the peaceful purposes of the United Nations to which we belong.

In other words, before the United States can consider United Nations membership for an international outlaw, what it must do is purge itself of its offenses against world law and against the principles of civilized behavior, as well as against the United Nations—and I want to announce here today

what I think the next President of the United States must do with regard to this particular problem.

I believe this matter is so fundamental to decency in world affairs that until Red China has proved her adherence to these standards by her deeds and not just by her words, the next President should consider a veto, which we have never used, to be fully justified by the United States in the National Security Council—a veto of any effort to admit a nation that does not comply, as Red China does not comply.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

[Exclusive interview with Vice President Nixon by Patrick Donaghy, Catholic World, November 1960]

What about the recognition of Red China and her admission to the U.N.?

Basic changes in the foreign policy of Communist China must occur before we can support recognition or United Nations membership for that country. As long as the Chinese Communists continue their present hostile and aggressive policies toward the free world and as long as they refuse to live in peace in the family of nations, there can be no question of our recognizing them.

Some people say that we must recognize Red China so that we can begin to talk with them about world problems. Recognition is not necessary for this purpose. We can communicate with them through channels that already exist. In fact, at the present time we are negotiating with the Red Chinese at Warsaw through our Ambassador there for the release of American citizens whom the Red Chinese hold prisoner on trumped-up charges.

Other people say that if we would change our attitude toward the Chinese Communists perhaps they would be mollified and would abandon their aggressive foreign policies. This kind of thinking is based on a serious misunderstanding of the Communist character and intentions. We must continue our policy of firmness without belligerency toward Red China.

REMARKS, VICE PRESIDENT NIXON, PORT ERIE AIRPORT, ERIE, PA., NOVEMBER 1, 1960

You remember what happened. A war in Korea brought about by a foolish, naive lack of understanding of dictators, of communism, inviting the very attack which came. And may I say that we're not going to go back to that kind of policy. We're going to go forward with the kind of leadership that President Eisenhower has given—firmness, strength, and never surrendering freedom any place in the world at the point of a gun. And I say to you, my friends, that is the road to peace.

You know, it's so easy for somebody to get up and say, "Oh, Mr. Nixon, why don't we give this away to the Communists? Why don't we give them this, because we don't want a war?"

My friends, we learned in dealing with Hitler; we've learned in dealing with Stalin. We're learning now in dealing with Khrushchev, with Mao Tse-tung, that when you deal with a dictator the way to war is paved with that kind of wishful, woolly thinking, with the kind of thinking which surrenders territory to them. Why? Because they don't want just a couple of islands. They don't want just Korea or Formosa. They want the world. And, wanting the world, every time you turn something over, it whets their appetite and they would demand more—and Americans will die for that kind of policy.

Cabot Lodge and I, I can assure you, know the Communists. We know Mr. Khrushchev. We would never make the mistake that was made in Korea. We will keep America strong, and we will keep the peace without surrender, and that's what we ask for in this campaign—the opportunity to do exactly that.

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON, LARKIN PLAZA, YONKERS, N.Y., NOVEMBER 2, 1960

And I'll tell you what our answer is. Our answer is he won't catch us in 7 or 70 years if we're true to the principles that have made America the great Nation that it is. [Applause.]

He also believes that the Communist system is going to dominate the world. He believes that they're going to gain a victory without war. My friends, he will not gain it provided again we are not foolish. Provided we recognize the type of a man he is and Mao Tse-tung and the other leaders of the Communist world. They don't react like Mr. Adenauer, Mr. Macmillan, Mr. de Gaulle, Mr. Nehru. These men are men who are ruthless and fanatical and who want nothing less than the world.

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 4, 1960, p. 36]

YOU ASKED THEM; THEY'VE ANSWERED

For the past 2 days, Vice President Nixon and Senator Kennedy have discussed questions that *News* readers wanted answered before election day. Today they conclude their replies with statements on foreign policy and medical care for the aged. The *News* hopes the answers have helped you decide which candidate is best for the country.

FOREIGN POLICY

(By Vice President Richard M. Nixon)

In my personal dealings with Communist leaders, I have seen demonstrated the truth that Communists have but one objective—a Communist world. Everything they do is designed to advance that objective.

This means that the free world can never relax its guard. We must continue a policy of steadfast resistance to Communist aggression.

If I am elected President, I will do everything in my power to continue such a determined, clear-headed policy.

Any unilateral concession is foolish when dealing with the Communists. We should have learned this lesson long ago.

But apparently there are still some American political figures who do not understand this fact.

When concessions were made at Munich, they did not make war less likely. They made war more likely. They simply whetted an aggressor's appetite.

When a U.S. Secretary of State did not make clear that we would defend Korea, he was issuing a plain invitation for the invasion of that country. This is exactly why Quemoy and Matsu are so important. To announce that we will not defend a part of the free world is an open invitation to the Communists to take that part.

A strong foreign policy must be accompanied by a strong defense posture. Communists understand power and respect it. As long as we remain the strongest military power in the world, we are assured that the Communists will not risk war.

Therefore, if I am elected, I will keep the United States where it is today—first.

A strong foreign policy must also seek to assist the developing nations of the world in attaining their legitimate desires to advance their economic development, conquer poverty and disease, and gain their place in the sun.

A strong foreign policy does not mean that we can never reach any agreements with the Communists.

Of course, I will continue to try to bring about meaningful and real disarmament. But any disarmament policy I am responsible for must and will have three basic ground rules: (1) There must be a workable inspection system, (2) all agreements must be self-enforcing, and (3) we must never take anything on faith.

We know the past history of the Soviet Union's broken promises and broken treaties. I will never allow a treaty that the Communists could turn their backs on if it served their purpose to do so.

I would also like to make it perfectly clear that I am opposed to extending diplomatic recognition to Red China. And I am equally opposed to admitting Red China into the United Nations.

To qualify for admission to the United Nations, according to the United Nations Charter, a nation must be "peace loving." Quite obviously, Red China is not.

The United States should not lend respectability to a pirate.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF VICE PRESIDENT
NIXON

NATIONAL TELETHON, ABC NETWORK,

Springfield, Mich., November 7, 1960.

This is from Ralph Miller, in Carmi, Ind., and the question is:

Would you use a veto in the United Nations Security Council to prevent the admission of Red China to the U.N.?

Vice President NIXON. Well, to Mr. Ralph Miller, my answer to this question is that I certainly would use the veto in the Security Council under present circumstances.

Let me put it this way: We cannot say at this time that Communist China will never qualify for admission to the United Nations, but at this time it is engaging in acts which disqualify it from admission to this organization. For example, I think many of us forget often that the United Nations Charter has a specific provision indicating that it is an organization of peace-loving peoples.

Of course, some people will say, "Well, now, if that's the case, how did the Soviet Union get in?"

And the answer, of course, is they were charter members.

Now, Communist China simply can't qualify as a member of the United Nations as a peace-loving country. It can't qualify because it at the present time is in defiance of the United Nations in Korea. That is why our American boys are still tied down there.

It is in defiance of the United Nations in the Formosa Straits where it is, in effect, waging military action against a member of the United Nations.

We know the story of Tibet.

Well, taking one example that is very close to home, to people here in the United States, they still, violating all canons of international law, keep prisoners, civilians from the United States, and we've been negotiating with them for years, as a matter of fact, to get them to change their policies.

And so this is my answer: That until the Chinese Communist Government changes its policies, until it in effect cleanses itself of its present deficiencies, we could under no circumstances agree to its admission to the U.N.

And although I would be reluctant to use the veto, because America has never used it, I think that the principle is so important here that we would have to use it to keep a nation out that simply can't qualify as a peace-loving nation.

[From: Nixon on the Issues (A compilation of positions taken on public questions by Richard M. Nixon during the Presidential campaign of 1968), Nixon-Agnew Campaign Committee, October 17, 1968]

COMMUNIST CHINA

U.S. POLICY

Any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China. This does not mean, as many would simplistically have it, rushing to grant recognition to Peking, to admit it to the United Nations and to ply it with offers of trade—all of which would serve to confirm its rulers

in their present course. It does mean recognizing the present and potential danger from Communist China, and taking measures designed to meet that danger. It also means distinguishing carefully between long-range and short-range policies, and fashioning short-range programs so as to advance our long-range goals.

Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates and threaten its neighbors. There is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation. But we could go disastrously wrong if, in pursuing this long-range goal, we failed in the short range to read the lessons of history.

The world cannot be safe until China changes. Thus our aim, to the extent that we can influence events, should be to induce change. The way to do this is to persuade China that it *must* change: that it cannot satisfy its imperial ambitions, and that its own national interest requires a turning away from foreign adventuring and turning inward toward the solution of its own domestic problems.

Only as the nations of non-communist Asia become so strong—economically, politically and militarily—that they not longer furnish tempting targets for Chinese aggression, will the leaders in Peking be persuaded to turn their energies inward rather than outward. And that will be the time when the dialogue with mainland China will begin.

For the short run, then, this means a policy of firm restraint, of no reward, of a creative counterpressure designed to persuade Peking that its interests can be served only by accepting the basic rules of international civility. For the long run, it means pulling China back into the world community—but as a great and progressing nation, not as the epicenter of world revolution.

The dialogue with Communist China must come, I think, during the two terms of the next president. I do not believe we should recognize Communist China now or admit it to the United Nations, because that would be in effect putting the seal of approval on Communist China's present very aggressive course against India and against our forces of course in Vietnam and against all of its neighbors.

UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP

I do not favor granting a seat to the United Nations to the Communist Chinese at this time. I do not rule it out for a future time, provided they meet certain conditions.

Why do we resist the Chinese coming into the United Nations? It's because they at the present time are engaged in a course of aggression against members of the United Nations and do not qualify as a peace-loving nation, in effect, as the United Nations Charter does require.

I think that until the Chinese Communists indicate they are willing to become civilized members of the community of nations, they should not be given the prestige of being in the United Nations. And I do not believe, incidentally, that there is any excuse to say that we can't communicate with them without their being in the United Nations because we can and we do.

A strong Japan and a strong group of free nations around the perimeter of China will have more effect on mellowing the Chinese Communist leaders than anything else we could do. Because once the Chinese Communist leaders realize that there is a risk in trying to break out, then the Chinese leaders will have to turn inward and solve some of their own problems.

I think that the Chinese Communist leaders will change their policies when they realize that by not being belligerent toward the United States and toward their neighbors in Asia, including the Indians and all the rest, that by turning inward and trying to work

for their own people, that they have a much greater possibility to have a better life for their own people.

The answer is that trade with China, recognition of China, admitting it to the UN, should come only when the Chinese Communists indicate by deeds that they want to be a part of the civilized family of nations and not an outlaw nation.

RECOGNITION

I would not recognize Red China now and I would not agree to admitting it to the UN and I wouldn't go along with those well-intentioned people that said, "Trade with them," because that may change them. Because doing it now would only encourage them, the hardliners in Peking and hard-line policy that they're following. And it would have an immense effect in discouraging great numbers of non-communist elements in Free Asia that are now just beginning to develop their strength and their own confidence.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

At the end of this century, Communist China will have a billion people that will have unlimited atomic weapons and it can be exporting them all over the world, and it is essential that whoever is the next President of the United States develop policies now that will get Communist China to change so that we can open a dialogue with them.

EXPANSIONIST POLICY

We have to realize, looking down the road, that Communist China within six years, seven years, at the very least, will have a significant nuclear capability. And Communist China will be outside of the nuclear club. Therefore, whoever is elected president this next time has to be thinking now as to how we develop the power around the perimeter of China which will convince the Communist Chinese leaders that they will not gain—as a matter of fact, that they will run very great risks—in the event that they attempt to expand through the area of the Pacific as they have been attempting to expand in their sorties against India and other countries who are their neighbors.

A QUESTION OF RESPONSIBILITY

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much stir recently regarding the first amendment guarantees of freedom of the press. The fourth estate apparently believes the Constitution guarantees its right to print stolen, classified documents. It has complained bitterly that any criticism of its objectivity by public officials amounts to intimidation and censorship. It has, in short, set itself up as sole arbiter of where freedom of the press ends and responsibility of the press begins—of what is in the national interest and what is destructive of national interest.

Unfortunately, in the view of many, the line has been drawn at the point of maximum freedom and minimum responsibility with relatively little regard for the national interest, particularly in terms of national security and defense.

For example, every major newspaper in the country took its turn at printing excerpts of the so-called Pentagon

papers, which were, at very best, questionable in regard to their impact on our national interests and at worst deliberately destructive of vital national security. Yet these same newspapers said absolutely nothing of a special order in the House on August 8 during which 88 Members of Congress from both political parties spelled out their great concern over America's strategic defense position and read into the RECORD abundant evidence that that position is deteriorating to a point which seriously jeopardizes our national security.

One is almost forced to the conclusion that the fourth estate is deliberately bent on undermining our security. It will print stolen documents that contain classified information possibly destructive of our security, but it will not print anything about the warning from a fifth of the Nation's elected representatives that our security is in danger so the people may be alerted to that threat. This seems to me a peculiar sense of responsibility for an institution so quick to invoke its constitutional freedoms.

But I am heartened by the fact that at least some segments of the press recognize and denounce this twisted sense of responsibility. An editorial in the August 25 edition of the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal and a recent column by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, contain dramatic evidence that there are those in the fourth estate who take the responsibilities of their profession seriously and realize that to undermine national security in the name of freedom of the press will, in the long run if not in the short, destroy both the Nation and its free press. It is editors and columnists like these, I believe, who are the true hope of the Nation. I include these two articles in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

[From the Knoxville Journal, Aug. 25, 1971]
WHERE THE PRESS FAILED TO REPORT THREAT
TO THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, Aug. 4, 1971, surely must go down in history as one of the darkest periods of the American press. On that day national newsmen, who only days before had hoisted the banner of the First Amendment in publication of the Pentagon Papers, ignored one of the most significant and most alarming news events in recent years.

Eighty-six members of the U.S. House of Representatives took the floor, one after the other, Democrats and Republicans alike, to issue one of the most ominous warnings ever sounded on Capitol Hill. Their oral comments, plus additional remarks, cover 104 pages of the Congressional Record for that day. Not since Speaker Sam Rayburn died have such a large number of Congressmen joined in colloquy on such a scale on a single topic. Collectively the congressmen represent about one fifth of the American people. But not a word of their subject received the attention of broadcast or print media.

Their warning was essentially this: If the United States continues to fall behind the Soviet Union in armaments—naval, nuclear and other types—the survival of the nation will soon be in jeopardy.

The proceedings were completely open, and even those newsmen who were unable to attend personally easily could have read the entire transcript in the Congressional Record the following morning. But the national press which had so valiantly battled for the right to publish classified military documents proclaimed a de facto news blackout on the com-

ments of the 86 congressmen, saying, in effect, that they had no right to be heard.

DEFENSE PANEL'S WARNING ALSO IGNORED

There's simply no excuse for this. Nor was there any excuse for a similar failure of the national press to report the findings of a Blue Ribbon Defense Panel released a few months ago. This group of distinguished citizens, which earlier had analyzed U.S. strength, issued a supplemental statement which the Pentagon turned over to the press back in March. It said, in part:

"The convergence of a number of trends indicates a significant shifting of the strategic military balance against the United States and in favor of the Soviet Union. These trends include: (1) the growing Soviet superiority in ICBMs; (2) the Soviet commitment of greater resources than the U.S. to strategic offensive and defensive weapons, with the continued deployment thereof; (3) the possibility that present U.S. technological superiority will be lost to the Soviet Union; (4) the convincing evidence that the Soviet Union seeks a preemptive first strike capability; (5) the rapidly expanding Soviet naval capability; and (6) the mounting hostility of segments of the public towards the military, the defense establishment, and 'the military-industrial complex,' without due recognition that sustained irresponsible criticism could undermine and weaken the only forces which provide security for the U.S."

The panel summed up its findings in this sentence:

"In the 1970s neither the vital interests of the U.S. nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure . . ."

The Aug. 4 parade of congressmen produced testimony of much the same vein, although supplemented with extensive detail and backed up by specific data.

Many of the specific comments referred to specific areas in which the Soviet Union has surpassed or threatens to surpass this country in armed strength. One comparison was especially chilling:

Today the Soviet Union has 1,500 ICBM launchers with a nuclear megatonnage of 10,580, whereas the United States has 1,054 launchers with a megatonnage of only 1,270—meaning that the Soviet Union has an 8 to 1 superiority in offensive power.

Rep. J. Herbert Burke, R-Fla., put the meaning of this circumstance in this manner: "In fact the Soviet force is capable of killing 100 million Americans on first strike."

EVEN AMERICAN SLBM EDGE THREATENED

According to the various statements by the Blue Ribbon Panel and the 86 congressmen, the United States retains the lead in only one area of missile armaments—in the shorter-range SLBMs which are launched from submarines. "Yet," the panel noted, "the Soviet Union has a major submarine construction program which by 1973-74 could nullify this advantage."

In another area of armaments this was the observation:

"The Soviet navy, modern and rapidly expanding, is now challenging U.S. naval superiority in every category except aircraft carriers. This Soviet naval buildup is a major element in the shifting balance of military power."

In his portion of the presentation Rep. John Duncan included this quotation from the panel's report:

"The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely the contrary. Among the great nations only the strong survive. Weakness of the U.S.—of its military capability and its will—could be the gravest threat to peace of the world . . ."

Congressman Duncan added this personal observation:

"Mr. Speaker, the Constitution in its pre-

amble makes clear that the first duty of our national government is 'to provide for the common defense.' We all have an oath, registered in Heaven, as Lincoln said, to uphold the Constitution and to carry out its provisions.

"That translates into a direct and unavoidable obligation on all members (of the Congress) to acquaint themselves with the problem of our national defense and to equip themselves with the information necessary to force a valid judgment . . ."

The same thought could apply to all citizens, who clearly have the duty to stay informed about the various issues facing the nation. How else can they, as voters, make "valid judgments" about the candidates before them?

But when the press ignores crucial warnings such as these, private citizens are left without vital information. The fabric of the Republic is weakened.

SENSING THE NEWS: U.S. DEFENSES IMPERILED

(By Anthony Harrigan)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One of the most important developments in the Congress this year—and one almost completely ignored by the Washington press corps—was a collective effort Aug. 4 by 86 members of the House of Representatives to warn the nation of the deterioration of America's defenses.

Speaker after speaker, members of both parties, rose in the House to state the ominous facts; the United States is falling behind the Soviet Union in all major types of armament, and, therefore, America's security is in jeopardy.

Tragically, this extraordinary congressional warning didn't make the headlines. William J. Gill, president of News Perspective International, reports: "Not one national television show featured this story; not a line of it appeared in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*. . . . As one disgusted House member from Illinois put it, 'If Rep. Bella Abzug had dropped her bra on the Capital steps it would have hit every screen and every front page in the country. But we get blanked completely on something like this.'"

It is shocking that attention isn't paid to the biggest news story of our time—America's virtual disarmament in the face of the growing military might of the Soviet Union. U.S. Rep. Floyd Spence (R-S.C.) who took the initiative in setting up the special presentation, summed up the situation with great accuracy, saying:

"We, along with many of our colleagues, have witnessed with alarm the steady growth of Soviet military power, while at the same time our own preparedness has been neglected.

"This trend has developed to the extent that we are presently in serious danger of becoming a second-rate military power. For example, the balance of sea power in the world today is, at best, only precariously tipped in favor of the United States. In fact, there are indications that in a non-nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union at sea, the U.S. Navy may come out second best."

Rep. Samuel Stratton (D-NY) added a warning that "for the past year or more we have been beset by a mounting anti-military movement, not only in portions of the country and in the public press but here in Congress as well, with special emphasis in the Senate but to a growing extent also in the House . . . We are in real danger of having started a process that has already cut our forces below what is adequate to meet our defense needs, and may even have already tipped the balance of world military power against ourselves."

U.S. Rep. Benjamin Blackburn (R-Ga) added a warning about the Strategic Arms Limitations talks with the Russians. He cited the "lamentable decline and fading of our superiority in strategic weaponry," noting

that the "current SALT talks may lead to dangerous technological and political imbalances which may leave us without the means to defend ourselves against Soviet attack."

Congressman Philip Crane (R-Ill.), who took part in the colloquy, observed that America's leaders no longer tell us that our country is the world's most powerful. It isn't, of course. The U.S. has 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Soviet Union has 1,500 ICBM's.

Rep. Crane commented: "It is as if Americans awakened one morning to find that all of their confident assumptions about their country were no longer true, as if they discovered that not only could their country not fulfill its commitments to others, but could not even defend itself."

It is to be hoped that the U.S. public will heed these warnings. Happily, the special order arranged by Congressman Spence and his associates indicates a bipartisan rally in support of stronger defenses. But presidential leadership is needed if the anti-defense lobby is to be overcome. This presidential leadership has been lacking the last 2½ years.

President Nixon undoubtedly erred early in his term when he accepted the strategic doctrine of nuclear "sufficiency" proposed by his chief foreign policy adviser, Dr. Henry Kissinger. In the years after World War II, the U.S. sought military supremacy. This supremacy deterred Soviet nuclear aggression. Now, our supremacy in arms is gone. The USSR is moving ahead in every type of weapons system. The Kissinger doctrine of "sufficiency" is proving to be our undoing. More and more, it is clear that Mr. Nixon has received bad advice from Dr. Kissinger—advice dangerous to the American people. It is imperative that Mr. Nixon dispense with Dr. Kissinger and start listening to concerned members of Congress and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the real experts who are the President's authentic military advisers according to the law of the land.

In the meantime, the American people can be thankful that there is a substantial number of congressmen who take seriously their responsibility to alert the nation regarding the deteriorated condition of the country's defenses.

PHOENIX PROGRAM IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate and passage of the foreign assistance bill, one of the questions of the so-called Phoenix program in South Vietnam was discussed. Several allegations were confusing if not inaccurate.

I have recently received a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Mr. G. Warren Nutter, which I believe very adequately sets the record and the facts straight on this matter and I would like to take this opportunity to read his letter into the RECORD.

But before I do that, I would like to note that as the chairman of the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee I am personally aware of the program and have also discussed it on numerous occasions with Ambassador Bill Colby who, until recently, was in charge of Phoenix.

Phoenix operates on the district and province level in South Vietnam with U.S. support and is designed to gather, evaluate, and disseminate intelligence on the identity and movements of members of the Vietcong, the so-called Vietcong infrastructure. These are nonmilitary figures who govern parts of Vietnam still controlled by their movement and who slip in and out of Government controlled and contested areas. And I want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that this information and intelligence data are used to neutralize this Vietcong effectiveness not for "assassination and torture" as was alleged here on the floor in support of an amendment whose aim was to withdraw U.S. support from this program. The letter received from Mr. Nutter which I believe sets this matter straight stated:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D.C., August 21, 1971.

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Record of August 3, 1971 (page H7761-2) reports an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act offered by Mr. Reid of New York, which was defeated by voice vote. This amendment would have barred any assistance under the Act to any nation for programs which encompass the assassination or torture of persons, or which violate the standards set forth in the Geneva Conventions. In his remarks submitting the amendment (copy attached), Mr. Reid made reference to the Phoenix Program of the Government of Vietnam, which is supported by the United States.

Ambassador William E. Colby, cited by Mr. Reid, has suggested that clarification would be appropriate of certain aspects of the Phoenix (Phung Hoang) Program in reference of Mr. Reid's remarks and the testimony received by the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the House Committee on Government Operations subsequent to Ambassador Colby's appearance there on July 19, 1971.

As described in some detail in Ambassador Colby's testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February 1970, the Phoenix (Phung Hoang) Program of the Vietnamese Government was effectively begun in July 1968, as the result of a Vietnamese Presidential directive. United States support of this program has been principally advisory in nature, directed at improving the intelligence methods, the apprehension techniques, the legal procedures and the detention arrangements involved in the struggle of the Vietnamese against the Viet Cong infrastructure, or clandestine, subversive and terrorist apparatus. As testified by Ambassador Colby, unjustified abuse occurred in this struggle in the past, and could occur at present, but the Phoenix Program does not encompass or condone unjustifiable abuses in any way, and in fact is designed to eliminate them. United States policy in this regard was set out in MACV Directive 525-36 of 18 May 1970 (copy attached) which formalized an earlier memorandum of 15 October 1969 cited in Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings February 1970, page 725. The Vietnamese Government in its Community Defense and Local Development Plan for 1971 includes the following provision in its Annex I covering the Phoenix (Phung Hoang) Program:

"In order to gain the confidence of the people and their support for the Government's program to neutralize the VCI, all personnel working with Phung Hoang must closely adhere to the policy of treating the population and the VCI detainees with a sense of high respect for the law and not abuse their authority in their performance

of duty. Consequently, Phung Hoang committees of all echelons must concentrate on the following points in 1971:

"a. Cooperation and coordination with village, hamlet, ward, and quarter officials when performing missions in their areas, to include notification of these officials regarding the disposition of any people arrested.

"b. Screening should be performed quickly, humanely, and fairly with emphasis on immediate release of innocent people without causing them undue trouble and annoyance.

"c. Perfection of target dossiers. Arrests are to be made only when sufficient evidence and accurate information is available.

"d. Province and City Security Committees must meet at least once a week (or more often depending on requirements) to consider detainee cases and sentence the VCI as appropriate.

"e. Notification of detainee disposition must be made to the appropriate government echelons and agencies to ensure effective monitoring."

As indicated in the Department of State's opinion, filed with the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations in response to its request of Ambassador Colby on July 19, 1971, the Phoenix Program is not violative of the Terms of the Geneva Conventions. Although certain aspects give concern in their field of due process, the Vietnamese and American Governments, working together, have brought about a number of improvements in its procedures and are cooperating in the formulation and application of additional measures to bring greater effectiveness to the struggle against the Viet Cong infrastructure and to ensure that the program meets high standards of justice. Reports of unjustified abuses predating the implementation of the Phoenix Program or involving US or Vietnamese military intelligence or combat operations should not be mistakenly ascribed to the Phoenix Program of the Vietnamese Government nor to US support thereof.

In summary, the struggle between the Viet Cong infrastructure and the Vietnamese Government is an integral part of the overall struggle against the Viet Cong. It is not mistakenly ascribed to the Phoenix Program. The Phoenix Program has brought about improvements in the effectiveness and propriety of the Vietnamese Government's conduct of this struggle. United States support of this program is conducted under the same restraints as support of other Vietnamese military and civil programs.

Sincerely,

O. WARREN NUTTER,
ASD-ISA.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REID OF NEW YORK

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. REID of New York: Page 12, line 13, strike out the quotation marks and the period immediately following such quotation marks.

"Page 13, after line 13, insert:

"(x) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any nation for programs which encompass the assassination or torture of persons, or which violate the standards set forth in the Geneva Convention."

Mr. REID of New York. This amendment is simple, I believe. It is directed to insuring that there are no programs through which the United States provides funds to any nation which encompasses as a program, the assassination or torture, or programs which violate the standards set forth in the Geneva Conventions.

More explicitly, my amendment would require that no U.S. funds would be furnished to programs which are characterized by a pattern of assassination or torture or other violations of the Geneva Conventions, to

which the United States is a signatory. It would cut off assistance only to those programs of a nation which were characterized by such abuses, but would not deny funds to worthy programs being carried out by that nation.

This amendment is prompted primarily by the outrageous abuses which have taken place under the Phoenix program in South Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, we have had testimony before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information last month, from Ambassador William Colby, former Director of CORDS, and from a number of other persons which relate to some activities of Phoenix, which, in my judgment are violative, at the time they took place, of the Geneva Conventions. The United States is clearly on record as being a signatory to the four Geneva Conventions, which clearly proscribe and preclude such activities.

We have had testimony from eyewitnesses that clearly indicates that there have been in the past, not in the immediate present, but in the past, immediate neutralization, termination with extreme prejudice, assassination, and torture ending in death. For those who saw page 2 of the Washington Post this morning, they will see some of the details of the latest testimony, and there is a similar story by Mary McGrory in the Washington Star tonight. Unfortunately it has been a record of testimony that I think is clear, and this is the reason why we think the bill before us should be explicit with regard to our use of funds in connection with regard anything that is violative of the Geneva Conventions.

I might mention parenthetically, that Ambassador Colby has pointed out that under the Phoenix program to date, while 28,000 persons have been captured of the Vietcong infrastructure, over 20,587 have been killed.

The thrust of this amendment is not against the rallying or the bringing over to the side of the Saigon Government those in the Vietcong infrastructure. Our concern is with practices that are clearly violative of the conventions.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain the Phoenix program in more detail.

The Phoenix program is a program of the GVN, heavily supported by the United States, whose stated purpose is to "eliminate" or "neutralize" the Vietcong infrastructure—VCI. Such "neutralization" or "elimination" is accomplished in any one of three ways: Rallying; that is, inducing the VCI to surrender or come over to the government side voluntarily—capture and sentencing, or killing.

In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information last month, Ambassador William Colby, former director of CORDS, the agency in Vietnam which administers U.S. support to Phoenix, stated that since the beginning of 1968 until May 1971, a total of 20,587 persons have been killed under the Phoenix program. In the same period, 28,978 have been captured.

The VCI are officially defined as the "leadership apparatus" of the Vietcong insurgency. They are nearly all civilians, including many women. Members of VC village, district, and province committees, for example, are classified as VCI. In most cases they do not qualify for "prisoners of war" status when captured. Thus Phoenix is aimed not at the elimination of armed combatants, but at the elimination of unarmed, noncombatant civilians. By analogy, if the Union had had a Phoenix program during our Civil War, its targets would have been civilians like Jefferson Davis or the mayor of Macon, Ga.

The abuses and inhumaneness perpetrated by the Phoenix program make it imperative that we cease to support it at once and do

everything in our power to have the GVN stop the program dead in its tracks. Under Phoenix, civilians identified as VCI have been assassinated without any semblance of judicial process. Ambassador Colby has acknowledged this, although he states that the United States is endeavoring to prevent its recurrence. Persons detained under the Phoenix program can be incarcerated for up to 2 years without trial under a South Vietnamese law known as the An Tri Law, again without any semblance of due process. Ambassador Colby admitted that under this law a Phoenix detainee could be jailed without a trial, without right to counsel, and without adequate protection of his rights "under our concept of due process." Torture of detainees during interrogation is another hallmark of the Phoenix program. Specific instances of torture have been described under oath by witnesses before the subcommittee. Theodore Jacqueney, a former AID official in Vietnam testified:

"In every province in Vietnam there is a Province Interrogation Center—a 'PIC'—with a reputation for using torture to interrogate people accused of Viet Cong affiliations. These PICs have a CIA counterpart relationship, and in some cases also have a relationship with the AID police advisor."

Mr. Jacqueney went on to describe a instance of torture, known as the "rock and roll," of which he had knowledge. Reports of such torture have come from others as well, and they simply cannot be ignored or downplayed.

At least as shocking as the assassinations, torture, and drumhead incarceration of civilians under the Phoenix program is the fact that in many cases the intelligence is so bad that innocent people are made victims. Yesterday two former military intelligence personnel in Vietnam, Michael Uhl and Barton Osborne, testified that virtually all information identifying an individual as a VCI is unverifiable and frequently completely unreliable. Both described motives of financial gain, and sometimes pure personal vindictiveness, as factors causing Vietnamese intelligence agents to give information about an individual. Ambassador Colby admitted this problem. In response to the question, "Are you certain that we know a member of the VCI from a loyal member of the South Vietnam citizenry?"

Mr. Colby stated:
"No. . . . I am not."

Who knows how many innocent people have been assassinated or tortured in the name of the Phoenix program?

Not only Phoenix, but any program or activity conducted by a foreign nation which involves assassination, torture, or other mistreatment of civilians, or which violates the standards of the Geneva Conventions, should not receive the support of the United States. I have described Phoenix as an egregious example. Wherever other examples may exist, they too must be cut off from U.S. support. We cannot hold our heads high as a nation if we continue to condone and support programs such as this.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address a question to the author of this amendment. I know the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which the gentleman is a member, has been holding hearings, but this amendment came as a surprise to the committee. I suggest the gentleman's subcommittee should hold further hearings and develop the case more precisely.

It worries me that we should add to section 620 of this bill another limitation which will be very difficult to administer.

The way I read the amendment, it says that no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any nation for programs which encompass the assassination, torture of

civilians, or which violate the standards set forth in the Geneva Conventions.

To me that language is somewhat vague. It worries me that we might be buying a pig in a poke here.

I have no strong feelings. If the subcommittee would develop something and put it in a bill form, along these lines, it will be considered. We have in our programs many former projects which could bring us into violation under this limitation.

What worries me is that perhaps a group of tourists in any country might do a couple of assassinations, and under this amendment we might upset our whole aid program.

I am not so completely opposed to this. I believe the subcommittee on which the gentleman from New York serves should hold further hearings and develop some legislation, and I can promise him it will receive some consideration.

Mr. REID of New York. The chairman very kindly asked me to comment.

First, Mr. Chairman, the thrust of this amendment is to say that U.S. funds should not go to any nation which is carrying out activities in violation of the Geneva Conventions, to which we are a signatory. If we are in fact doing that now we are in violation of international law which should be supreme in matters of this kind.

The only two specifics which go beyond the Geneva Conventions mentioned in the amendment are the assassination and torture, but they are covered by an additional phrase dealing with a program, a program of assassination or a program of torture.

I do not think any person or his spouse would argue for a program of assassination or a program of torture.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, both of those are explicitly prescribed and covered in the Geneva Conventions. All I am trying to do is to put this House on record to show a sense of concern that we will uphold the Geneva Conventions to the extent our funds are utilized.

Mr. MORGAN. I wonder if the gentleman would explain to the House who would make the determination under his amendment?

Mr. REID of New York. I would think the Secretary of State would make this determination.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.
So the amendment was rejected.

MILITARY OPERATIONS: PHOENIX (PHUNG HOANG) OPERATIONS

1. *Purpose.*—This directive establishes policy and responsibilities for all US personnel participating in, or supporting in any way, Phoenix (Phung Hoang) operations.

2. *Applicability.*—This directive is applicable to all MACV staff agencies and subordinate commands.

3. *Policy.*—

a. The Phoenix Program is one of advice, support, and assistance to the Government of Vietnam (GVN) Phung Hoang Programs, aimed at reducing the influence and effectiveness of the Viet Cong Infrastructure (VCI) in the Republic of Vietnam (RVN). The VCI is an inherent part of the war effort being waged against the GVN by the Viet Cong (VC) and their North Vietnamese allies. The unlawful status of members of the VCI (as defined in the "Green Book" and in GVN official decrees) is well established in GVN law and is in full accord with the laws of land warfare followed by the US Army.

b. Operations against the VCI include: the collection of intelligence identifying these

members, inducing them to abandon their allegiance to the VC and rally to the government, capturing or arresting them in order to bring them before province security committees for lawful sentencing, and as a final resort the use of military or police force against them if no other way of preventing them from carrying on their unlawful activities is possible. Our training emphasizes the desirability of obtaining these target individuals alive and of using intelligent and lawful methods of interrogation to obtain the truth of what they know about other aspects of the BCI. US personnel are under the same legal and moral constraints with respect to operations of a Phoenix character as they are with respect to regular military operations against enemy units in the field. Thus, they are specifically unauthorized to engage in assassinations or other violations of the rules of land warfare, but they are entitled to use such reasonable military force as is necessary to obtain the goals of rallying, capturing, or eliminating the VCI in the RVN.

c. If US personnel come in contact with activities conducted by Vietnamese which do not meet the standards of land warfare, they are:

(1) Not to participate further in the activity.

(2) Expected to make their objections to this kind of behavior known to the Vietnamese conducting them.

(3) Expected to report the circumstances to the next higher US authority for decision as to action to be taken with the GVN.

d. There are individuals who find normal police work or even military operations repugnant to them personally, despite the overall legality and morality of these activities. Arrangements exist whereby individuals having this feeling about military affairs can, according to law, receive specialized assignments or even exemption from military service. There is no similar legislation with respect to police type activities of the US military, but if an individual finds the police type activities of the Phoenix Program repugnant to him, on his application, he can be reassigned from the program without prejudice.

4. *Responsibilities.*—Subordinate US commanders are to insure that the policies outlined above are strictly adhered to.

5. *Reports.*—This directive requires no report.

W. G. DOLVIN,
Major General, USA,
Chief of Staff.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN GILBERT GUDE TO CHEMICAL ENGINEERS

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, many, many tasks remain to be accomplished by the Congress, by industry, and by the scientist and engineer in the cleansing of our environment. A colleague on the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Representative GILBERT GUDE of Maryland, discussed these tasks during the congressional recess before a national meeting of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers in Atlantic City, N.J.

His address outlines some of the progress that has been made but stresses the great efforts needed still. But it also suggests the great rewards of this work—

the belief that we are working to pass on a cleaner, purer world to our children:

It is a very great pleasure for me to participate today in this panel discussion on the chemical engineer and the environment. As a member of the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House, I have been deeply involved in legislative efforts to improve our environment. One thing I have learned is that despite our nation's wealth of scientific and technical talent, we have not managed to employ this talent in solving the difficult problems of environmental pollution. If we are ever to succeed in achieving our goal of a safer and cleaner world, we will need more than just rhetoric, more than just money; we will need the brains, creativity and initiative of many individuals. Therefore, I am very pleased to see the AICE focus on this problem today.

American industry has developed a number of technological innovations that have contributed enormously to our efforts to control pollution. For example, the Monsanto Company has recently developed a catalytic oxidation process, now being demonstrated at an electric power plant, to remove sulfur oxides from stack gases.

Recently, in Puerto Rico, I inspected a secondary wash water treatment plant at Union Carbide's petrochemical facility at Quayanilla Bay, where petrochemical effluent is broken down in anaerobic and aerobic treatment ponds. Also, in the course of developing their secondary plant, Union Carbide found it feasible to recycle certain wastes which were previously discharged as pollutants.

The anaerobic bacteria are transplanted from a culture used in the production of rum at a nearby Puerto Rican rum plant. So far, the bacteria have failed to complain of the change in diet! I guess after enough rum you don't know what you're eating!

Also, in Puerto Rico, I saw one of the few operating examples of the recycling and utilization of waste heat. This was at the Commonwealth Oil Refining Corporation's facility not far from Union Carbide. The Company constructed a desalination plant which employs waste heat to purify sea water to a quality higher than that necessary for drinking water.

Closer to home, my own State of Maryland is looking into pyrolysis techniques which involve shredding solid waste and heating it to high temperatures in the absence of oxygen. Since there is no oxygen, there is no burning and most of the material is converted to gas. Then the gases are burned, greatly reducing their volume, and producing practically no air pollution.

Despite this progress, however, a great deal remains to be done. We have not yet developed commercially viable methods of controlling nitrogen oxides. Technology to control heavy metals and other toxic substances is still inadequate. In fact, we have only recently developed the sophisticated equipment needed to detect many of these substances in the environment.

The Second Annual Report of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, released just this August, reveals that research and development expenditures for pollution control by all industry is to increase to \$925.8 million in 1971. This is an increase of 25 percent over the 1970 expenditure. These figures indicate that industry realizes the commitment required.

Notwithstanding the need for research and development, many pollutants could be significantly reduced by more widespread use of current technology. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates, for example, that 95 percent of particulate emissions could be eliminated if presently available technology were put to work.

Industry is making some progress in installing pollution controls. It is difficult to get accurate figures in this area because there

is a problem in separating expenditures for pollution control from those made for process changes that increase productivity. However, figures from the Council on Environmental Quality indicate that investment in pollution control equipment increased 50 percent in 1970 over 1969. In 1971 it is expected that such investments by all of business will total \$3.6 billion, an increase of 46 percent over 1970.

I have not quoted these figures to convince you that all is rosy and that the problem is well on the way to being solved. This is far from true. I merely want to indicate that industry is moving and that there is a place in industry for people to work on these problems.

The Administration has been quick to recognize the urgency of the environmental crisis and has initiated some very innovative and practical legislation. One of the Administration's best bills, which I introduced in the House, is the Power Plant Siting Bill.

This legislation applies to all bulk power suppliers—nuclear as well as conventional—including investor-owned, Federal, State, municipal, and cooperatively owned systems.

It provides for the establishment of state, regional and federal certifying agencies to hold public hearings and certify power plant sites, facilities, and high voltage transmission lines well in advance of construction.

The utilities would be required to submit plans for proposed system expansions at least ten years ahead of construction. Hearings on site acquisition and construction permits would be held 5 and 2 years in advance, respectively.

Our Nation now faces the future alternative of blackouts and brownouts on the one hand, or haphazard consideration of the environmental issues raised by new power plants on the other. The Power Plant Siting Bill would assure early and systematic review of the need for new power facilities and their impact on the environment.

The power plants to be constructed in the future also present us with an opportunity to make use of the waste heat produced in the electric generating process. I mentioned earlier that this was being done at the Corco Facility in Puerto Rico, but waste heat from power plants presents a much more serious problem than that from refineries. About two-thirds of the total energy converted in today's power plants is expelled as waste heat. The need for vast quantities of water to condense this waste heat at low costs has drawn the power utilities to our nation's lakes, rivers, and bays. There are often harmful effects from introducing heated water from the condensers back into the waterways.

Reuse of waste heat is a form of recycling of resources, and I believe that this is the direction in which we must move. Numerous uses have been suggested, but surprisingly little research has been done in this area. One of the difficulties is that the heat is at a relatively low temperature. The amount of this heat is vast, however,—more than enough to heat all the homes in America.

Another environmental problem that requires much future research is oil pollution, an almost inevitable result of our oil-based economy. The extent of oil pollution in the world's seas is great and becoming greater every year. Spills while loading and unloading tankers, through the pumping of bilges, through tanker accidents, and through losses during exploration, all result in pollution. In addition, much of the oil pollution in the coastal regions results from used petroleum products passing untreated through the municipal sewer systems and then being discharged into the waters.

This pollution will continue to increase as our needs increase, as more oil is transported in ever larger tankers, and as production is shifted to the more hazardous areas such as Alaska, the continental shelf and the deep ocean.

Floating masses of crude oil on the oceans and the presence of crude oil on beaches are now common occurrences. Oil is found in the stomachs of surface feeding fish, and finely dispersed hydrocarbons occur in marine plants and in the fat of fish and shellfish. The full extent of this contamination is virtually unknown. The possible harmful results of this situation are staggering. One of the many problems is cancer. The carcinogenic effects of the chemicals in petroleum have been known for some years now. The effect of crude oil and oil products on man was first noted when a high incidence of skin cancer was observed in some refinery personnel. Better plant design and education have since reduced this hazard.

When oil is spilled into the environment, however, we lose control over it. Marine organisms ingest and retain hydrocarbons which are transferred to and retained by predators. Shellfish can cleanse themselves of the human waste which is so often discharged untreated or poorly treated from our municipal sewage plants, but they cannot perform this remarkable feat with hydrocarbons. Thus, animals that were not directly exposed to a spill can be contaminated when these chemicals get in their food chain. This has grave implications for commercial fisheries and for human health. The eating of oil-contaminated fish and shellfish at the very least increases the body's burden of carcinogenic chemicals.

I am particularly interested in this problem because the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland is a great financial and recreational resource to my state. The Chesapeake Bay is the queen of America's estuaries, and we want her to retain her crown.

It has been estimated that 70% of the fish caught off the Eastern seaboard spend some portion of their lives in the nutrient-rich, low salinity area of the Chesapeake Bay. The Bay produces 25% of the total world catch of crabs, 50% of all soft shell clams caught in the nation, and 50% of the nation's oysters. Of the 10,100,000 striped bass caught along the Atlantic coast in 1970, nearly 6,000,000 were caught in the Chesapeake Bay.

Not only chemical engineers, but biochemists, biologists, oceanographers and others with a background in the physical sciences are needed for oil pollution work. It is a vitally important issue not simply because of the economic value of the seas, but because of the great importance of the seas in the ecological life-cycle of this planet.

This month, after a study of oil pollution in the Chesapeake Bay, I made a number of recommendations on how to alleviate this problem.

Among the things I recommended were: strict standards for vessel design, construction, maintenance, and operation in order to reduce the chances of major spills.

I also recommended that the Secretary of Transportation should be authorized to levy assessments on the pollution potential of the oil companies operations in a given area. This would give incentive to the companies to invest in the needed preventive facilities and clean-up equipment. Those that failed to do this would have to contribute to a fund to be used for the development and implementation of oil spill clean-up plans administered by the Coast Guard.

In my remarks, I have tried to give you some indication of how industry and government have responded to the crisis of the environment. It will no doubt be emphasized many times during this panel discussion that what is very much needed today is the dedication and creative energy of men with valuable specialized knowledge.

Everyone, but especially people in fields such as chemical engineering, should consider the environmental effect of proposed projects. Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act requires that any

federal agency proposing legislation or planning to undertake action significantly affecting the environment must file an impact statement with the Council on Environmental Quality. I would hope to see industry make such studies part of their standard procedures, and, indeed, it would also be effective if individuals made a similar commitment in their personal lives.

A poster in New York's subway asked "Did you make New York dirtier today?" Under it someone scrawled: "No, but New York made me dirtier today!" Because of New York's mountains of problems and dirt, we seldom talk much about the good things New York has produced. Similarly, the day is approaching when the good things our technology and economy have produced may be forgotten amid the resulting dirt and grime. It may be that our children will look upon us as destroyers, not builders. But this need not be.

All of us work hard to provide for our future and the future of our children. One of the best things we can do for their future is to work to eliminate the health and safety hazards of a polluted environment. The talents of the chemical engineer can be invaluable in this effort. To be able to fish with your children in a clear, unpolluted river, or to walk with them on a clean unspilled beach, and to know that you are playing a role in preserving this natural heritage for them can be a most rewarding experience. Ecology is its own reward!

VEYSEY CITES MEXICO'S CULTURAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICAN LIFE IN OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE WEEK

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Mexican Independence Day, the Congress requested in 1968, that the President designate a week to include September 15 and 16 as National Hispanic Heritage Week. I join President Nixon in extending warm greetings to our Hispanic friends and neighbors on both sides of the border.

On this happy occasion I would like to offer some thoughts on our relations between Mexico and the United States.

It was on September 16, 1810, that Padre Miguel Hidalgo ordered the "Grito De Dolores," the battle cry of the Mexican Revolution. The years that followed were long and bitter ones for Mexico as she tried to break the bonds of the conquerors, create her own national unity, and overcome the social and economic problems confronting a young nation.

The Mexican Revolution of 1910, which brought so many thousands of Mexicans into the United States created fresh pride in the ancient heritage of the Mexican race and a new sense of identity. This also meant the beginning of a new era for the Mexican American in the Southwest. It has meant a political awakening which has led Mexican Americans to participate both as citizens who cast their vote at the polls and as candidates for office. It has also involved a social awakening in which Mexican Americans have begun to insist upon fulfillment of the

civil rights guaranteed to them by the U.S. Constitution and by the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo of 1848.

Today Mexican Americans' contributions to the industrial, agricultural, artistic, intellectual, and political life of the Southwest cannot be measured solely in terms of present day accomplishments. It is certain that the Southwest as we know it would not exist without the Mexican-Spanish heritage. What sets off New Mexico from Oklahoma and differentiates California from Oregon is in large measure the result of the activities of the ancestors of our citizens of Mexican descent.

In many sections of the Southwest, particularly along the border from San Diego, Calif., to Brownsville, Tex., Mexican Americans are the majority population, and their language and culture serve to provide the entire region with much of its distinctiveness. The American way of life has been and is being immeasurably enriched by their presence north of the present-day international boundary.

Today Mexican Americans are represented in all walks of life in this country. Civil servants, U.S. Senators and Representatives, lawyers, social workers, teachers and scholars, artists and architects, the diplomatic corps, and the medical profession all attest to the true potential of these American citizens.

As with cultures brought by other immigrants to these shores, Americans have absorbed Hispanic-Mexican ideas, art, and customs, changing them to fit the American way of life. In recent times many people have rediscovered the richness of the Hispanic-Mexican inheritance in our own backyard. Their inherent love of the land, their emphasis on close family bonds, their customs of worship and their deep religious devotion, have contributed to the cultural well-being of the United States. The great gardens of the Mexican missions in California where olives, limes, dates, figs, oranges, lemons, and grapes were first adapted to U.S. soil have been the seed beds for millions of acres of groves and vineyards throughout the United States.

Mexican mining techniques in copper, gold, and silver formed the basis for present-day mining processes. Without these processes most of the richest mines in the West could not have been properly developed.

The American cowboy is directly inherited from the Mexican vaquero. The superb horsemanship of the Mexican cowboy was again established in last year's Olympics competition.

In time of war U.S. citizens of Latin American descent have established an outstanding record of bravery, loyalty, and patriotism in fighting for this Nation's cause. During World War II, 500,000 Mexican Americans served in the Armed Forces.

Long may the policy of "Buen Vecino" flourish between us. Long may we both remain free. Long may we both be able to congratulate each other on our Independence Days. The 16th of September is a holiday and an occasion that crosses the border. May our common boundary always remain an open door encouraging

good will among the people of our two nations.

WHO REPRESENTS THE PUBLIC?

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial was recently broadcast by radio station WMNI in Columbus, Ohio, by Bill Mnich, president. This editorial is worthy of consideration by all of our colleagues, and has to do with the serious question of "who represents the public." The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL

Lobbying in this country, whether it be in Congress, the Ohio General Assembly, or City Council, is big business. Special interest groups maintain offices in the Nation's Capital and retain a full staff of workers to "buttonhole" legislators and argue for, or against legislation that will be beneficial or detrimental to the group they represent. The same is true in the state legislatures, but on a smaller scale. But who represents the public? You and me?

So often when an important piece of legislation is being considered, the lobbyists are the only ones to turn out to present their cases. This will prompt the lawmakers to lament the fact that "the public" is apathetic since no representative of the public showed up. But, that assumption is wrong! *The legislator is the representative of the public.* He or she is the person the voting public has chosen to be their spokesman and if congressmen don't recognize that fact, they have no business serving in the General Assembly. After all, the so-called "other side" or public doesn't have time to run down to the legislature interested or concerned. These people are the working productive backbone of the community. Their spokesmen are the people they elected to protect their best interests. Sometimes, however, elected officials tend to forget that fact. We urge all legislators to quit governing by pressure or fear of any kind. After all, there are 10 million people in Ohio and 200 million in the United States not in your office—they are the ones you represent, Mr. Legislator!

CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN OVER DEFENSE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, commander in chief, Strategic Air Command, said:

This country is in greater danger today than it was at the time of Pearl Harbor or at any time, in my judgment, since the 18th century, but the danger isn't generally recognized.

Just prior to the August congressional recess, more than 80 Congressmen took the floor in the House of Representatives to demonstrate their concern about the rapidly declining defense capabilities of the United States. The week before, a

number of Senators had voiced similar sentiments.

There is now little doubt in the mind of any informed person that the United States is inferior to the Soviet Union in practically every aspect of military power. What is worse, this disparity in strategic forces is growing worse due to a combination of Executive restraint in hopes of progress at the SALT talks, congressional criticism, and growing pressure from numerous disarmament lobbies chanting about reordering priorities.

Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, spoke about the U.S. failure to acknowledge repeated warnings from the House Committee responsible for our defenses, that our military forces are being seriously depleted. He then inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire foreword from the 1971 edition of the authoritative English publication "Jane's Fighting Ships," so that all those interested might grasp the extent of our naval decline.

Jane's reported that "by any standard the Soviet Fleet now represents the supernavy of a superpower," while "the size and relative capabilities of the U.S. Navy continues to decline at what many authorities consider to be an alarming rate." Jane's also pointed out that the Chief of U.S. Naval Operations considered our naval force to have fallen below a "prudent level." It stated "the Soviet Navy has already exceeded the United States in active surface ship and submarine numbers," while at the same time "in some respects the characteristics and capabilities of the Soviet ships obviously are superior to those of their U.S. Navy counterparts."

Information brought to light during this congressional colloquy relating to other areas of our Nation's sagging defenses was as disturbing as that concerning the state of our Naval forces.

Dr. John S. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in April that the former estimate that the Soviets would not be able to destroy an unprotected land-based Minuteman missile force until 1975 had been rendered "obsolete" by Soviet construction of new missile silos. Recent information that the Soviets are proceeding with this construction of what appear to be two new generations of intercontinental ballistic missiles at a "high start rate"—read—unexpectedly rapid pace—should put to rest any assertions that they are building strategic forces simply for purposes of deterrence.

U.S. deterrence of the Soviet Union has been based on being able to deliver 300 warheads on target after absorbing a Soviet strike. The Soviet Union is now able to deliver many times that number on the United States even if we decided to strike first.

The sorry state of our strategic bomber force was also a subject of comment. In 1961 we had 1,500 aircraft in our manned bomber inventory. Today, with a force level of 435 B-52's, we have one-third

that number. By the time the B-1 advanced strategic bomber comes into the inventory—if it ever does—we will probably be reduced to a bomber force consisting of 255 B-52's due to the necessary retirement of older models in the meantime. While as our bomber force decreases, the number of Soviet nuclear ballistic missile submarines which pose a threat to our bomber force is rapidly increasing.

Small wonder many citizens are not aware of the dire peril into which our Nation is drifting when despite the unusual number of Congressmen participating in this effort, covering 104 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and despite the startling nature of the facts brought forth, News Perspective International reports that—

Not one national television news show featured this story; not a line of it appeared in the New York Times nor the Washington Post, and so far as the Congressmen could immediately determine neither the Associated Press nor United Press International carried it on their national wires.

If this news blackout on the danger our country faces continues, we will not respond adequately or in time. When the Soviet Union wants to start a war, it will not be deterred by weakness.

NATIONALITIES SERVICES CENTER HONORS DR. HENRY B. OLLENDORFF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, September 17, the Nationalities Services Center of Cleveland, Ohio, will hold its fifth annual Golden Door Award Ceremony.

The Nationalities Services Center, a community based organization, is charged with assisting new residents from abroad who settle in the greater Cleveland area.

Each year the Nationalities Services Center recognizes an outstanding citizen of foreign birth for contributions and achievements made to our American way of life.

This year's recipient will be Dr. Henry B. Ollendorff, the founder and guiding light of the Council of International Programs for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, Inc. The principal speaker at Friday's award ceremony will be Mrs. Laura Fermi, widow of the late Enrico Fermi, the great Italian-American who did so much to unlock the secrets of the atom. Mrs. Fermi is very famous in her own light as the author of many widely read books on science, politics, and, most recently, a book entitled "Illustrious Immigrant."

The Nationalities Services Center should be commended and thanked by the entire greater Cleveland community for their untiring efforts to call the at-

tention of all Americans to the gifts which immigrants to this country have contributed to the quality and diversity of American life. Over the years the greater Cleveland community has been the terminal point for peoples from many diverse lands and cultures. These people have become Americans and contributed to the growth of our Republic, but they have also remembered their homelands and have thus contributed the gift of many cultures and diverse ideas to this new land. Best wishes to the Nationalities Services Center for a successful awards meeting this year and in the years to come.

I also want to say that the center could not have chosen a better man to honor than Dr. Ollendorff. I have known Dr. Ollendorff ever since I began my activities in public life in Cleveland. While I was a student at Western Reserve University, I served as a volunteer with Dr. Ollendorff in the University Settlement and the Hiram House.

This wonderful man has spent his entire life in serving his community and making Cleveland a better place in which to live. He deserves the gratitude of every citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter at this point in the RECORD a biographical sketch of Dr. Ollendorff:

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA: HENRY B. OLLENDORFF

Henry B. Ollendorff was born and raised in Germany, and received his Doctor of Laws Degree from the University of Heidelberg in 1929. In 1938, he came to the United States and later graduated from the New York School of Social Work of Columbia University. He came to Cleveland in 1940 to work at Friendly Inn Settlement. In 1948, he became the Executive Director of the Neighborhood Settlement Association—the first federated city-wide settlement agency in the U.S.A. Under his leadership, new neighborhood centers were established in many Greater Cleveland areas.

In 1954, he went to West Germany as a U.S. Specialist in Social Group Work, through the International Educational Exchange Service of the U.S. Department of State. During that time, he taught a social group work seminar for a selected number of German youth leaders and group workers.

This program now brings to the United States each year 180 social workers and youth leaders from 60 European, Near Eastern, Asian, African and Latin American countries. The five city programs in Chicago, Cleveland, Columbus, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Philadelphia and the newest program in West Virginia are members of the "Council of International Programs for Youth Leaders and Social Workers".

Presently Mr. Ollendorff serves as a member of the U.S. Committee of the International Conference on Social Welfare and of the Commission on International Social Work of the Council on Social Work Education.

The Rotary Club of Cleveland presented Mr. Ollendorff with its International Service Award in 1959. He has been decorated by the West German Government with the Order of Merit, in recognition of his contributions toward better understanding between this country and Germany. He is also the recipient of the French Order of Merite Social.

Mr. Ollendorff lives with his wife, Martha, at 3607 Northvale Boulevard in Cleveland Heights, Ohio. They have two children: Frank Ollendorff and Mrs. Sanford Kaplan.

INCENTIVES FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill to authorize reduced postage rates for certain mail sent to Members of Congress. I introduce this legislation because of my conviction that we must remove any barriers that interfere with the freedom of citizens to express their views on national issues to their elected representatives—even if it is only an 8-cent stamp. Because each Member of Congress is responsible to his constituents, channels of communication must remain open. The issuance of a 1-cent stamp for mailing letters to Members of Congress encourages the constituent to make use of these channels so that he may express his concern for the important questions that face Members of Congress daily. Let us make it as easy as possible for those who wish to participate in our democratic system through the use of correspondence.

Opponents of this idea have argued that a lowering of postal rates for Congressional correspondence will result in an inundation of mail to congressional offices so voluminous that the offices will not be able to handle the mail effectively. As Congressmen, we must be available to our constituents—aware of their positions and their wishes. To hope that the high postal rates will discourage such availability is wrong. I urge the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to seriously consider this legislation.

RIISING CRIME RATE CALLS FOR TEACHING STANDARDS IN SCHOOLS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the recent Federal Bureau of Investigation report on crime in the United States shows an 11-percent increase in crime in 1970 over 1969, and that the national crime rate has increased 144 percent since 1960.

Further, during the decade of 1960-70, arrests of persons under 18 years of age more than doubled while the population in this age group, 10 to 17, rose 29 percent.

It is apparent—

The FBI report stated—

The involvement of young persons measured by police arrests is escalating at a pace almost four times their percentage increase in the national population.

The report also says:

Crime is a social problem and the concern of the entire community.

This is a national problem, and with so many of America's youth involved, we need to do everything we can to reverse the high and continuing climb of crime in the United States.

President Nixon warned of the consequences of our country turning to crime in a speech in Kansas City in July and said we were approaching the decadence that destroyed history's great civilizations.

The President said:

I think of what happened to Greece and to Rome, and you see what is left—only the pillars.

He also suggested a way out of this decline in a speech to the Knights of Columbus in New York City, August 19, 1971:

When we talk about character of a nation we must never forget that character depends upon the individual character of 200 million Americans. Where does that come from? It comes from the home. It comes from the churches. It comes from the schools of this Nation. There is where the character of the next generation, the coming generation, is being forged.

We must see to it that our children are provided with the moral and spiritual and religious values so necessary to a great people in great times. And . . . at a time we see those private and parochial schools which lay such stress on these religious values, as we see them closing at the rate of one a day, we must resolve to stop that trend and turn it around.

There is a great need today in America for broad instruction in the development of man's moral and ethical values. Those who need it most, receive it least. The study of criminal laws and why each has been enacted and why they must be obeyed if society is to survive would be one thrust of such education. A program of ethical studies can be developed in the elementary and secondary schools of our Nation. The Federal Government can give stimulus to this through the financial grant procedure.

I have introduced legislation, along with cosponsors from all parts of country, to accomplish this—H.R. 8782—and copy of the bill follows this speech. The court decisions prohibiting teaching religion in public schools do not prohibit what the legislation calls for.

This bill is a direct answer to the problem of filling the vacuum evident today in American life, in our ethical and moral life, as pointed out by the President.

Members of Congress interested in joining me in the sponsorship of this bill are invited to call my office, extension 52501, as the bill will be reintroduced with additional cosponsors in the near future.

The bill follows:

A bill to provide Federal grants to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach moral and ethical principles

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"GRANTS FOR TEACHING MORAL AND ETHICAL PRINCIPLES"

"SEC. 810. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and carrying out programs under which students attend-

ing public elementary and secondary schools will be provided instruction in moral and ethical principles. The content and nature of such instruction shall conform to general standards prescribed by such State agencies.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this

section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years."

SEC. 2. Section 804 of such Act is amended by inserting after "this Act" the following: "(other than section 810)".

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 16, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John M. Crosby, St. Mary's Rectory, Riverside, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, bless these men assembled here, the work they do, and the goals that they foresee. They came here as the wise men from afar, from the center, the sides, and the corners of our land. May they be dedicated to the people who have chosen them, and to the people for whom they have been chosen. Help them, O God, to play a worthy part in the drama of our world, to reach out beyond the horizons of this building to embrace a troubled land. Save them from the narrowness of the provincial and the blindness of self-interest. Teach them to love as You love, to give as You give. Direct their actions, O Lord, and by your inspiration may they come to completion.

Through Christ our Lord. 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 a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 234. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of detention camps, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2495. An act to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION FROM THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 14, 1971.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my posi-

tion as a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provision of section 2(b), Public Law 89-491, as amended, the Chair appoints as a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

POSTPONE SOCIAL SECURITY TAX INCREASE

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the current discussion on our economy has evoked much debate on how to help business get back on its feet.

But we seem to have forgotten the man who is really hurt by the inflationary spiral. I am talking about the middle and moderate wage earner. How do we help him meet the needs of every day living?

One way would be to postpone the scheduled social security tax increase. In January 1972, the tax base on employees and employers is scheduled to be increased from \$7,800 to \$9,000 a year. In other words, the employee will be taxed 5.2 percent on his earnings up to \$9,000 in 1972.

Thus, while we are talking about speeding up the amount a person may deduct from his personal income taxes, this will be eaten up by an increase in social security taxes.

So, while we give with the one hand, we take with the other. I favor moving up the timetable on personal deductions to allow a taxpayer to deduct \$750 in 1972 instead of 1973. But this \$50 increase will be taken away by the increase in social security taxes.

Mr. Speaker, to spur our economy, to get more money into circulation and, thus, lower unemployment, we should, first, speed up the scheduled personal income tax deduction and, second, post-

pone the scheduled social security tax increase.

These actions, I contend, would do more for our economy by helping the middle and moderate wage earner meet the needs of every day living.

AMENDING LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4713) to amend section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to correct an omission in existing law with respect to the entitlement of committees of the House of Representatives to the use of certain currencies, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, after the second line following line 6, insert:

SEC. 3. (a) The fifth sentence of section 133(g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190a(g)) is amended to read as follows: "Each such supplemental authorization resolution shall include a specification of the amount of all supplemental funds sought by that committee for expenditure by all subcommittees thereof under such resolution and the amount so sought for each such subcommittee. Each such supplemental authorization resolution shall amend the annual authorization resolution of such committee for that year unless the committee offered no annual authorization resolution for that year, in which case the committee's supplemental authorization resolution shall not be an amendment to any other resolution and any subsequent supplemental authorization resolution of such committee for the same year shall amend the first such resolution offered by the committee for that year. Each such supplemental resolution reported by such committee shall be accompanied by a report to the Senate specifying with particularity the purpose for which such authorization is sought and the reason why such authorization could not have been sought at the time of, or within the period provided for, the submission by such committee of an annual authorization resolution for that year."

(b) Section 133(g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190a(g)) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: This subsection shall not apply to any resolution requesting funds in addition to the amount specified in such section 134(a) and which are to be expended only for the same purposes for which such amount may be expended."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section are enacted by the Senate as an exercise of its rulemaking power, and such amendments are deemed a part of the Standing Rules of the Senate,