

Rieve, Roy C. Webb, James A., III
Warner, Paul G.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gruver, William K. Spinelli, Robert B.

Henry P. Boardman, Jr., Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

James W. Fitzsimmons III, Nurse Corps, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary promotion to lieutenant in the Nurse Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Benson, Patricia G.	*Hurlbut, Bonny A.
*Binaghi, Joanne T.	*James, Mary C.
*Bivins, Rita H.	*Loser, Margit M.
*Blake, Sally A.	*Mearls, Joanne R.
*Botzum, Diane	*Nyce, Barbara R.
*Clark, Georgia	*Pane, Marietta A.
*Delarot, Anna M.	*Ragozzine, Carolyn M.
*Derrough, Lols A.	*Wylie, Elizabeth G.
*Hazard, Roberta L.	
*Hoag, Jean W.	

Mildred L. Carr, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Supply Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

David M. Muschna, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

*Indicates appointment issued ad interim.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having been designated in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, Section 5232, Maj. Gen. William G.

Thrash, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

Lt. Gen. Raymond G. Davis, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment as Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, Section 5202, with the grade of general while so serving.

Having been designated in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, Section 5232, Maj. Gen. Wallace H. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named staff noncommissioned officers for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Candelario, Rafael
Moore, Terrance L.

The following-named U.S. Naval Academy graduates for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Anderson, R. G.	Brown, Michael M.
Annis, Robert E.	Brown, Stephen R.
Appenfelder, G. D.	Burnette, R. G. Jr.
Ard, Peter N.	Cabana, Robert D.
Balcom, John L.	Caouette, T. H.
Bayne, Douglas L.	Carroll, C. T. F.
Beck, Mark T.	Carter, William B.
Bennett, Chris	Cheney, Stephen A.
Bjerke, Thomas E.	Clarkson, A. F., Jr.
Blair, G. W.	Clydesdale, R. III
Bloomer, David R.	Compton, M. R.
Boteler, Johal R.	Conroy, V. P., Jr.
Boyer, Charles E.	Crimaldi, Sam B.
Bozarth, Errett J.	Dalton, Thomas R.
Brighton, S. H.	Demars, M. W., Jr.

Dodson, Thomas J.	Miller, H. K., Jr.
Dunleavy, C. J.	Miller, Raymond T.
Duscheld, A. L. III	Moore, J. T. C., II
Elsberry, John G.	Nadolski, Keith E.
Erickson, R. H.	Nelson, Ralph D.
Flinn, George W.	North, John R.
Fliszar, John N.	Obrien, T. P., Jr.
Fretz, O. R., III	Olsen, D. A., Jr.
Fuchs, Frank C.	Paul, P. J., III
Gallagher, F. M., Jr.	Perry, A. L., III
Gardner, Mark S.	Peterson, Dale A.
Gell, Jerome L.	Pickett, Gerald W.
Giacobbe, Peter J.	Porter, John F.
Graham, Vernon C.	Fullen, G. D.
Greene, M. J. L., Jr.	Queen, James E.
Gregor, C. John	Quinn, John A., IV
Griffin, Barry P.	Radomski, D. J.
Hammond, C. W., Jr.	Riggs, Stephen A.
Harper, James R.	Rodgers, George L.
Harris, Gerald F.	Rose, Bowen F., Jr.
Havenstein, W. P.	Santillo, J. C.
Hayman, Thomas A.	Sattler, John F.
Hedderly, G. T.	Schwelm, Karl T.
Hemler, Jeffrey F.	Searing, James M.
Helkes, Lambert C.	Settle, Robert H.
Hermann, Peter E.	Shoaf, Peter J.
Hesse, Donald E.	Smith, Paul R.
Hield, Roger A., Jr.	Speer, Martin J.
Hull, Jeffrey L.	Spratt, Ronald E.
Inskeep, Carl D.	Stephan, Terry A.
Jamieson, Thomas M.	Stiles, Clay O.
Jecmen, Reid A.	Storey, David K.
Jennings, S. C.	Storey, J. A., III
Kellogg, John E.	Sullivan, Cecil E.
Kinnear, N. T., III	Sullivan, P. H.
Knott, David A.	Summa, Mario J.
Kremian, Frank T.	Swords, Michael J.
Lammers, J. R.	Tonkin, Terry L.
Longworth, M. W.	Travis, Richard F.
Macklin, Mark S.	Uberman, Joseph S.
Marcy, Hugh W.	Voss, Paul H.
Mayes, Robert C.	Waterman, Brett N.
Mazzara, Andrew F.	Weiss, Terry T.
McConnell, F.	Williams, P. E.
McKenzie, Scott W.	Winkelman, Jack D.
Meek, Robert W.	Winslow, W. E., Jr.
Mendelson, J. S.	Wnek, Ronald F.
Mikkelsen, D. J.	Zaudtke, Peter A.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 23, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Rudolf Kiviranna, of the Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church of New York, offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, we approach Thee in sincere humility.

We live in a world under the shadows of great problems to which there are no easy solutions.

Give us, O God, Thy light to understand the difficulties of our world and our responsibilities to overcome them.

We need courage and wisdom to take a decisive stand against all evil which in many ways threatens the world and our Nation.

On the Independence Day of the Estonian nation we think of all nations who are forced to live under the yoke of atheistic communism.

Through Thy grace these nations have preserved an unconquerable will for freedom and an unquenchable hope that they may one day belong to the family of free nations.

To further this cause bless our President and Government and the endeavors of the Congress of the United States. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 16 United States Code 715a, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. CONTE.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE PLYMOUTH-PROVINCETOWN CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 91-474, the Chair appoints as members of the Plymouth-Provincetown Celebration Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. KEITH, and Mr. CONTE.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(a), Public Law 86-380, the Chair appoints as members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mrs. DWYER.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 15 United States Code 1024(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. REUSS, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BLACKBURN.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the

following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HALEY, Mr. UDALL and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(b), Public Law 89-491, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DONOHUE, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS EX OFFICIO OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 85-874, as amended, the Chair appoints as members ex officio of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. RONCALIO, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

REINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, during the past few Congresses I have offered a number of measures designed to stimulate discussion on the issues they raise. Today, I am reintroducing a number of these bills. It is my hope that the dialog on each of these measures will continue. I am also hopeful that the proposals I am introducing today will receive hearings during this Congress.

In the coming weeks I will be introducing proposals on consumer protection, the environment, and drugs, and crime. These subjects are not covered by the 18 measures being introduced today.

The following is a brief summary of each piece of legislation:

First. The Meals for Millions Foundation of Los Angeles, Calif., will be granted a Federal charter. The measure sets forth the purposes and structure of the program. There are no Federal funds involved.

Second. Two measures deal with financing important education programs. One bill would create a secondary market for education facilities construction loans. The other bill would establish a secondary market for the various federally insured student loan papers.

Third. A measure creating a National Institute on Digestive Diseases, thereby promoting research and training in this field.

Fourth. An amendment to the National Defense Education Act which would expand Federal support of programs training Americans in international affairs and languages.

Fifth. A measure that would include

chiropractic under the provisions of medicare.

Sixth. An amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act which would exclude the Bank's receipts and disbursements from the budget, thereby increasing the Bank's operating flexibility.

Seventh. A measure creating a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court enabling small wage earners to have a hearing on their tax problems.

Eighth. A measure that would require public opinion polls to disclose the method used in obtaining their information.

Ninth. A measure limiting advertising of alcoholic beverages on the public airways.

Tenth. A bill guaranteeing Federal employees their constitutional rights to privacy.

Eleventh. An amendment that increases the presumption of service-connected multiple sclerosis from 7 to 20 years.

Twelfth. A measure permitting States to arrange for hospital coverage under medicare.

Thirteenth. A bill authorizing pensions to survivors of those awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously.

Fourteenth. A measure making it easier for the blind to get disability benefits.

Fifteenth. A measure creating a new formula permitting the Retired Reserve to receive retirement pay.

Sixteenth. A bill that would allow the Federal Government to pick up the increased cost of welfare caused by court decisions doing away with residency requirements.

Seventeenth. A measure permitting veterans retired at 100-percent disability before 1949 to collect retirement pay.

I have made a number of statements on each of the above measures. Those interested in any of the items mentioned may contact my office and request my previous statement on it.

ARMS ET LES FRANCAIS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years there has been constant discussion in the Congress about the sale of U.S. arms to foreign nations. This discussion was particularly warm in connection with projected sales to Peru, Brazil, Argentina, and Colombia.

The opponents of such sales, in undoubted good faith, argued that providing more modern equipment would step up an arms race and might even provide the means for suppressing popular revolutionary movements.

The countervailing argument, which I accepted, maintained that the countries in question would obtain the arms in any event regardless of the state of their national budgets and that it would be better for us to be the suppliers than to have them come from other sources. If the United States made the sales, there would be greater control over the types of weapons and their sophistication, as well

as the ability to place restraints on duplication, maintenance, and spare parts.

A recent study proves that predictions of those who favored a continuation of the policy have come true. French arms salesmen have moved into the Latin American market with a vengeance since our refusal to continue our programs.

C. L. Sulzberger in his New York Times column, "Arms and the Frenchman," of February 21, 1971, makes the following statement:

Recently agreements have been made or are under negotiation with Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Panama, Peru and Venezuela. Those mostly involve Mirage jets but some concern Fouga Magister trainers, AMX tanks, Alouette helicopters, gunboats and Exocet sea-to-sea missiles. The biggest single accord was arranged last year with Argentina for 106 Mirage V's.

Mr. Sulzberger also shows that France has moved into the arms market in South Africa which has been partially vacated by the British because of the clamor of the opposition to the current Government and the objections of African members of the Commonwealth. With the rising tide of anti-American feeling in Latin America and the present revolutionary tendency, the furnishing by the French of these weapons cannot be viewed with complacency, nor can the possibility of introducing Iron Curtain armaments be dismissed.

It is interesting to note that this rather cynical policy has brought military orders of over a billion dollars to France in 1970 and covers negotiations with no less than 26 countries.

I certainly do not advocate an attempt on the part of the United States to become a competitor in the merchandising of weapons for profit. At the same time, I do consider it worthwhile to see what has happened in fact when we have withheld our weapons from the countries in question. The result has not been to cut off their purchase, but simply to change the source of acquisition to one other than ourselves. Obviously, in certain cases this could bring about unwelcome and dangerous complications.

The article follows:

ARMS AND THE FRENCHMAN (By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—A certain American envoy to France, named Benjamin Franklin, used to say honesty was the best policy and this is what the French today assert with respect to their enormous arms trade with the rest of the world, a commerce described by rivals or disappointed clients as "warmongering" or "outrageous." French arms policy may be cynical but it is not obscured by cant.

Paris, which has now replaced London as number three armaments export capital (after Washington and Moscow), contends quite blandly that it sells weapons on a strictly business basis in the national interest, is no merchant of death and simply provides what others would provide if the French didn't offer better goods or better terms.

As a consequence of this straight-forward approach to a highly charged subject the French brought their total for foreign military orders last year to well over \$1 billion. Since January, 1969, sales have been arranged or negotiations begun with no less than 26 countries.

The two most contentious regions involved, politically speaking, are Latin Amer-

ica and South Africa. French arms salesmen, under their director, Hughes de l'Estoire, have moved into the Latin-American market previously regarded as Washington's exclusive ballwick, thus clearly reducing dependence on the U.S.A. of several nations in the Monroe Doctrine area.

Recently agreements have been made or are under negotiation with Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela. These mostly involve Mirage jets but some concern Fouga Magister trainers, AMX tanks, Alouette helicopters, gunboats and Exocet sea-to-sea missiles. The biggest single accord was arranged last year with Argentina for 106 Mirage V's.

Effective intrusion into the Latin market has obvious political repercussions because of its heritage of anti-Yankee feeling and also because of the rising tide of revolutions stressing hostility to Washington. The only equally explosive area of French arms penetration is South Africa.

In 1969 Paris sold 42 Mirage III and three Mirage III B jets to Pretoria. A new contract is being negotiated for 100 Mirage Milans. The French have sold helicopters and Panhard armored cars (both effective against guerrillas) and are developing their surface-to-surface Cactus guided missile in South Africa with Pretoria paying about three-fourths its cost.

Astonishingly, this produces few complaints against Paris from the many blacks or pro-black African clients of France's armaments industry, including Cameroun, Congo, Gabon, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Senegal, Algeria, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia. Indeed, the largest contract yet made by the manufacturers of the Mirage was for the sale of 110 of these remarkable jets to leftist, revolutionary Libya which violently dislikes South Africa.

This unembarrassed export to both sides of the African disputes enrages Britain, which keeps risking dissolution of the Commonwealth by angry black states every time limited military sales to Pretoria are mentioned.

That liberal newspaper, *The Guardian*, reported recently: "The extraordinary manner by which France has managed to carry on its arms sales to South Africa without major challenge was never more marked than when President Kaunda visited Paris last autumn after his first angry confrontation with Mr. Heath over the South African arms issue . . .

"There is little doubt that France stands ready to fill the gap if Britain were after all to decide against an arms deal with South Africa. Nevertheless President Kaunda emerged from his session with Monsieur Pompidou mollified, and off the warpath against France."

The only obviously political restriction on French arms salesmen has been vis-a-vis Israel which bought and paid for fifty Mirage V's never licensed for export because of the later embargo on weapons sales to that little country. Aircraft manufacturers ultimately lost little by the boycott since the French Air Force itself has purchased only about 400 of the 1,200 Mirages so far manufactured. The rest have gone to thirteen foreign lands.

By outright come-and-get-it arms dealings, a policy which doesn't even pretend to adhere to any limitations equivalent to the moral or political restrictions of American, Russian or British salesmen, France has accomplished three things she values in the national interest.

She has gained immense prestige for the excellence of her weapons, above all (paradoxically) by Israel's extraordinarily effective use of the Mirages she had bought before the embargo. France, moreover, has balanced her foreign trade, with arms exports comprising 8 per cent of all sales and more than a quarter of manufactured equipment shipped abroad. And she has earned enough to pay entirely for the research and development

program of the high quality French armaments industry.

COAST GUARD ACADEMY COURSES ON U.S. HISTORY AND TRADITION

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations, of which I am a member, recently held hearings on the attempted defection by Lithuanian Seaman Simas Kudirka and found negligence at several of the bureaucratic levels involved. During these hearings I noted a lack of sensitivity on the part of the Coast Guard officials involved, both to the human aspects of the case and long historical tradition of the United States regarding political refugees. I stated that the implications of the Kudirka tragedy went far beyond the incident itself. They touched on our whole tradition of the right to asylum.

As a Member of Congress and a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, I have, since the hearings, inquired at the Academy about courses offered there in American history and government. I expressed to the Academy my particular concern that our Coast Guard officers be properly instructed in our Nation's traditional protection of human rights. The Academy's reply, which I shall place in the RECORD along with my original letter, provides a basic description of the course offerings. While the rights of political asylum are not the specific topic for any one course, Rear Adm. John F. Thompson does describe the Academy's academic program as "firmly rooted in the American tradition of responsibility for the individual and his freedom." I am pleased to see that there is emphasis upon the historical and constitutional elements of U.S. society and I hope that our traditional guarantees will be more clearly understood as a result of this unfortunate incident.

It is my hope that the Coast Guard Academy will further emphasize this aspect of its academic program and as a member of the Board of Visitors, I will continue to stress the need for such instruction. Coast Guard officers must act in the future with more awareness of our traditional protection of human freedom than was displayed in the Kudirka case. In a nation founded on the basic rights of the individual, this kind of tragedy must not be allowed to reoccur.

The text of my letter to the Coast Guard Academy and the Academy's reply follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1970.

Rear Adm. ARTHUR B. ENGEL,
Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard Academy,
New London, Conn.

DEAR ADMIRAL ENGEL: Recent hearings held by the State Department Organization and Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a Member and concerning the attempted defection of a Lithuanian sailor aboard a U.S. Coast Guard Cutter indicated a lack of formal instruction to Coast Guard officers on

United States policy concerning political refugees and indeed in other areas of history and political questions.

As a Member of Congress and as a Member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, I should like to know what courses in American Government and American History are offered at the Academy. I am particularly interested in knowing whether or not any instruction is given concerning our Nation's traditional protection of human rights, with specific reference to the right of asylum for political refugees.

I shall appreciate hearing from you on this important matter at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY,
New London, Conn., December 23, 1970.
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: In response to your letter of 16 December 1970, may I describe relevant courses in history and government taught here at the Coast Guard Academy. These courses, and indeed the entire course of study at the Academy, are the result of continued curriculum development, particularly over the past ten-year period. Our curriculum is under constant review, by both internal faculty bodies and outside educational advisers.

During their four years of study for the B.S. degree and a commission in the Coast Guard, cadets in all curriculum areas are required to complete satisfactorily a single-semester course in the history of the United States, and a single-semester course in American government. The first of these courses focuses upon American historical government from its constitutional beginnings up through the present time. It is a basic sophomore survey course designed to give both broad background and adequate preparation for other courses in history. The second of these courses, Principles of American Government, concentrates upon the organization and functioning of our national government. The role of each governmental branch, and their relationships to the constitution, are studied, along with the constitution itself.

Several other courses, either curriculum requirements for special areas of study or elective courses open to all cadets, are pertinent to your question. One is the history of American Diplomacy, in which diplomatic history and foreign policy of the United States are considered. A second is the course in International Relations, required of all senior cadets who are in a non-technical area of study; this course considers questions of foreign policy, international law, and international organizations. At present, there are approximately a dozen other courses taught in history and government; History of Colonial America, The Civil War and Reconstruction, The New Deal, Fair Deal and After, American Maritime History, Modern European History, Modern Russian History, Modern Asia, American Constitutional Development, Military Policy, Comparative Government, and Western Political Theory. In addition, a course in the fundamentals of law, taught to all seniors, covers certain aspects of international law, such as sovereignty and jurisdiction at sea. In several of these courses, questions of foreign policy and international political relations are considered. There has been, however, no coverage of the right of asylum for political refugees as a specific topic in these courses. A case study is now being developed by staff members for inclusion in the required law course.

An education firmly rooted in the Amer-

ican tradition of responsibility for the individual and his freedom, plus indoctrination into the humanitarian mission of the Coast Guard, seem to me to be the strongest foundations for a firm belief in the right of the individual to freedom. It is such an education which we are attempting to give here at the Coast Guard Academy. I would be pleased to discuss these matters with you at any time, and would like to invite you to visit the Academy at your convenience.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. THOMPSON,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard.

THE LATE S. SGT. KARL G. TAYLOR

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1971, in the name of the Congress, the President awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously to S. Sgt. Karl G. Taylor, who was killed in Vietnam on December 8, 1968. At the time of his death, he was serving as company gunnery sergeant, Company 1, 3d Battalion, 26th Marine Regiment. Staff Sergeant Taylor had been in the Marine Corps since 1959 and was serving his second tour in Vietnam. He is the husband of the former Shirley Ann Piatt and the father of two sons and a daughter, Karl G., Jr., age 7; Keven G., age 4; and Sheryl A., age 8. Mrs. Taylor and the children live in Avella, Pa.

In addition to the Congressional Medal of Honor, Staff Sergeant Taylor's medals and decorations include the Purple Heart, the Presidential Unit Citation with one bronze star, the Good Conduct Medal with two bronze stars, the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnamese Service Medal with three bronze stars, the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Palm, the Military Merit Medal, the Gallantry Cross with Palm, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

I am including in my remarks the background of the Congressional Medal of Honor and the citation accompanying the medal.

The American people should be proud of Staff Sergeant Taylor for his sacrifices and courageous service to his country.

The material follows:

MEDAL OF HONOR

The Medal of Honor is the highest award for bravery that can be given to any individual in the United States. In judging men for receipt of the medal, each service has established its own regulations. The deed must be proved by incontestable evidence of at least two eyewitnesses; it must be so outstanding that it clearly distinguishes the recipient's gallantry beyond the call of duty from lesser forms of bravery; it must involve the risk of his life; and it must be the type of deed which, if he had not done it, would not subject him to any justified criticism.

The idea for the Medal of Honor was born during the Civil War as men fought gallantly and oftentimes displayed great heroism. George Washington originated the Purple Heart in 1782 to honor brave soldiers, sailors and marines. From that time until the Civil War, Certificates of Merit and a "brevet" system of promotions were used as military awards. The first military decoration formally authorized by the American Government as

a badge of valor was the Medal of Honor for enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps. It was authorized by Congress, and approved by President Abraham Lincoln on December 21, 1861. The medal for the Army and Voluntary Forces was authorized on July 12, 1862.

The medal is awarded "in the name of the Congress of the United States" and for this reason, it is often called the Congressional Medal of Honor. It is only on rare occasions, however, that Congress awards special Medals of Honor. An Executive Order, signed by President Theodore Roosevelt on September 20, 1905, directed that ceremonies of award "will always be made with formal and impressive ceremonial" and that the recipient "will, when practicable, be ordered to Washington, D.C. and the presentation will be made by the President, as Commander in Chief, or by such representative as the President may designate."

The Navy Medal of Honor is made of bronze, suspended by an anchor from a bright blue ribbon, and is worn about the neck. The ribbon is spangled with a cluster of 13 white stars representing the original States. Each ray of the five pointed star contains sprays of laurel and oak and is tipped with a trefoil. Standing in bas-relief, circled by 34 stars representing the 34 States in 1861, is Minerva who personifies the Union. She holds in her left hand the fasces, an ax bound in staves of wood, which is the ancient Roman symbol of authority. With the shield in her right hand, she repulses the serpents held by the crouching figure of Discord. The reverse of the medal is left blank, allowing for the engraving of the recipient's name and the date and place of his deed.

CITATION

The President of the United States in the name of The Congress takes pride in presenting the MEDAL OF HONOR posthumously to Staff Sergeant Karl G. Taylor, United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following Citation:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a Company Gunnery Sergeant during Operation MEADE RIVER in the Republic of Vietnam on the night of 8 December 1968. Informed that the commander of the lead platoon had been mortally wounded when his unit was pinned down by a heavy volume of enemy fire, Staff Sergeant Taylor along with another Marine, crawled forward to the beleaguered unit through a hail of hostile fire, shouted encouragement and instructions to the men, and deployed them to covered positions. With his companion, he then repeatedly maneuvered across an open area to rescue those Marines who were too seriously wounded to move by themselves. Upon learning that there were still other seriously wounded men lying in another open area, in proximity to an enemy machine gun position, Staff Sergeant Taylor, accompanied by four comrades, led his men forward across the fire-swept terrain in an attempt to rescue the Marines. When his group was halted by devastating fire, he directed his companions to return to the company command post; whereupon he took his grenade launcher and, in full view of the enemy, charged across the open rice paddy toward the machine gun position, firing his weapon as he ran. Although wounded several times, he succeeded in reaching the machine gun bunker and silencing the fire from that sector, moments before he was mortally wounded. Directly instrumental in saving the lives of several of his fellow Marines, Staff Sergeant Taylor, by his indomitable courage, inspiring leadership, and selfless dedication, upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and of the United States Naval Service.

UTILITY CONSUMERS' COUNSEL ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today being joined by 17 of my colleagues in introducing the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act of 1971. Senator METCALF is the Senate sponsor of this legislation.

Two years ago the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations held hearings on a similar bill introduced by Mr. METCALF in the Senate and Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. HATHAWAY, and myself in the House. The bill we introduce today includes those changes made in the bill by the subcommittee during the 91st Congress.

The Utility Consumers' Counsel Act has three major objectives: First, to require utilities to report to regulatory bodies information which is pertinent to utility regulation, and to the understanding of utility rates and procedures; second, to require the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Communications Commission to report this information to Congress and the public in a timely and convenient manner, using automatic data processing to the fullest extent possible; and, third, to establish at the Federal, State, and local levels, offices of utility consumers' counsel to represent the interests of utility consumers before regulatory commissions and courts.

The need for this legislation is obvious. Perhaps in no other consumer-oriented area is a citizen so frustrated as in his dealings with the public utilities. His need for their services is fundamental to modern-day living. His dealings with them are complex, impersonal, and often unsuccessful.

The creation of a Federal Utility Consumers' Counsel would do much to improve the Federal regulation of utilities. But even more important is that section which provides grants to States and local governments for the creation of State utility consumers' counsels. In State after State, the utilities have dominated the State commissions that are supposed to regulate them. The selection of commission members is far too often a matter of party patronage, and frequently political considerations enter into commission decisions. Only 14 States elect their regulatory utility commissioners. The remaining 36, or 72 percent of our States, have their commissioners appointed for terms from 4 to 10 years.

Let me point out here that I do not propose or even expect State or local utility consumers' counsels to work in opposition to State regulatory utility commissions, but rather in conjunction with them. As Lee White, former Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, stated:

Regulators have long recognized that their effectiveness depends to a marked degree upon an accurate understanding of all relevant facts and a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the significant issues raised in the matters presented for their consideration.

But all too often the State commissioners are faced with the utility interests mobilizing their economists, en-

gineers, and accountants in a massive presentation of data to support a rate case. Knowing that company versions of its investment, income, depreciation, and expenses as rate base elements should be items of controversy, the State Commissioners simply must pass over these items for lack of experts who can challenge the company. The utility consumer counsels will provide this expertise so sorely needed.

Knowledgeable and balanced regulation can only be achieved if those who do the regulating, at any level, have accurate, complete, and comparable data available to them. As Senator METCALFE stated upon introduction of this bill in the Senate:

At present it is difficult and in some cases impossible for users or regulators of utility services to obtain detailed basic information about electric, gas, telephone and telegraph companies. By basic information I mean: Who owns the company? Who works for it? Where does its money go? What are its policies?

Title II of the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act is important in this regard. It requires the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Communications Commission to obtain and publish this information. It also authorizes the FPC, the FCC, and the Securities and Exchange Commission to make full use of automatic data processing in preparing and printing this material, thus facilitating their job.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to recognize the fact that much of the regulation of our essential monopoly industries is mythical. Regulation is supposed to be a substitute for the absence of public control. The bill we introduce today is designed to strengthen representation of the interests of utility consumers at the State and local level, for it is only through the combined efforts of local, State, and Federal regulatory authorities that utility regulation in the public interest can be effective.

J. CARTER PERKINS, VICE PRESIDENT OF SHELL OIL CO.

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate a native of the Third District of Georgia. I observed in the Stewart-Webster Journal that J. Carter Perkins of Lumpkin, Ga., was selected as the new vice president of the Shell Oil Co. on February 4.

Mr. Perkins' family has been active in community affairs in Lumpkin for generations. He is the present director of Shell's Washington, D.C., office, a position he has held since 1965. Before arriving in Washington, Mr. Perkins was associated with Shell in its land and legal departments in the New Orleans and Los Angeles areas, after having been associated with Gulf Refining Co. in the marketing division. In his new capacity, he will continue his responsibilities in the Washington area.

An outstanding legal counsel with Shell since 1948, Mr. Perkins holds pro-

fessional memberships in the Supreme Courts of Florida, Louisiana, District of Columbia, California, and the United States, as well as other intermediate Federal courts. I salute Mr. Perkins on behalf of Lumpkin, Ga., and the entire Third District.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today 12 Members of the House led by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK); our majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS); the chairman of the subcommittee on flood control, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and other members of the Committee on Public Works have introduced a bill that endeavors to meet on a broad front the rising crisis of unemployment in this country.

The bill, H.R. 4810, would extend the Appalachia program for 2 years. It would extend the Economic Development Act and the regional commission legislation for 2 years and provide additional funding for these very successful operations. It would also reinstitute the highly successful Accelerated Public Works Act of the early 1960's, providing over a 2-year period a substantial authorization for grants to the States and to the municipalities to carry out high priority public works projects at the local and State levels. A total of \$1,850,000,000 would be authorized for that accelerated public works operation over the next 2 years.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for his statement and sponsorship of the most comprehensive bill on this subject that has been introduced in this session of the Congress.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman and I hope that we will have additional sponsors for this legislation and that we can speedily proceed to a consideration of it in the committee and to early consideration by the House of this very urgently needed proposal.

PHOTO EXPO 1971, IN CHICAGO, WEEK OF APRIL 17-25

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

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, to an observant person, sensitive to the many changes in the processes of life, each moment in time and space has a unique beauty and point of interest.

Whatever the special interest of the observer, be he man, woman, or child, each moment of his day presents a picture never seen before, or one which shall never be seen from that angle again, ex-

cept through the eye of the camera, in the hands of a photographer.

The photographer, consequently, is an essential technician, and the camera is an essential tool of what appears to be a phenomenally expanding industry.

To focus attention on the magnitude and expansiveness of the industry, the National Association of Photographic Manufacturers is planning an extravaganza of achievements called Photo Expo 1971, for the week of April 17-25 in the new McCormick Place in Chicago. The exposition, also labeled "The Universe of Photography" because of its design to meet the needs of everyone with a stake in photography, will include the latest in cameras, film, projectors, and electronic equipment as developed by over 400 manufacturers in the United States and 11 other countries. The presentations will be well worth seeing, and I want to urge all who can attend to do so.

At this time I would like to introduce a House joint resolution which recognizes the importance and accomplishments of the photography industry:

H.J. Res. 378

Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the period from April 17, 1971, through April 25, 1971, as "National Photography Week"

Whereas photography is one of the Nation's largest and fastest growing industries:

Whereas photography has become a vital instrument in business, medicine, space, education, entertainment, transportation, agriculture, and communication;

Whereas photography is essential to military and scientific endeavors;

Whereas photography is the recognized art form of the modern era;

Whereas photography provides a rewarding and challenging career for thousands of professional photographers, filmmakers, photo-finishers, photographic dealers, and audiovisual experts;

Whereas photography is a constructive hobby enjoyed by millions of Americans, young and old alike; and

Whereas Photo Expo 71, which will be the largest photographic exhibition ever held in the Western Hemisphere, is scheduled to be held from April 17, 1971, through April 25, 1971, at McCormick Place, Chicago, Illinois: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as a tribute to the importance of photography in American life and in recognition of Photo Expo 71, which will be the largest photographic exhibition ever held in the Western Hemisphere, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period from April 17, 1971, through April 25, 1971, as "National Photography Week", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

FULL SPEED TO DULLES?

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday Star there were two items of special interest:

First, which received prominent coverage, was the article by Mr. Jack Kneece asserting that the administration's proposal to sell Dulles and National Airports

was not the unloading of financial nightmares which some have suggested. Mr. Kneese claimed that on closer inspection, the interest in the proposed sale is now looking "more like the Oklahoma land rush."

In the same issue, buried among classified advertisements, was a small item that two contracts have been awarded for a tracked air-cushioned vehicle to run from Dulles Airport to Dolly Madison Boulevard in McLean, Va.

The two \$100,000 contracts for preliminary design work and work proposals went to Ling-Temco Vought of Dallas and to Rohr Corp. of Chula Vista, Calif.

The Department of Transportation was also reported to be negotiating a similar preliminary contract with the Grumman Corp. of Long Island, N.Y.

There are serious questions which ought to be raised in connection with these contracts for a rapid transit system. It is curious that while the administration on one hand wants to sell Dulles, it is with another hand putting in a system which conceivably would enhance the attractiveness of the airport and recruit more passengers for the future owners.

Second, and equally importantly, is the fact that the very stretch of highway considered for rapid transit construction is probably the only segment of highway in the entire metropolitan area which now provides relatively rapid traffic. It has the least need for rapid transit equipment.

While the tracked air-cushioned vehicle could be a great project, it appears to be running in the wrong direction. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to invest money in rapid transit, it ought to be directed toward improving the traffic situation between McLean and Washington. This is where it will do the most good. I respectfully submit that the Congress ought to question the Department of Transportation on this matter. It merits inquiry.

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a joint resolution amending the Constitution to provide for direct election of the President and the Vice President. The resolution which I introduce is the same as House Joint Resolution 681, which this House passed September 18, 1969, but on which the other body failed to complete action in the 91st Congress.

Direct election of the President was a good idea in 1969 and remains a good idea today. The failure of the Senate to approve it should not deter this House from passing a similar constitutional amendment in this Congress. Since we debated this measure at some length in the 91st Congress, it would seem to me that we ought to move with dispatch in repeating passage this year and I respectfully beseech the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the leadership, to schedule early consid-

eration by the House so the proponents of direct election in the Senate will have in hand an added argument for obtaining early consideration of the measure in that Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments on either side of this question are well known and I certainly do not intend here to go into them in any depth. I think that it does bear repeating that the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President is open to the possibility of a severe constitutional crisis, along the lines of probability which existed in 1968. It is only good fortune which has prevented such an occurrence to date and the argument used by defenders of the electoral college—to wit, that no such crisis has yet occurred—does not for a minute erase the fact that it could occur.

There is an old American aphorism that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Accordingly, I am persuaded that we ought to provide for direct election of the President and Vice President, thereby precluding the dreaded possibility of crisis which lurks in the present method.

Alternative means for election of the President and Vice President have been an issue in this country since the very beginning of the Republic. This question caused considerable consternation at the Constitution Convention and we are aware that the imperfect solution which issued from those deliberations led to the crisis of 1800 and the subsequent adoption of the 12th amendment in 1804 to provide for separate balloting for President and Vice President.

It would have been far better for these United States had the Founding Fathers agreed to direct election of the President. That method was put forward as an alternative and given serious consideration. Only the necessity of compromise—in all probability—precluded its adoption, leaving us with the Trojan horse which haunts us today.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the present method? First, it can result, and has, in the election of a candidate who receives fewer popular votes than his opponents; second, the procedures for contingent election can result in election of a candidate who has not received the most popular votes, which happened in 1824 with the election of John Quincy Adams; third, the independent elector has the option of ignoring the popular choice in a State and voting his whim, which has occurred on a number of occasions, and, fourth, the unit rule—whereby the candidate winning a plurality of votes in a State receives all that State's electoral vote is unfair, if practically wise. At the present time, only the State of Maine provides for other than winner-take-all in the presidential sweepstakes. But even there, so long as we retain the notion of an electoral vote, some people's votes will not count.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one alternative to the present method which will eliminate the problems I have outlined and that is direct election. Under the plan passed in 1969, and reintroduced by me, the voter will choose between tickets—one candidate for President and one for Vice President on each ticket. Every

vote counts. If a ticket obtains at least 40 percent of the popular vote and, of course, leads in the balloting, the election is decided in their favor. If, however, no ticket receives 40 percent of the vote, there will then be a runoff election between the top two vote-getters. This seems to me to be the most sensible alternative. I know that some in Congress are worried about the runoff provision, fearing it an enticement to proliferating third parties which will act the role of spoiler.

Mr. Speaker, I am not that concerned. Our two-party tradition is strong and I cannot believe for a minute that adoption of direct election is going to dilute that tradition. Major parties survive by incorporating the popular ideas promoted by third parties. The Democratic Party traces its lineage to Jefferson and the Republican Party is more than 100 years old. How can anyone believe that direct election is going to dilute voter attachment to these two parties? This is but a bogeyman manufactured by those who favor retention of the electoral college.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am cognizant of the arguments of those who favor retaining the present method, but I am not persuaded. That is why I have chosen to introduce this joint resolution and that is why I am convinced that the Congress must act to change that present method.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY BY REDUCING CORPORATE TAXES

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland has issued a statement on the administration's proposal to stimulate the economy by reducing corporate taxes. I agree with his statement that this is another demonstration of the President's mistaken economic priorities. I think this statement merits the attention of the House, and include it in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT AFL-CIO SECRETARY-TREASURER

AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland issued this statement today following the Administration's announcement of an across-the-board reduction of corporate taxes by means of accelerated depreciation allowances:

The AFL-CIO is deeply disturbed by President Nixon's further commitment to the "trickle-down" theory of economics. In this time of recession, inflation and six-percent unemployment, it is incredible that the President can find no better action than to extend a tax windfall of several billion dollars to the nation's corporations.

The President is helping those who need it the least at the expense of those who need it the most. It is not the nation's wealthy corporations that need help; it is the workers, who are struggling to keep their heads above water, and to pay the property taxes and school taxes that already burden them disproportionately. President Nixon's bonanza to business undoes much of the progress toward tax justice made by Congress in the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

What America needs now is strong government action to create jobs, curb inflation and lift our sagging economy—not gimmicks to reduce the taxes of corporate business.

BALTIMORE SUN STORY CHARGES FORMER ACTING AIR FORCE SECRETARY TOWNSEND HOOPES LEAKED HIGHLY CLASSIFIED SECURITY INFORMATION TO THE NEW YORK TIMES: WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT IT?

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post there appeared a news item by Kenneth Crawford indicating that a very serious security leak that occurred in early 1968 to the New York Times with regard to what President Johnson considered a matter of "the highest possible degree of security," was actually perpetrated by one Townsend Hoopes, who was at that time the Acting Secretary of the Air Force. The details of this story are, in fact, included in a story which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on February 10 by Phillip Potter, which I shall insert at the end of my remarks. It involves a leak that appeared in the New York Times 2 days before the New Hampshire primary, on March 10, 1968, to be exact, that General Westmoreland had requested 206,000 additional troops for Vietnam.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this story is correct, it betrays a very shocking situation which existed in the Pentagon during the tenure of Secretary McNamara and apparently also of Secretary Clifford, and it raises a grave question as to what other serious violations of security may have gone on.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, one cannot help wondering in what other ways this strange kind of disloyalty and defiance of law on the part of top civilians in the Pentagon during those years may have complicated and unnecessarily prolonged our efforts to achieve our national objectives in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, these are very serious charges, and we cannot allow them to be ignored. I am asking Mr. Hoopes, who is now in private life here in the Washington area, whether these facts are true. I am at the same time asking the Secretary of Defense to give me the classification of the information which Mr. Hoopes reportedly passed on to a newspaper reporter, incidentally at the home of a member of the Military Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee.

Third, I am also asking the Attorney General the penalty for a violation of the security of classified material of this degree of classification—which must be at least top secret—and whether the Department of Justice is taking any steps to prosecute in this case.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include, first, the appropriate excerpt of the article by Kenneth Crawford in today's Washington Post; second, the original story from the Baltimore Sun of February 10, 1971; and third, two paragraphs from Mr. Potter's original story which were not printed in the Sun story of March 10:

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE BY KENNETH CRAWFORD IN THE WASHINGTON POST, FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Here in Washington, too, there has been a lively journalistic contest to be first with the worst. One of its high points was The New York Times revelation in the aftermath of the Tet attacks that the military was asking for 206,000 more troops to take advantage of the enemy's overextension. Coming, as it did, two days before the New Hampshire primary, the Times report had enormous political impact. It almost certainly contributed to the big McCarthy vote and, in turn, to President Johnson's subsequent decision not to run again.

The genesis of the expose, if that is what it was, has just been publicly revealed for the first time by Phillip Potter, Washington Bureau Chief of the Baltimore Sun. It was leaked to the Times by Townsend Hoopes, then a Pentagon official or dovish persuasion. Actually, the plan Hoopes made available to the Times was one of the alternatives under consideration and one which had little chance for Presidential approval in the Washington atmosphere of post-Tet distress. Hoopes had to violate a specific presidential order of secrecy pending decision to spring the leak.

Things haven't changed much, as the suspicious reporting of the South Vietnamese effort to cut the Ho Chi Minh trails in Laos demonstrates. By part of the press it is treated as a cunning scheme to inject Americans into an expanded war rather than what it is, a bold attempt to prepare for continued evacuation of American forces. Reporters and editors keep telling themselves and others that they have been more perceptive about this war than have military and political leaders. They may be right. But they have enjoyed the advantage of ultimate irresponsibility. In President Nixon's place, they would probably be doing about what he is doing. And history may be more approving of him than of them.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 10, 1971]

LAOS DRIVE RECALLS 1968 OPTIONS

(By Phillip Potter)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 9.—The relative equanimity with which Washington, and presumably the nation, is reacting to President Nixon's decision to let South Vietnamese forces—with American air support—attempt to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos must be stirring envy in Austin, Texas.

A columnist in the New York Times wrote today that "the reaction here bore a remarkable resemblance to the reaction to the latest manned excursion to the moon. There was much less excitement than during previous escalations."

DIFFERENT IN 1968

It was otherwise when, in February, 1968, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. William C. Westmoreland, then American commander in Vietnam, came up with a proposal for an "aggressive" strategy to do what Mr. Nixon now espouses, a widening of the war in order to shorten it.

Their proposal grew out of General Westmoreland's conviction that the enemy's Tet Offensive of January-February—marked by heavy attacks on Saigon and other cities—was, in fact the foe's "Battle of the Bulge," akin to the desperate move that Hitler ordered to stop the onrush of the American and British forces into Germany.

BOLDER STRATEGY

He and General Wheeler, encouraged by hints from President Johnson that he was disposed to offer General Westmoreland reinforcements and might even be receptive to a new and bolder strategy to end the war, met in Saigon from February 23 through

25, 1968, and prepared an outline for the deployment of added force.

Included among the options for consideration by the President and his Washington advisers were these:

1. Applying greater pressure throughout South Vietnam and expanding territorial security by destroying guerrilla and mainforce units and neutralizing the enemy's traditional base areas.

2. Accelerated bombing of North Vietnam to include more productive targets such as Haiphong.

3. Operations to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos.

RAIDS ON SANCTUARIES

4. Raiding selected border sanctuaries in Cambodia and Laos.

5. Amphibious and joint amphibious-air-mobile operations against enemy bases just north of the Border Buffer Zone between North and South Vietnam.

To carry it all out, the generals concluded, would require 206,000 in additional American forces.

There was, perhaps, some lack of realism in their thinking.

While they saw Tet as an opportunity, the mood in America as when news of the Battle of the Bulge first broke, was one of depression. The press was full of the enemy's heroes and dispatches on the alleged inadequacies of our South Vietnamese allies.

Even General Westmoreland had failed to realize what he came to feel shortly thereafter—that the enemy offensive had been South Vietnam's "Pearl Harbor," sparking among its people and government a determination to fight back and shoulder a far larger part of the war.

CERTAIN QUESTIONS

President Nguyen Van Thieu, who had been resisting pressures from General Westmoreland to draft 18- and 19-year-olds for fear of public opinion, found it immediately possible after Tet.

By then, however, General Wheeler had carried back to Washington the plans he and General Westmoreland had worked up for consideration by civilian authorities. He gave them to the President, who sent them on to Robert S. McNamara, then defense secretary, for study. Along with them, Mr. Johnson sent a directive demanding answers to certain questions:

"What military and other objectives in Vietnam are additional U.S. forces designed to advance? What specific dangers is their dispatch designed to avoid? What specific goals would the increment of force... aim to achieve in the next six months or over the next year? What probable Communist reactions do you anticipate in connection with each of the alternatives you examine? What negotiation postures should we strike in general?"

OTHER QUESTIONS

Also, "What major congressional problems can we anticipate and how should they be met? What problems can we anticipate in U.S. public opinion and how should they be dealt with? You should feel free in making this report to call on the best minds in this government to work on specific aspects of the problem, but you should assure the highest possible degree of security up to the moment when the President's decision on these matters is announced," the directive stated.

Alas for such a presidential hope.

Because Harold Brown, the Air Force secretary, was away from Washington, his under secretary, Townsend Hoopes, a Pentagon "dove," was among those who assembled with Secretary McNamara at the end of February to analyze the military's proposals.

DINNER WITH MOORHEAD, DALE

Shortly afterward, Mr. Hoopes went to dinner at the home of Representative William

S. Moorhead (D., Pa.) and a fellow guest was Edwin L. Dale, Jr., economics writer for the New York Times. All three had been fellow students at Yale.

Mr. Hoopes told Mr. Dale that there was a fight in the Pentagon to knock down what he said was a "request by General Westmoreland for 206,000 more American troops in Vietnam."

On Sunday, March 10, two days before the New Hampshire primary, the New York Times displayed with big, bold headlines: "Westmoreland Requests 206,000 More Men, Stirring Debate in the Administration," an article saying that the Vietnam commander was seeking reinforcements for a "bolder strategy" in the conduct of the war, including "ground actions into Laos and Cambodia to disrupt the enemy's base areas and infiltration routes."

M'CARTHY'S BID

It had four bylines, including Mr. Dale's.

Two days later came the 1968 New Hampshire primary, which most observers believed would end Senator Eugene J. McCarthy's bid to take away the 1968 Democratic presidential nomination from Mr. Johnson.

Instead, he got a surprising 42.4 per cent of the Democratic primary vote compared to Mr. Johnson's 49.4 per cent as a write-in candidate. The senator also picked up most of New Hampshire's convention delegates.

Contrast the national reaction then with the reaction now as South Vietnamese troops hit the North Vietnamese supply network of supply trails in the Laotian Panhandle.

It indicates Mr. Nixon's success in convincing the American people that he has a workable plan for ending American participation in the war—Vietnamization.

It was one thing for American generals to call for American reinforcements for a more "aggressive" allied strategy to shorten the conflict.

It appears to be another thing for the South Vietnamese, while American ground forces are withdrawing, to undertake to wipe out enemy bases in Laos and Cambodia with only American air support.

In operations against Cambodian sanctuaries last spring, the South Vietnamese forces showed military capability. If they can do as well against the enemy supply network in Laos, Mr. Nixon's gamble will look good.

If not, another American president may be deciding that one elective term is enough. The "doves" may be nesting now. A military setback would get them fluttering again.

The following are two paragraphs which were deleted from the original Potter story and should have been inserted following the third paragraph under the subheadline "McCarthy's Bid," and prior to the paragraph beginning "Contrast the national reaction.":

Mr. Hoopes, in a book he wrote after leaving the Pentagon, while not acknowledging this tip to Mr. Dale, stated that "Public knowledge of the 206,000 figure helped (McCarthy) tremendously."

In any case, the McCarthy vote clearly influenced the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy to enter the Presidential race, and that, in turn, no doubt influenced President Johnson not to run for another term. General Westmoreland was soon recalled to be made Army Chief of Staff.

to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if I might ask the gentleman if I am correct in assuming that there will be business next week.

Mr. BOGGS. In assuming that there will be no business?

Mr. GROSS. That there will be some business.

Mr. BOGGS. There will be business next week. We expect to schedule the debt ceiling bill, a very important bill, and we may also have some suspensions.

Mr. GROSS. What I would like to say to the gentleman is that the minority of the minority has been here ready, willing, and able to do business, and it is becoming a little tiresome just to come over for small routine each day. So that I would hope that there would be some business next week and thereafter so we can get caught up.

Mr. BOGGS. I can assure the gentleman, who describes himself as the minority of the minority, that we will have very much to do within a very short period of time.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

"DRAGONLADY" OR PUBLIC DEFENDER?

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the Department of State's Passport Division maintain records concerning persons whose citizenship is questionable—are in the United States contrary to law, smugglers, revolutionists, subversives, convicted criminals, violators of immigration regulations in the past, military deserters, selective service delinquents, airplane hijackers, adjudicated mental incompetents, and so forth. The maintenance of such records by name in the Department is appropriately designated a "lookout" file and is under the jurisdiction of the Director of the Passport Office, a staunch though oft misrepresented American, Miss Frances Knight.

Last week, the New York Times again indulged itself in dissemination of semi-paranoid editorializing in the form of remarks in a column by Tom Wicker referring to Director Knight as "the dragon lady of the State Department," and to the lookout file as some kind of an invasion of privacy in the nature of snooping. This is baloney, pure and simple.

This sort of editorializing is the same old story of delusions of persecution on the part of some who are hipped that rights of personal privacy override the necessary recordkeeping requirements of Government in respect to individual backgrounds that are of demonstrated

concern to the safety of the country in travel abroad.

Despite previous highly dubious Warren Supreme Court decisions pronouncing a virtual requirement that passports may not be denied to demonstrated subversives, the fact remains that there are many legally valid reasons for the denial of a passport. It is to implement these and to establish a basis for initial investigation that the lookout file must be maintained for the protection of the United States of America.

Things like this ought not to be distorted by slanted press accounts or prejudiced editorializing on the part of columnists, whether in the New York Times or any other paper.

I requested from Miss Knight a clarification of the Department's role in the maintenance of the lookout file and she has responded to me by letter as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., February 19, 1971.

Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WYMAN: In answer to your telephone inquiry regarding the two recent articles appearing in the New York Times, please be assured that I am as concerned as you are with the obvious misrepresentation of facts. There is considerable official information available to the New York Times regarding the operation of the Passport Office and lookout list in such documents as the Warren Commission Report, testimony at Congressional Hearings, and its own sources of information from within the Department of State. It is, indeed, unfortunate that the New York Times consistently demonstrates such an irrational, antagonistic phobia on virtually all matters which concern the security of the United States.

You mention the scare headlines of February 11, and February 16, 1971, as they appeared in the New York Times. Let us consider them: the first reads "Passport Office has Secret File" and the subhead reads "243,135 Names in Computer—Applications Screened". The average reader draws the inference that a gestapo is loose in Washington—that the Passport Office is in the "surveillance" business—an untrue but favorite charge and repetitive of that particular New York newspaper. The second article was headlined "Raw Material for the Snoopers"—a further insinuation that something akin to the dreaded KGB has established a base in the Passport Office.

Let us consider some background of the New York Times' preoccupation with misinforming the public on the contents of Passport Office files and the operation of the Passport Office.

On March 8, 1966, the Passport Office sent a routine classified message to the American Embassies in Moscow and Paris concerning the travel abroad of Henry Stuart Hughes, a Harvard University Professor on sabbatical leave. This message requested these embassies to notify the Department of any information received by them concerning Professor Hughes' activities abroad.

This classified message was "leaked" to the New York Times and was virtually quoted verbatim by that newspaper. In its issue of March 23, 1966, the New York Times touched off its ever-ready panic button and alleged the State Department was conducting a "surveillance" of U.S. citizens during their travel abroad. The article further stated that Miss Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office, "had been reproved by her superiors" for sending the message. Both statements were lies.

In a letter of March 23, 1966, Senator Edward M. Kennedy asked the then Secretary

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

of State, Dean Rusk, to comment on the New York Times' article. The Department of State by Press Release, No. 74, dated April 5, 1966, set out the Secretary's reply to the Senator's letter. The Secretary stated in part:

"You inquired first as to 'the relationship between the Passport Office and the investigatory agencies of government, both in the granting of passports and in the surveillance of those who have received passports.' First of all, I wish to emphasize most strongly that no question of surveillance or investigation by the Department of State or any American diplomatic post abroad is involved. The Department of State has traditionally been the agency of the Government to which other Departments turn for cooperation and assistance in aspects of their responsibilities relating to areas outside the United States. These have included requests for information the Department may receive concerning individuals travelling abroad. Requests of this kind have been sent routinely to the Passport Office in the Department. Also routinely, such requests have been passed on to our diplomatic missions abroad, with a request that the mission should forward to the Department any information that it may receive in normal course of business during the travel of an American citizen. The diplomatic missions have not been asked to conduct any surveillance or to engage in any investigative process. They have merely been asked to transmit certain information they may receive which, in the absence of a request from the Department, they might have no occasion to report." (Emphasis added)

The Passport Office was merely following a routine practice established by the Department of State in cooperation with other areas of the Federal Government. Former Secretary of State Rusk answered this Congressional inquiry in a forthright manner which even the New York Times should be able to comprehend.

The current misrepresentation in the New York Times was occasioned by a speech made by Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., on February 9, 1971, in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, expressing his legitimate concern with violations of the First Amendment Rights of free speech and freedom to associate. The Senator's speech has not been made available to me. No Passport Office representative was present when a spokesman for the Department of State briefed a member of the Senator's staff concerning Passport Office procedures. Therefore, I have no firsthand knowledge of what was said.

With specified reference to the New York Times article of February 11, 1971, it should be made clear that the Passport Office has statutory and regulatory authority for the maintenance of records of persons who for one reason or another, mainly citizenship, should not be issued a passport.

This authority is: 22 USC 211(a) and 212; 8 USC 1105; 8 USC 1185; Presidential Proclamation 3004; Executive Order 11295; and the Passport Regulations 22 CFR Parts 50, 51 and 53. In addition, the Passport Office is bound by the conclusion of the Warren Commission arising from its report on transactions between Lee Harvey Oswald and the State Department. The New York Times is aware of this fact in view of the ample lineage it gave the Warren Commission Report.

The New York Times article dated February 11, 1971 is captioned "Passport Office has Secret File." The fact that the Passport Office has such a file is not a secret; it was published in 1964 in the hearings of the Warren Commission; the categories of persons listed in the Passport Office "lookout file" have been discussed in various Congressional hearings available to the New York Times as well as to the public. Particular reference is made to a report of April 4, 1957 issued by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee. This report sets forth, at length, an exhaustive

study of the passport procedures and was based on oral testimony before the Committee citing numerous studies. Further, so far as I am aware, Senator Ervin did not characterize the Passport Office lookout list as a "secret" file.

The New York Times article state:

"A spokesman for Senator Ervin, however, said today that the State Department had reported to him in writing that the largest group of names on the list was in the 'known or suspected Communists or subversives' category and that the number of names under 'doubtful citizenship' ranked second."

I do not know the identity of the unnamed "spokesman" referred to in the article. However, the facts which the Passport Office furnished to the upper echelons in the Department of State handling all the contacts with Senator Ervin's office specifically indicated that the great majority of names contained in the lookout file relate to loss of citizenship, questionable citizenship or insufficient evidence of citizenship. Information to this effect was also furnished by me to Mr. Ben Franklin of the New York Times on February 10, 1971 in an interview requested by that reporter.

As reported by the New York Times, Senator Ervin is alleged to have said that while there might be legitimate reasons for maintaining portions of the Passport Office file, many of the justifications for it given to his subcommittee by the State Department were beyond any reason whatsoever.

Insofar as the Passport Office is aware, the Department of State was not asked and made no effort to justify the various categories in the lookout file. The New York Times listing of some of the categories deliberately impugns the necessity for and reasonableness of the lookout file and gives rise to some very pertinent questions:

1. Does the New York Times advocate the issuance of U.S. passports to persons who are not citizens of the United States in violation of law (22 USC 212)?

2. Does the New York Times advocate the facilitation of travel of arms smugglers, persons engaged in revolutionary activities or those who have a record of criminal activity abroad? These are examples of the persons whose "actions do not reflect to the credit of the U.S. abroad (1,040 persons)."

3. Does the New York Times advocate non-compliance with the conclusions of the Warren Commission and Presidential directives that all agencies cooperate with the Secret Service and other law enforcement agencies in reporting defectors, expatriates and repatriates who are considered to be a class potentially dangerous to the life of the President of the United States? Persons in this category meet the criterion established by Federal security agencies responsible for the program of protecting the life of the President of the United States and other Federal officials.

4. Does the New York Times advocate the issuance of passports to persons who are the subject of criminal warrants of arrest issued by competent legal authorities? This question is particularly pertinent in the light of current domestic crime problems. In other words, does the Times advocate that the Passport Office refuse to cooperate with law enforcement agencies of the Federal and State governments?

5. Does the New York Times advocate a refusal to respect court orders granting the custody of children to one of the parents, thereby permitting through the issuance of a passport the other parent to illegally take children out of the country?

6. Does the New York Times advocate travel assistance to military deserters or selective service delinquents who are subjects of warrants of arrest?

7. Does the New York Times advocate non-cooperation and non-compliance with the security/intelligence agencies of the Federal

Government in advising them of the travel or contemplated travel of known or suspected espionage agents, revolutionaries, communists and subversives who advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government?

8. Does the New York Times advocate the removal of the names of airplane hijackers and potential hijackers so that police authorities would not be appropriately advised of the prospective travel of such persons?

In its article of February 16, 1971, the New York Times also reports that the State Department had acknowledged maintaining a secret surveillance file of passport applicants.

The Passport Office has no information that the State Department or anyone connected with it "acknowledged maintaining a secret surveillance file of passport applicants". But I reiterate I do not know who the New York Times confers with in the Department of State. Nevertheless, the New York Times has available to it public information to the effect that the State Department has, in the past, denied emphatically that it maintains surveillance of passport applicants. As previously stated in this communication, Secretary Rusk in Press Release #74 of April 5, 1966, denied categorically any question of surveillance or investigation of passport bearers by the Department of State or any American diplomatic post abroad. That the State Department would now acknowledge maintaining a "secret surveillance file" is astounding. I am not aware of any such file.

As stated repeatedly, the lookout file maintained in the Passport Office is no secret. Its existence has been the subject of publication by the Warren Commission and others.

There is no surveillance, watch, observation, or other type of spying on passport applicants by the Passport Office, or by the Department of State.

At the conclusion of its article of February 11, 1971, the New York Times states: "Miss Knight said she would not necessarily notify anyone that he was included in the file even if the 'adverse action' were taken in her own office, through the denial of a passport."

This statement is misleading. I specifically stated to Mr. Ben Franklin of the New York Times, during the interview on February 10, 1971, that, if no adverse passport action was taken, the person would not be notified of the fact that his name was contained in the lookout file. Some names in the lookout file are not based on the contemplation of passport denial. They are there merely for the purpose of informing law enforcement agencies with a legitimate interest that a person is traveling abroad. If adverse passport action is taken, the Passport Regulations, which are distributed publicly and were handed to Mr. Ben Franklin by me personally, specifically require that the person affected be notified of the reasons for the action, of the evidence upon which it was based, and of his right to a hearing.

The New York Times article, either deliberately or through misinformation received from sources outside the Passport Office, has created a totally erroneous impression of the Passport Office lookout file and has, as a result, completely distorted Senator Ervin's inquiry into an area of legitimate concern to him. The New York Times, it would appear, has either infected itself or is deliberately attempting to infect its readers with an Orwellian Syndrome.

It is abundantly evident that the New York Times could not control its phobia on the subject because three days later, on February 14, 1971, it published a picture of the New York Passport Agency and captioned it thus:

"Nearly 2 million Americans apply for passports every year. Last week another Passport Office service was revealed—a secret com-

puterized file of 243,135 names that may be of interest to Government law enforcement Agencies. The file is said to include 'suspected Communists and subversives' and those of 'questionable citizenship'.

Thus the New York Times published another calculated falsification. The 243,135 names are not released to "law enforcement agencies", as the caption indicates. A few are, but only a small fraction of the whole and the questions arise again—questions as to the persistent and extraordinary concern of the New York Times with protection of wanted criminals, espionage agents, individuals known to have engaged in passport fraud, child custody cases and so forth.

Finally, by February 16, 1971, the New York Times obviously worked itself up to such a mental sweat over the situation, that a quasi-editorial by one Tom Wicker appeared and stated:

"Senator Ervin already has disclosed that the Dragon Lady of the State Department, Director Frances Knight of the Passport Office, has at her disposal a computer bank of 243,135 names of person considered—not necessarily proven—to be subversive or to fail to 'reflect credit' on the United States."

Mr. Wicker is located with the New York Times staff in Washington and thus close to the source of primary information, but he did not choose to check his facts. Indeed, Mr. Wicker's statement is not a misunderstanding nor a typographical error nor a misquote. It is a deliberate and calculated lie and as such neither he nor the New York Times reflect any credit or honor on what was once upon a time regarded as a distinguished and respectable profession—namely, responsible newspaper reporting.

Sincerely,

FRANCES G. KNIGHT,
Director, Passport Office.

DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION CLUBS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, March is National DECA Month. It is very significant. Distributive Education Clubs of America are the only national organizations, operating within the schools, to attract young people to careers in marketing and distribution.

I have always felt that each of us achieves satisfaction and success in direct proportion to our ability to help other people. In no profession does an individual have a greater chance to do this than in the marketing of a product or service.

Marketing is the total process through which an organization recognizes a need in the community, produces a product or service that fills the need, sells it to the people who need it, and stands behind it so that it gives complete satisfaction.

People in marketing then, are responsible for the standard of living we enjoy in this country today. They are the ones who developed the automobiles, refrigerators, fabrics, plastics, and medicines. They encouraged people to want something new and better. As they increased the sale of new products, they made mass production and lower costs possible. Marketing people are responsible for keeping the wheels of industry turning.

I salute these young people who are

interested in marketing. This country will remain free as long as it is strong. We will be strong only as long as our economy is strong. These young people will do their part to keep it that way.

NATIONAL FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer these remarks in tribute to over 450,000 Future Farmers of America in 9,000 chapters across our Nation. This week is National Future Farmers of America Week, a time when it is a privilege and honor to pay tribute to the young people who belong to this organization who are quietly working within our system of government to improve our society.

The rest of our Nation's youth would do well to exemplify the spirit of the Future Farmers of America, motivated by idealism but tempered by the real world of practical experience. The theme for this year's observance is "Involved in America's Future," a most appropriate theme for this action-oriented organization whose members have worked tirelessly in community improvement activities since the FFA's inception in 1928.

Today, the FFA community involvement has a new look. Called the "Building Our American Communities" program, it is a coordinated effort between community leaders and FFA youth to initiate local, self-help programs regarding community problem identification, resource evaluation, and selection of community development alternatives and action.

The importance of this youth program in rural America cannot be overemphasized. The population of the United States could likely grow by 50 percent in the next 20 years. Where these future 100 million citizens locate and what kind of economic opportunity they will find will dictate our Nation's destiny.

It is obvious that many of our problems relating to our large urban areas—crime, housing, welfare, malnutrition, transportation—at least in part have been produced by the tremendous population migration to our overcrowded metropolitan areas. In order to save our cities, we must create a new environment of jobs, education, and favorable living conditions in the countryside to initiate a reverse migration back to our rural and small-town areas. We must realize that a healthy and revitalized rural and small-town America is interdependent and that a healthy and revitalized rural and small-town America will also mean a healthy and revitalized urban America. The FFA is working to achieve this goal so important to our national well-being.

To assist in this effort, I plan to introduce two bills I feel compliment these FFA goals. Later this week I will introduce legislation to end estate tax discrimination against inheritance of a family owned business. I am introducing this bill in conjunction with National Future Farmers of America Week to

stress the need for ending tax discrimination against young people who would stand to inherit a family-owned farming operation. This legislation provides that estate taxes on family ranches, farms, and small businesses be computed on the property's earning power instead of the inflated sales prices based on speculative land values.

In addition, I am pleased to report that 32 of my colleagues have joined with me in sponsoring the Rural Job Development Act of 1970, a comprehensive bill authored by Senator JAMES PEARSON, of Kansas, designed to encourage job-creating industries to locate in rural job development areas.

Mr. Speaker, the average age of the American farmer is over 52. The consumer should realize FFA Week could just as well be appropriately called National Food and Fiber Alert Week. Without the promise of young people entering farming and agri-business, our Nation's food and fiber supply is endangered. The consumer takes our abundant food supply for granted. Most assuredly this is not the case. We stand in real danger of losing the most efficient and productive man in our entire economy unless we strengthen the family farm and the surrounding small business economic environment.

The enthusiastic young people who are now taking an active role in the Future Farmers of America are pointing the way and offering constructive programs by which we can revitalize rural and small-town America, help save our cities and insure the farmer he will be able to continue his efforts to provide America with the highest quality food at the lowest cost in the world. I am most proud to pay tribute to their leadership in this most important goal.

INTERSTATE ENVIRONMENT COMPACT

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I am today joined by my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF), in introducing a bill to authorize the Nation's States and territories to enter into an interstate environment compact.

This proposal is also being introduced in the Senate today by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, JOHN L. McCLELLAN, and other Members of that body at the request of the Southern Governors' Conference. Our former Governor of Arkansas, the Honorable Winthrop Rockefeller, sponsored the compact movement as 1970 chairman of the conference and is still active both at the State and National level in pursuing this goal. We are also indebted to Prof. Eugene F. Mooney, of the University of Kentucky College of Law, for his dedicated efforts toward this formation as chief counsel of the Southern Regional Environmental Conservation Council.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has chal-

lenged the several States to clean up their air, land, and water and thus our national environment. From the basic legislation in the fields of water pollution, air pollution, and solid waste disposal, the Federal Government has now begun to assemble an administrative apparatus appropriate to our developing understanding of the nature, scope, and diversity of the task. The future will see intensification and amplifications of our current approach. A major premise of this approach is that the National Government and the States have definite and differentiated roles to play in our national environment control program. Specifically, the States have the primary responsibility for cleaning up our air, land, and water, while the National Government is to prescribe national criteria and assist the States in implementing their control and abatement programs.

The interstate environment compact would give advance congressional approval for participating States to enter into supplementary agreements relating to regional interstate environmental problems of common concern. Environmental pollution problems are not restricted by State boundaries and require common action between and among adjacent States. It is hoped that such compact would ultimately encompass all States to effectively deal with regional environmental problems and ecological disorders.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to consent to the Interstate Environment Compact

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is given to any two or more States to enter into the following compact:

"INTERSTATE ENVIRONMENT COMPACT"

"ARTICLE 1"

"FINDINGS, PURPOSES AND RESERVATIONS OF POWER"

1.01 FINDINGS.—Signatory states hereby find and declare:

"(a) The environment of every state is affected with local, state, regional and national interests and its protection, under appropriate arrangements for intergovernmental cooperation, are public purposes of the respective signatories.

"(b) Certain environmental pollution problems transcend state boundaries and thereby become common to adjacent states requiring cooperative efforts.

"(c) The environment of each state is subject to the effective control of the signatories, and coordinated, cooperative or joint exercise of control measures is in their common interests.

1.02 PURPOSES.—The purposes of the signatories in enacting this are:

"(a) To assist and participate in the national environment protection programs as set forth in federal legislation; to promote intergovernmental cooperation for multistate action relating to environmental protection through interstate agreements; and to encourage cooperative and coordinated environmental protection by the signatories and the federal government;

"(b) To preserve and utilize the functions, powers and duties of existing state agencies of government to the maximum extent possible consistent with the purposes of the compact.

"1.03 POWERS OF THE UNITED STATES.—"

"(a) Nothing contained in this compact shall impair, affect or extend the constitutional authority of the United States.

"(b) The signatories hereby recognize the power and right of the Congress of the United States at any time by any statute expressly enacted for that purpose to revise the terms and conditions of its consent.

1.04 POWERS OF THE STATES.—Nothing contained in this compact shall impair or extend the constitutional authority of any signatory state, nor shall the police powers of any signatory state be affected except as expressly provided in a supplementary agreement under Article 4.

"ARTICLE 2"

"SHORT TITLE, DEFINITIONS, PURPOSES AND LIMITATIONS"

2.01 SHORT TITLE.—This compact shall be known and may be cited as the Interstate Environment Compact.

2.02 DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this compact and of any supplemental or concurring legislation enacted pursuant or in relation hereto, except as may be otherwise required by the context:

"(a) 'State' shall mean any one of the fifty states of the United States of America, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Territory of the Virgin Islands, but shall not include the District of Columbia.

"(b) 'Interstate environment pollution' shall mean any pollution of a stream or body of water crossing or marking a state boundary, interstate air quality control region designated by an appropriate federal agency or solid waste collection and disposal district or program involving the jurisdiction or territories of more than one state.

"(c) 'Government' shall mean the governments of the United States and the signatory states.

"(d) 'Federal Government' shall mean the government of the United States of America and any appropriate department, instrumentality, agency, commission, bureau, division, branch or other unit thereof, as the case may be, but shall not include the District of Columbia.

"(e) 'Signatory' shall mean any state which enters into this compact and is a party thereto.

"INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION"

3.01 AGREEMENTS WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND OTHER AGENCIES.—Signatory states are hereby authorized jointly to participate in cooperative or joint undertakings for the protection of the interstate environment with the federal government or with any intergovernmental or interstate agencies.

"ARTICLE 4"

"SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENTS, JURISDICTION AND ENFORCEMENT"

4.01 Signatories may enter into agreements for the purpose of controlling interstate environmental problems in accordance with applicable federal legislation and under terms and conditions as deemed appropriate by the agreeing states under section 4.06 and section 4.08.

4.02 RECOGNITION OF EXISTING NON-ENVIRONMENTAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—The signatories agree that existing federal-state, interstate or intergovernmental arrangements which are not primarily directed to environmental protection purposes as defined herein are not affected by this compact.

4.03 RECOGNITION OF EXISTING INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS DIRECTED TO ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES.—All existing interstate compacts directly relating to environmental protection are hereby expressly recognized and nothing in this compact shall be construed to diminish or supersede the powers and functions of such existing inter-

governmental agreements and the organizations created by them.

4.04 MODIFICATION OF EXISTING COMMISSIONS AND COMPACTS.—Recognition herein of multistate commissions and compacts shall not be construed to limit directly or indirectly the creation of additional multistate organizations or interstate compacts, nor to prevent termination, modification, extension, or supplementation of such multistate organizations and interstate compacts recognized herein by the federal government or states party thereto.

4.05 RECOGNITION OF FUTURE MULTISTATE COMMISSIONS AND INTERSTATE COMPACTS.—Nothing in this compact shall be construed to prevent signatories from entering into multistate organizations or other interstate compacts which do not conflict with their obligations under this compact.

4.06 SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENTS.—Any two or more signatories may enter into supplementary agreements for joint, coordinated or mutual environmental management activities relating to interstate pollution problems common to the territories of such states and for the establishment of common or joint regulation, management, services, agencies or facilities for such purposes or may designate an appropriate agency to act as their joint agency in regard thereto. No supplementary agreement shall be valid to the extent that it conflicts with the purposes of this compact and the creation of a joint agency by supplementary agreement shall not affect the privileges, powers, responsibilities or duties under this compact of signatories participating therein as embodied in this compact.

4.07 EXECUTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENTS AND EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Governor is authorized to enter into supplementary agreements for the state and his official signature shall render the agreement immediately binding upon the state;

"Provided that:

"(a) The legislature of any signatory entering into such a supplementary agreement shall at its next legislative session by concurrent resolution bring the supplementary agreement before it and by appropriate legislative action reverse, modify or condition the agreement of that state.

"(b) Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to limit the right of Congress by Act of law expressly enacted for that purpose to disapprove or condition such a supplementary agreement.

4.08 SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENTS.—Signatories may enter into special supplementary agreements with the District of Columbia or foreign nations for the same purposes and with the same powers as under section 4.06 upon the condition that such non-signatory party accept the general obligations of signatories under this compact: Provided, that such special supplementary agreements shall become effective only after being consented to by the Congress.

4.09 JURISDICTION OF SIGNATORIES RESERVED.—Nothing in this compact or in any supplementary agreement thereunder shall be construed to restrict, relinquish or be in derogation of, any power or authority constitutionally possessed by any signatory within its jurisdiction, except as specifically limited by this compact or a supplementary agreement.

4.10 COMPLIMENTARY LEGISLATION BY SIGNATORIES.—Signatories may enact such additional legislation as may be deemed appropriate to enable its officers and governmental agencies to accomplish effectively the purposes of this compact and supplementary agreements recognized or entered into under the terms of this Article.

4.11 LEGAL RIGHTS OF SIGNATORIES.—Nothing in this compact shall impair the exercise by any signatory of its legal rights or remedies established by the United States Constitution or any other laws of this Nation.

"ARTICLE 5

"CONSTRUCTION, AMENDMENT AND EFFECTIVE DATE

"5.01 CONSTRUCTION.—It is the intent of the signatories that no provision of this compact or supplementary agreement entered into hereunder shall be construed as invalidating any provision of law of any signatory and that nothing in this compact shall be construed to modify or qualify the authority of any signatory to enact or enforce environmental protection legislation within its jurisdiction and not inconsistent with any provision of this compact or a supplementary agreement entered into pursuant hereto.

"5.02 SEVERABILITY.—The provisions of this compact or of agreements hereunder shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact, or such an agreement is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory or of the United States or is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact or of any such agreement and the applicability thereof to any participating jurisdiction, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby and shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining participating jurisdictions and in full force and effect as to the signatory affected as to all severable matters. It is the intent of the signatories that the provisions of this compact shall be reasonably and liberally construed in the context of its purposes.

"5.03 AMENDMENTS.—Amendments to this compact may be initiated by legislative action of any signatory and become effective when concurred in by all signatories and approved by Congress.

"5.04 EFFECTIVE DATE.—This compact shall become binding on a state when enacted by it into law and such state shall thereafter become a signatory and party hereto with any and all states legally joining herein.

"5.05 WITHDRAWAL FROM THE COMPACT.—A state may withdraw from this compact by authority of an act of its legislature one year after it notifies all signatories in writing of an intention to withdraw from the compact: Provided, withdrawal from the compact affects obligations of a signatory imposed on it by supplementary agreements to which it may be a party only to the extent and in accordance with the terms of such supplementary agreements."

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS FOR REVENUE SHARING DESERVE FAIR HEARING

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

Mr. DUPONT. Mr. Speaker, there have been some incredible statements attributed to Democratic leaders recently concerning President Nixon's proposals for revenue sharing, which he outlined in his state of the Union message to the Congress.

I use the word "incredible" purposely, because I just do not believe some of our Democratic colleagues are fully aware that they are rejecting out of hand a concept which is favored by an overwhelming 77 percent of the rank-and-file members of their party. Those are Gallup poll figures which were recently released.

The Congress has been criticized recently for not being responsive to the public interest. How do we deny that charge? We have a situation here where

the President has sponsored a concept that has the overwhelming support of Governors and mayors and is favored by 77 percent of all American adults. Yet, even before we have seen the details of the President's specific legislation, we have press reports, attributed to knowledgeable Democrats, that hearings will be held for the purpose of killing the revenue-sharing plan.

If these reports are true, it is a disastrous situation. Something is very, very wrong when any Members of this body think they can defy the will of three-fourths of the American people. At the very least these proposals deserve a fair hearing before the Congress, not hearings designed to kill the proposal.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, there is one passage in the President's economic report which, in my view, underscores the effectiveness of this administration's economic policy. The President said:

We must constantly review our economic institutions to see where the competitive market mechanism that has served us so well can replace restrictive arrangements originally introduced in response to conditions that no longer exist.

It is too often forgotten that a free and competitive market has served us well. It is the basis upon which we have built the most productive economic system in the history of mankind.

Though it would seem self-evident that we should tamper with such a system only with extreme care, there are still some who urge new intervention each time there is a minor dislocation in the marketplace.

Happily, President Nixon is not of this school. He understands a basic lesson of economics that the best way to correct economic problems is to make the market itself work to correct those problems. It is a far better approach and, in the long run, much more productive.

GARLAND: DISTINGUISHED AWARD CITY

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

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great amount of personal pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the fact that the city of Garland, Tex., has been designated as winner of a Distinguished Achievement Award for outstanding community improvement in the National Clean-Up Contest. Garland achieved this honor in the category of cities between 25,000 and 250,000 population.

This contest is an annual event begun in 1929 by the National Clean Up-Paint Up-Fix Up Bureau in Washington, D.C. Through this contest each year, hundreds of cities across the country voluntarily undertake community betterment efforts, with particular attention and emphasis on communitywide beautification, property improvement, and youth activities.

Taking the total population of the 320 cities which competed in the contest, over 50 million people participated.

Among the many individuals in city service clubs and organizations that deserve special mention for their efforts in leading Garland in winning this award are Mr. Max Schied, Mr. R. E. Dodson, and Mr. J. C. Landers of the chamber of commerce; and Mrs. Virginia Stone and Mr. Bill Cox of the city health department. Many, many other individuals deserve commendation for their efforts. However, these few stand out for special notice in this campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I am most proud to represent this outstanding and progressive city and its fine citizens.

VIETNAM DISENGAGEMENT ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in spite of widespread public outrage, congressional protest, and criticism from abroad, our coercive and destructive Southeast Asian policy of militarism continues and expands. We despair, but we cannot allow ourselves to falter in our efforts to end this odious war. Only through definitive congressional action will the administration be forced to reckon with the will of the American people and with the bankruptcy of its policy. Therefore, I am glad to join with the gentleman from New York and other distinguished Congressmen, in cosponsoring the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971.

My colleagues raised sobering questions about our widening commitment and demonstrated the urgency of immediate and positive action on the bill. I concur with their forceful expressions of concern, and feel that it is time, once again, to look at the broad picture of our role in Asia. We must rethink the fundamental origins and purposes of our Southeast Asia policy, explore the viability of our expressed goals, and reassess the effectiveness of our current posture.

In this regard, I wish to recommend to my colleagues the following article by Prof. David P. Mozingo, of Cornell University, which appeared in *World Politics*. Although published in 1967, its message has not lost its immediacy. Professor Mozingo convincingly argues that our China containment policy was modeled after the seemingly successful post-1947 containment policy of the Soviet Union in Europe. He points out, however, that whatever one might think of the goal of containing China, the means for such containment do not exist in Asia. Unlike Europe, the countries of Southeast Asia are in a state of rapid social change. They do not, themselves, provide the stable and unified base which is necessary for effective containment of China. Consequently, in order to implement our policy, we have had to oppose the natural forces of change in the area, and impose stabil-

ity in the form of preserving the status quo.

CONTAINMENT IN ASIA RECONSIDERED

(By David P. Mozingo*)

Since the Korean War, United States policies in Asia have gradually developed along the lines of the "containment" doctrine so successfully applied in Europe after 1947. Washington has increasingly seen the problem of Chinese power in Asia in much the same light as that posed by Soviet power in Europe and has behaved as if both threats could be contained by basically the same kinds of responses. In both Asia and Europe, containment measures have reflected a perceived need for complementary interaction between military policies and aid programs in order to prevent aggression by Communist powers and to foster the internal stability of nations in the area. Although difficulties have arisen in seeking the best balance of these components of the containment policy in Europe, most of the essential American objectives in the West have been attained.

"For some time, however, it has been apparent, particularly in Southeast Asia, that the application of containment measures in the Far East has not yielded results comparable to those achieved in Europe." While it is widely recognized that this disparity in results reflects special Asian problems not encountered in Europe, there has been a general reluctance to question whether the containment philosophy really addresses the basic sources of the instability in Asia that alarms the United States. It is time to analyze the relative failure of the containment doctrine in Asia by considering both the obvious special difficulties confronting the United States there and the inherent differences between the situation in Asia and that in Europe.

Had the sense of historical perspective exerted a more prominent influence on Asian policy formulation, it is likely that containment's central objective of establishing a hard political and military line between a U.S. and a Chinese sphere of influence would have seemed infeasible from the beginning. In Western Europe, the basis for effective U.S. containment measures was soundly conceived because these measures were applied in defense of communities long-established within the framework of a nation-state system. Moreover, special ties bound the United States to Great Britain and France. By applying the containment doctrine in the West, the United States, for the third time in this century, reaffirmed the strategic principle that had formerly governed Britain's policy toward Europe: No single continental power was to be permitted to conquer or dominate the European nation-state system. Further, the U.S. measures to contain Russia in Europe were strengthened by the historic determination of the Western democracies to preserve their established order and values.

In Asia, the containment doctrine has been applied to an area where a nation-state system is only just beginning to emerge amid unpredictable upheavals of a kind that characterized Europe three centuries earlier. It is only since 1949 that the restoration of a strong, unified China, the withdrawal of the Western colonial powers, and the formation of new independent countries have created the beginnings of a modern nation-state system in Asia.

The question in Asia is not how a traditionally functioning system can be rehabilitated but how a very new system

will evolve and mature. The kinds of American technical and economic power that helped to restore the historic vitality of the European system would seem to have, at best, only partial relevance to the Asian situation. It may be doubted whether the kinds of tools and power available to the United States can induce stability in an environment in which most countries are experiencing a profound and rapid transformation of their societies, values, and attitudes. Much of the American experience and structure of values has already shown itself to be not only inapplicable but also not even wanted. The results of the competition between the United States, Russia, and China in Asia thus far seem to indicate that attempts by external powers to shape the emerging Asian system are unlikely to succeed. None of these powers has been able, whether by appeals to ideology or common national interests or by large-scale economic and military aid, to exert enough influence to draw the more important Asian powers into close alignment. In the absence of firm ties and mutual interests of the kind that have bound the United States to Western Europe (and these did not emerge overnight), a policy of containment in Asia must rest on unstable foundations.

THE EFFECTS OF NATIONAL RIVALRIES ON A CONTAINMENT STRATEGY IN ASIA

The Soviet threat to Europe has been regarded primarily as a military one. Even when the Western part of that continent was most weakened, immediately after World War II, Communist parties were unable to take power in any country by popular consent. Western Europe's economic recovery was rapid. National conflicts were not so severe as to prevent the formation of an alliance. Until recent times, there was broad agreement among the Western powers about the nature of the Soviet threat and how to meet it. Consequently, it was to lay a firm political foundation for the NATO structure.

The political conditions that were indispensable to the creation of security arrangements in Europe are absent in Asia, where very few powers see their security interests in the same way. Except for Taiwan, all of the Asian powers have an enemy or enemies whom their leaders apparently regard as more threatening than China. Japan, for example, still regards Russia as at least as great a threat to her security as China. Moreover, the common threat to South Korea and Japan that developed as a result of the Korean War has yet to result in a real rapprochement between these two countries; but without such an understanding, no "little NATO" in Northeast Asia can be built. For these and other historical, economic, and psychological reasons it is doubtful that any anti-China security arrangement can win Japan's enthusiastic participation. In fact, only the United States and South Korea have indicated interest in an alignment with Taiwan against Peking.

In Southeast Asia, the menace to Thailand, Laos, and South Vietnam comes in the first instance not from China but from a very independent and highly nationalistic regime in Hanoi. North Vietnamese expansion into Southeast Asia also alarms Cambodia, but not as much as her fear of Thai and South Vietnamese aspirations to recover lost territories at Phnom Penh's expense. Prince Sihanouk believes these two historic enemies have aligned themselves with the United States, not so much to contain China or North Vietnam as to secure the arms and tacit backing of the United States for the pursuit of their irredentist claims on Cambodia—hence, his close ties with Peking and deference to Hanoi. Similar fears influence Pakistan, whose government (understandably) believes India is gearing her defenses less to protect the subcontinent from Chinese invasion than to dominate

Pakistan. In Rawalpindi's view, New Delhi is using the boundary dispute with Peking to secure U.S. and Soviet aid that will more likely be used against Pakistan. Indonesia, the Philippines, and Malaysia are geographically beyond the reach of Chinese power. They have predominantly the same racial composition. In spite of these favorable conditions, in recent times the relations between the three countries have been strained by harmful rivalries they themselves have generated, not Peking.

Such strife among Asia's non-Communist powers, for which their own governments are responsible, has been far more beneficial to China's aspirations and interests as a great power in the Far East than have any actions she has initiated herself. It is therefore difficult to see how a containment policy directed primarily against China can be truly effective as long as the Far East seethes with conflict between jealously independent rival nationalist regimes whose policies are essentially their own. To a certain extent it would seem that previous U.S. attempts to back one or another potentially anti-Communist state and to promote the growth of its petty military power have not so much deterred or contained the dubious military threat from China as they have sharpened the very national conflicts, internal and external, that undermine local stability and hence frustrate the development of a broader basis for conciliation among the nations in this region. American objectives would perhaps have been better served by policies that emphasized the American role as a "conciliator" in Asia (for example, in the India-Pakistan, Indonesia-Malaysia, or Cambodia-Thailand-Vietnam disputes) than by so much emphasis on building anti-Communist "positions of strength" through military alliances aimed at China. Actually, the United States has the strongest kind of interest in promoting conciliation between all the states of Asia in this century of intense nationalism. This interest includes even such issues as the Sino-Indian boundary dispute. However, it is clear that the incessant conflict and rivalry among Asia's non-Communist states go further to destabilize Asian politics than do the actions taken thus far by the Peking regime.

The existence of intense rivalries among Asia's non-Communist powers, rivalries that result from their own conceptions of national interests and objectives, has produced a response in Asia to the fact of Chinese Communist power that is altogether different from Europe's reaction to the Soviet threat. At no time has there emerged anything like an Asian consensus about how to regard Chinese military or political intentions. It would be difficult to show that any Asian countries capable of independent action have accepted the United States' assessment of China. This judgment is supported by the fact that the United States has been unable to construct, even informally, an alliance structure in the Far East, directed against Peking, which includes the major Asian powers. It is well known that even some allies of the United States, given the balance of power that so heavily favors Russia and the United States, do not regard Peking as a serious military menace to themselves. At the same time, there can be scarcely a government in the Far East today that is not aware of how useful it is, in dealing with the United States, to invent or exaggerate fears of a Chinese bogeyman.

The United States, far removed from Asia and from direct threat by China, stands almost alone in emphasizing the urgent menace of Peking, while most of the countries in the region, who ought to be highly sensitive to any Chinese threat, have taken a more conservative view of their Chinese neighbor's intentions. Even India's bitter hostility to Peking has not produced anything like the devil-theory of China that has grown up in

*The views expressed in this paper are those of the author. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of The RAND Corporation or the official opinion or policy of any of its governmental or private research sponsors.

the United States. To sum up, the states of Asia have not agreed on the existence of a common external threat; but such an agreement seems to be an indispensable condition for the success of policies modeled on European-type containment.

APPRAISING CHINA'S INTENTIONS

It is not only the inherent differences between the political structure of non-Communist Asia and Western Europe that cast doubt on the validity of applying European-type containment doctrines to the Far East. The aims and direction of Chinese Communist policy—indeed, the nature of the Communist challenge in Asia itself—must be evaluated in terms that are largely irrelevant to European experience. Menacing Soviet actions in Europe presented such a clear and present danger to all concerned that they provoked the creation of the NATO alliance. Since the Russian forward pressure came after the Western powers had already acquiesced in considerable territorial and political concessions in Eastern Europe to meet alleged Soviet security interests, there was general agreement in Western Europe that Moscow's intentions were not defensive in nature. The American effort to equate China's intervention in the Korean conflict and her use of force in the Taiwan dispute, in Tibet, and on the Indian boundary with Soviet behavior in Eastern Europe has obviously failed to convince most Asian governments that China has aggressive intentions toward them. This failure suggests why the United States has been unable to crystallize opinion in these countries behind any genuine Asian regional security arrangements to curb a supposed threat of Chinese expansion.

In explaining Chinese action, Pakistan, Burma, Cambodia, Nepal, even Indonesia and our ally Japan, have tended to give more weight to traditional, nationalistic, and defensive motives than to purely "aggressive" Communist revolutionary impulses. This is not to say that these non-Communist Asian countries have been unconcerned about China's actions, her power, or her Communist system. But it is clear that most of these countries rely on their own perception of their Chinese neighbor, and their perception is such that the United States is unlikely to succeed in arousing a high level of Asian fear about China unless Peking behaves in a manner far more threatening to them, collectively and individually, than she has done to date. It is recognized in a number of Asian capitals that China's belligerence is largely a function of her special rivalry with the United States over Taiwan and other issues. Hence these countries have chosen to avoid alignments that would conflict with their own interest in stabilizing relations with Peking. Their aim has been, quite obviously, to avoid inflaming relations with China, and they do not wish to be drawn into the Sino-American quarrel. Asian reactions to the issues raised in Korea, Taiwan, Tibet, India, and Vietnam have been extremely varied and at no time has any of these conflicts produced an Asian front against China similar to that which the Soviet Union brought on herself by her actions in Europe. The disparity of views among the non-Communist Asian powers, and between them and the United States, about China's intentions robs the policy of containment of the basic consensus that was essential to its success in Europe.

China's foreign policy has also helped to undermine the appeal of the containment doctrine in Asia. The basic direction of her foreign policy in Asia since 1954 has been toward seeking an adjustment of contentious issues between herself and such of her neighbors as were not allied with or seemingly under the control of the United States. Thus, for more than a decade, China has worked to normalize relations with Afghanistan,

Burma, Pakistan, Cambodia, Ceylon, Nepal, and Indonesia. Peking is outspokenly hostile to all members of the American anti-China bloc. She seeks in various ways, including the threat to support revolutionary elements, to convince their leaders that making common cause with the United States carries certain risks; that it is not possible for any of them to support the United States in opposing China and have friendly relations with Peking at the same time. Even in relation to countries in this category, however, China's actions—as distinguished from her verbal condemnations—have been cautious and restrained. To those Asian governments that decline alignment with the United States, Peking offers such explicit rewards as border settlements, aid, and China's non-support of insurrectionary tactics by local revolutionaries. This Chinese stance reflects not only the limitations on Peking's military capabilities for large-scale aggressive actions, but, vastly more important, her recognition that naked and unprovoked aggression against her neighbors would threaten the collapse of her entire diplomacy in Asia. Since the Bandung Conference, China has attempted to compose her relations with any genuinely nonaligned neighbors in order to identify and isolate the United States as the aggressive power and to find common ground with Asian nationalism for the purpose of organizing opposition to the policies of the United States.

Since the mid-1950's, China's diplomatic efforts to prevent her neighbors from being drawn into the American anti-China alignment have consistently enjoyed priority over Peking's commitment to support Communist revolutions. The Chinese position on revolution, which is central to an accurate understanding of her policies in Asia, should not be misunderstood or distorted. China encourages armed "revolutionary" action on the part of Communists or other dissidents in countries where special conditions exist—that is, where the so-called "imperialist" powers have interposed themselves, as in Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, Laos, South Vietnam, and most recently, Thailand (after U.S. military forces arrived in that country). Ostensibly nonaligned governments, as in India, have also to reckon with Peking's anger when they adopt "anti-China" policies. One listens in vain, however, for the strident Chinese call to "revolution" in any Asian country that is clearly independent of American tutelage and pursues a policy of accommodation with Peking.

Where supporting revolution conflicts with China's hope to wean non-Communist Asian governments away from the United States, revolution is pushed into the background. China has advised in her ideological pronouncements on revolution that local Communist parties, though they should learn from Chairman Mao, must in the final analysis find their own formulas for taking power. In those Asian countries that remain independent of the United States and friendly to China, Peking shuns calling upon the local parties to attempt "adventurist" revolutionary actions that conflict with her own diplomacy. Toward governments in this category, China's basic policy for more than a decade has been to concentrate wherever possible on currying favor with nationalist leaders (some of whom, from the Communist viewpoint, can scarcely be described as "progressive") and to encourage the local party to develop the art of skilled united-front tactics. Local Communists are expected to exploit the various "contradictions" in their own country so as to place themselves in a position to take power when the old incompetent order collapses. Peking encourages local parties to take power by the parliamentary or peaceful path if they can, but she points out that there is no instance in which the bourgeois classes have permitted a Communist party to win power "democratically." Hence,

the Chinese argue, it is indispensable that a real Marxist-Leninist party organize for and be prepared to use armed revolutionary struggle. Otherwise the chances are very slim that a Communist party could come to power, much less be strong enough to carry out a dictatorship of the proletariat.

Peking's actual behavior and her ideological theses on revolution reveal that she is prepared to refrain from direct interference in the competition (whether peaceful or violent) between Communist parties and the "bourgeois" classes in Asian countries, so long as the United States also does not directly intervene in these countries' politics.¹ This is the essence of the Chinese version of peaceful coexistence in Asia, formulated more than ten years ago at the Bandung Conference.² China has not violated her own ground rules in relation to any independent Asian country, regardless of its social system, except where the United States has come to play a direct role in support of "bourgeois" regimes' competition with local Communist parties. The dispute with Moscow on the meaning of peaceful coexistence has arisen over the issue of what the policy of the Communist powers should be in situations where the United States rushes in to prop up a non-Communist regime that is in danger of losing the competition with its local Communist opponent. China argues that the Communist bloc should try to deter, or by various means oppose, attempts by the United States to use her own power unilaterally to determine the outcome of the competition between the bourgeois elites and the Communist forces. The Chinese leaders' views of their own national interests requires this position, for they regard the United States as bent on organizing all Asia into a belt of client-states opposing Peking. These fears are less disturbing to the Soviet leaders, who have long betrayed noticeable ambivalence about the desirability of fully opposing the United States in Asia if to do so would benefit the interests of the Chinese state.

As her power increases, of course, it is possible that China may abandon her present compromise with independent Asian nationalist regimes and, under the protection of her own nuclear deterrent, energetically attempt to impose Communist regimes on her neighbors. That possibility cannot be dismissed lightly, but it is a course of action fraught with grave risks for Peking. While it is conceivable that China might attempt to invade small neighboring countries or to foment and support revolution in them, it is far less likely that she will feel confident enough to undertake such measures against large Asian powers such as India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Japan. Some of these nations will be able to move in the nuclear direction at some future time; should Peking, without provocation, take an aggressive attitude toward these countries, she would run the risk of hastening the development of an anti-China nuclear club. Nothing would seem so well calculated to drive non-Communist Asia closer to the United States (or Russia) as an attempt by Peking to coerce her neighbors into unconditional surrender to Chinese demands.

¹ The definitive statement of the Chinese position on "peaceful coexistence" with other non-Communist states was set forth in the Sixth Comment on the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, "Peaceful Coexistence—Two Diametrically Opposed Policies," published December 12, 1963. The full text is in *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement* (Peking 1965), 259-301.

² For complete texts of Chou En-lai's three speeches at the Bandung Conference on relations with Asian countries, see *China and the Asian-African Conference (Documents)* (Peking 1955).

Seen dispassionately, China's policies in Asia are more characteristic of a traditional great power than of a revolutionary renegade. The commitment to revolution plays a special part in Chinese policies, but in aspiring to great-power status, Peking emphasizes such traditional and conventional instruments as diplomacy, economic power, and the presence or threat of force. The demands of the Chinese regime for certain irredentas, spheres of influence, and concessions to its security interests are opposed by the United States and the Soviet Union, each of them much more powerful than China. Peking cannot hope to force concessions from either of these powers by provoking a direct test of strength. But it is quite evident that Communist China does not intend to accept passively a position and influence in the world, particularly in Asia, that she regards as being dictated either by the Soviet Union or by the United States. It is doubtful that any Chinese leadership born in this century would react differently. But the Chinese leaders are not the only ones in Asia and in other areas with aspirations that go beyond the position Russia or America would assign to them. China's call to "revolution" is directed primarily to existing and potential elites in Asia and elsewhere whom she regards as likely to share with her an interest in altering any status quo imposed by U.S. or Soviet policies.

The model she has offered to these potential Communist and nationalist allies, in the hope that their revolutionary efforts will shake U.S. and Soviet domination, is one derived from Chinese Communist revolutionary experience. The Chinese leaders believe that under favorable conditions, well-trained and indoctrinated Communist parties can integrate this model with their own concrete situations and can ultimately take power. The Chinese do not say that revolution can or should be launched everywhere; they actively support unrest only in certain carefully defined revolutionary situations: where "imperialism" (i.e., the United States) is present, and where the prescribed local conditions of success exist. Peking is the master, not the servant, of its revolutionary ideology.

The entire Chinese line on revolution has been fashioned to support the great-power policies Peking pursues in her contest with the United States and the Soviet Union. Where China's leaders have believed their interests in this fundamental struggle could be best served by supporting foreign Communist revolutionary movements, they have done so. But wherever they have believed they could advance in the contest with Moscow and Washington by supporting an odd assortment of friendly nationalist, militarist, or monarchial regimes, they have not hesitated to leave local Communist parties to their own fate. Had Peking's actions conformed to the devil-theory of China that has grown up in the United States, the appeal of the containment policy in Asia would no doubt be much greater than it is today.

OBSTACLES TO CHINESE PREEMINENCE IN ASIA

It is not surprising that a state with China's present power and long history should aspire to regional preeminence. But the task of transforming such ambitions in Asia into reality promises to be very difficult. Various forces in Asia, independent of American power, seem likely to curb Peking's influence.

The position of the Chinese state in Asia is not comparable to that of the United States in the Western hemisphere or to Russia's position in Eastern Europe. In addition to the United States, Peking confronts, in Russia, Japan, India-Pakistan, and Indonesia, large powers which, irrespective of their political order, have reason to oppose mainland China's hegemony in Asia. Russia's and Japan's interests are very different from China's, and the power complex developing

in both these countries would act as a major curb on Chinese expansion in the most decisive theater, Northeast Asia, even the unlikely event of a total withdrawal of American power. The departure of the United States from Asia would no doubt gratify Peking, but it would not clear the path for Chinese hegemony. Rather, it would set the stage for a different kind of power struggle in the area.

Since the nineteenth century, both Japan and Russia have tried to be expansionist powers at China's expense. No Chinese government is likely to rid itself of the old fear that these two powers might again take the path of aggression against China or combine against her interests in Asia. If a disengagement were ever to occur between the United States and China, it seems very probable that China's attention would turn to the older problem of opposing Russian and Japanese penetration of the Asian mainland. In the twentieth century this old three-power rivalry might take a different form than it did in the past, but the steady rise of Russian and Japanese power would continue to be a basic obstacle to Chinese hegemony. The longer and much deeper history of China's fear of Russia and Japan may one day exert a powerful influence on future Chinese leaders' attitudes toward the United States, if a major conflict between the two powers does not come to pass.

The natural direction for Chinese expansion, it is usually thought, is into Southeast Asia, where China has historically exerted influence. China's nearness and the absence of strong indigenous military powers have led to the assumption that she is destined to dominate Southeast Asia unless resolutely deterred by the United States. This fits in neatly with theories about power vacuums. But the major Southeast Asian countries themselves have strongly resisted the idea of being drawn into China's orbit (or anyone else's). All of the countries in this area, including Vietnam, share an antipathy toward Chinese pretensions to superiority and dominance whether on the part of local Chinese populations or of the Peking government. Nearly all the countries of Southeast Asia possess impressive geographic barriers against a major Chinese invasion. Moreover, they all are well aware that Soviet and American power interests are also opposed to Chinese predominance, although not all agree with the United States about how to deal with China. Contrary to the experience of past centuries, when her spreading culture was a powerful vehicle for claims to regional predominance, China's influence as a whole has been declining in Southeast Asia. Recently excluded from the area by the Western imperial powers, China now faces the intense nationalism that has captured the successor states since World War II.

The existence of fraternal Communist parties, the most successful of which have been every bit as nationalistic as the Chinese party, has not constituted an unmixed blessing as far as Peking's search for preeminence in the area is concerned. These parties have been useful and necessary allies, as in Vietnam and Laos, in opposing the American effort to turn the 1954 Geneva agreement on Indochina into an anti-Communist and anti-China front. On the other hand, some of these highly nationalistic and ambitious Communist parties, like the Indonesian one, often complicate China's diplomatic dealings with nationalist governments. The stronger Asian Communist movements have all shown an independent temper, and this has increased their freedom to take actions contrary to China's interests.

The Chinese leaders believe that the removal of Western influence from Asia, coupled with prolonged internal instability, will eventually aid local Communist movements in coming to power. But China's leaders, no less than Russia's are already discovering in their relations with North Vietnam and North

Korea that ideological affinity and territorial proximity between Communist states do not result in the subordination of the smaller partners. Already it is evident that North Korea and North Vietnam will develop their own distinctive national personalities and forms: neither is now or is likely to become simply a small replica of "the thought of Mao Tse-tung." In the past, both regimes have shown a willingness to depart from the Chinese line on key issues. Should other Communist regimes emerge in Southeast Asia—in Vietnam, say, or possibly in Indonesia—Peking cannot assume on the basis of past experience that they will follow her lead. Actually, China must remain worried that such regimes may seek more freedom of action by currying favor with the Soviet Union—or, for that matter, with the West. Consequently, it is by no means clear at this point that China's leaders would prefer the development of stable, independent, diverse, and highly nationalistic Communist regimes in Southeast Asia in preference to the prolonged continuation of weak non-Communist regimes led by men willing to defer to China's interests in return for Peking's respect of the essential sovereignty of their countries.

None of the elites of the principal Asian nations—Japan, India, Pakistan, Indonesia—on whose political and military stance a great deal of China's ultimate position and influence in Asia depends, have shown themselves to be anybody's pawns—Russia's, China's, or America's. The United States and Russia have failed on the whole in their attempts to manipulate Asian nationalism so as to support their own state strategies in the cold war. By now it ought to be apparent that there is not going to be either an American or a Soviet solution to Asia's postcolonial problems. By its nature that goal was never really attainable, but it seemed to be a serious aspiration at one time because both Russia and America have been attracted, to a different degree and in very different ways, to the notion that they have special world ideological missions. Peking may believe China can succeed where two vastly richer and stronger superpowers failed, but the post-World War II history of Asian nationalism indicates very clearly that none of the great powers will be likely to succeed in this endeavor.

It should not be forgotten that between 1948 and 1951, during the heyday of Sino-Soviet cooperation, the Communist parties of Asia tried very hard to use armed insurrection as a means of discrediting and destroying such leaders as Nehru, Sukarno, U Nu, and others. In every instance where the non-Communist leadership could lay genuine claim to representing the force of nationalism, the Communist rebellions were crushed. So complete was the failure of these parties' assaults on nationalism that the Communist movement was forced to come to terms and to shift to policies of peaceful coexistence—a new line first championed by the Communist parties of China, India, and Indonesia, and only later by the Soviet Union. It should also be added that except for the special case of Malaya, the most politically significant defeats inflicted on Communist movements have come at the hands of nonaligned nationalist governments, and, as the recent suppression of the Indonesian Communist party again demonstrates, these defeats were brought about without the assistance of the United States.

The fear, expressed in the argument that neutralism or nonalignment is simply a temporary way station on the road to communism, that Peking and other Communists can push over popular nationalist regimes like "dominoes" once a Communist revolution succeeds somewhere else, is overwhelmingly contradicted by the proven vitality of Asian nationalism in the last twenty years. The Chinese Communists were the first to recognize, more than a decade ago, that gen-

uine non-Communist nationalism was nobody's pushover and that efforts by local Communist parties to prove the contrary would bear bitter fruit. In Asia, it is only where an existing leadership has not earned, and therefore cannot claim, the mandate of nationalism that Communist parties have been able to make a serious challenge for power—a challenge based on their own attempt to seize power from those who either lost that mandate or never had it.

THE REAL AMERICAN PROBLEM IN ASIA

Much discussion about the threat of Chinese Communist expansion exaggerates what Peking is capable of doing both now and later and underplays the role of indigenous forces at work in neighboring countries affected by Chinese policies but clearly free from Chinese domination. This is a critical distinction to make, for the fact is that China is assigned far more responsibility than she deserves for the disturbances that lie at the roots of American anxiety about Asia. It is simply not true that Peking or any other Communist power can successfully "turn on" a Communist revolution wherever it chooses. Neither Peking's actions nor her ideological pronouncements have created the essential conditions that have energized the growth of the Communist movement in Asian countries. Local Communist parties have scored impressive gains, invariably, in those countries where native non-Communist elites have, by their own actions, failed to gain or retain their people's recognition as popular, effective nationalists. Local non-Communist elites themselves, not Peking, created the basic sources of internal discord in Laos, Vietnam, and Indonesia, where the most successful Communist movements to date have developed. Communist strength in these countries would be far less today had the non-Communist political elements subordinated their private rivalries to the larger task of national consolidation. Where the competition among the non-Communist elites has not reached the point of destroying the national fabric—for example, in Japan, Thailand, Pakistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, India, Malaysia, and the Philippines—the Communists have been unable to make a serious bid for power.

The plain fact is that Asian communism's greatest asset is not, and never has been, Communist China's potential military threat or her support of revolution. It has been, and continues to be, primarily the existence of incompetence and corruption and the lack of a genuine, socially progressive, nation-building ethic within the non-Communist elite in every country where communism has made serious advances. Conversely, the most effective deterrent to Communist gains has proved to be the existence of a non-Communist elite dedicated to solving its country's problems and therefore capable of holding the loyalty of its own people. American military power and aid, in themselves, have not proved adequate to find, to build, or to replace a dedicated, hard-working, non-Communist elite.

In the absence of indigenously inspired civil strife, gross incompetence among the non-Communists, or a foreign colonial enemy, no Communist movement in any Asian country has come even close to taking power, through either revolutionary or conventional political strategies. The political, economic, and social upheaval indispensable for a successful "people's war" cannot be manufactured abroad, and it does not burst on the scene overnight. Fundamentally, the prospects for successful Communist movements in Asia depend far less on contriving armed insurrection than on the character and ability of the non-Communist elites. Asia's non-Communists, the Chinese believe, will do the basic job of disintegrating their own societies and reputations to the point at which Communist parties can effectively exploit the situation. If the Chinese are right, and the evidence suggests that in some coun-

tries they are, the Communist threat to Asia would not disappear if Communist China's presence vanished from the scene tomorrow.

There most certainly are both immediate and long-range prospects that the kind of future the United States would like to see develop in Asia will not come about. And the nature of the threat to idealized U.S. hopes is primarily the potential rise of authoritarian or totalitarian regimes in response to a broad pattern of grievances long felt and long uncorrected. But this danger comes not from the Left alone, in the shape of communism, but also from the Right, in the form of authoritarian, oligarchic regimes representing the military, the privileged social classes, and the commercial element. There are numerous examples—Laos, Indonesia, Vietnam, Kerala—to show that when the Communist parties are likely to take power, whether through elections or revolution, the rightist classes are likely to agree on a coercive political solution of their own invention, rather than to accept one formulated in Moscow and Peking.

For a long time, United States assumptions about political developments in Asia have contained the unwarranted expectation that somehow national communities based on some form of democratic consensus ought to, or are likely to, flourish in the area, provided an assumed Communist threat to their institutions is checked and economic development is encouraged. It is quite natural that the United States, in view of her values and traditions, should act to promote economically viable and politically responsible regimes wherever there is a clear indication of local purpose and desire. But successful policies for the long run—not based merely on the year-to-year fluctuation in Communist fortunes—must take account of the limitations on what the United States, great though her power is, can realistically expect to achieve in a vast and varied part of the world that has very different traditions from her own. History thus far would appear to show that overt Communist military aggression can be defeated and that artificially contrived "people's wars" do not succeed in countries whose leaders command the consent and loyalty of their own people. There is, however, serious reason to doubt that any foreign power, including the United States, can redeem the image of harsh and unpopular governments or can persuade or force unwilling governments to take those measures of reform that alone can win the support of their own populations or build a nationalist following where one does not exist.

Unfortunately, the painful truth is that Asia's strongest political tradition is the very authoritarianism that stands in the way of such reforms. The variations in this authoritarian tradition have been either despotic or benevolent but have remained authoritarian. The sharing of state power under the rule of law is an alien conception in many parts of Asia. Moreover, the desirability of political Westernization is not at once obvious to most Asians, as it is to Americans. Except where Western institutions have been imposed forcibly by Western powers, there has been little lasting, indigenously sustained commitment to socially progressive or politically democratic ideas in any Asian country. There is no "free Asia" counterpart to the Western democratic traditions on which to build except in our own imagination. The United States can have hope for and can act to sustain Japan's, India's, or any other country's adoption of consensus-type political communities, but there should be no illusions. The foundations of transplanted Western political and social ideas in Asia are weak. Institutions based on them have already been overturned in Burma, Korea, Pakistan, Laos, and Indonesia; they have hardly existed in other countries of the Far East. One may even fairly doubt that Western political forms

would survive in India or Japan in the event of a serious crisis.

In Asia, however, the absence of quasi-democratic, pluralistic institutions has not proved to be an insuperable obstacle to maintaining stable political communities based on the tacit or expressed consent of the governed. Indeed, some Asian societies are likely to find what they regard as the appropriate balance between the conflicting demands of progress, justice, and order best achieved within a traditional-authoritarian political system that is in harmony with their historical development. What has proved to be the indispensable condition for maintaining a stable non-Communist political order is that the government and its leaders win and retain the confidence of their people as genuine exponents of nationalism. Where this common bond of nationalism links leaders and citizens, no Communist movement in Asia has been able to sever it at the polls or on the battlefield.

All this is true even in era when U.S. military power has been overwhelming and when vast sums have been made available for aid to any regimes that would hoist the anti-Communist banner. The United States has been at no disadvantage compared to the Communists in her resources for waging the contest in Asia. Quite the opposite is true. The real difficulties that beset the United States arise primarily from the nature of the task she has set out to achieve. That task has become, evidently, nothing less than to act as a vehicle shaping basic forces of change in a vast part of the world that not only is entering the nation-building stage of development, but it is also undergoing at the same time the profound experience of total cultural transformation. But the United States has virtually no ties linking it to the traditions that are bound to govern the evolution of most Asian countries. In the context of the profound upheaval now occurring in Asia independently of great-power action, it would be well to ponder whether even the United States can reasonably expect to exert a decisive molding influence on the form or spirit of new national communities that must ultimately reflect their own diversity, peculiarities, needs, traditions, and aspirations. It is leaning on a weak reed, in truth, to base long-range policies on assumptions that the United States, or any combination of Western technological expertise and aid, will somehow be able to channel and mold the vast revolution in human attitudes and behavior that is painfully under way not only in Asia but in three-quarters of the world. But if the United States is determined to substitute American power for the absence of indigenous, non-Communist nationalism and to attempt a basic transformation of the elites and the societies of the far-off countries of Asia, let that true purpose be defined for what it really is, not displaced onto the myth of a Chinese Communist bogeyman.

It is primarily the evolution of nationalism, not the foreign policies or ideology of the Peking government, which frustrates the United States in Asia. The power fundamentally to change the basic indigenous forces shaping the development and character of nationalism in Asian countries lies in neither Peking nor Washington. No internal or external Communist power has yet been able to force the submission of an independent Asian country, however poor and whatever its political system, whose non-Communist leaders can justifiably claim the mandate of nationalism. It is incredible to suppose that the United States can, by the exercise of her own power, claim that mandate for any non-Communist elite that has not earned it from its own people. And until the United States comprehends the full meaning of nationalism in Asia, Communist and non-Communist alike, the gap between America's expectations and the real world around her will remain frustratingly large.

EXTENDING TEMPORARY INTEREST RATE, PRICE, RENT, WAGE, AND SALARY CONTROL POWERS

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President and his administration for having the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable John Connally, appear before the House Committee on Banking and Currency this morning in support of H.R. 4246. This particular proposal is one which would extend until March 31, 1973, certain temporary interest rate control powers and would also continue authority for the President to establish mandatory controls over prices, rents, wages, and salaries at levels not less than those prevailing on May 25, 1970.

I do this because I remember quite well the difficulty we had in getting the administration to realize that this might be a worthwhile tool if in their discretionary authority they chose to use it to combat inflation. I am happy that our efforts last year have begun to bear fruit this year, and I commend the administration for recognizing the potential of this particular measure.

I include for the RECORD the statement by Secretary Connally before the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning:

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN B. CONNALLY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am pleased to appear before you today in support of H.R. 4246, introduced by you and sixteen other members of the Committee. The legislation would extend until March 31, 1973, certain temporary interest rate control powers exercised by the Federal banking agencies. It would also continue the authority for the President to establish mandatory controls over prices, rents, wages, and salaries at levels not less than those prevailing on May 25, 1970.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend enactment of your bill without amendment.

The temporary powers over interest rates paid by banks and savings and loan associations, originally enacted in September 1966, have served a useful purpose. They are admittedly "stop-gap" in nature, and do little to solve the fundamental problem of competitive equality among thrift institutions. Nor can they be administered in such manner as to insulate banks and savings and loan associations from the impact of disintermediation in a tight money period.

We believe, however, that a two-year extension of the authority makes sense. A Presidential Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation, which is scheduled to report before the end of this year, is intensively studying the interest-rate control problem. If the temporary authority is extended for two years, sufficient time will be available to permit receipt of the Commission's report, followed by enactment of whatever legislation may be necessary to deal with the fundamental problem.

In addition, a lapsing of the temporary authority would bring the permanent, underlying statute into effect. This statute provides for inequitable rate regulation, since it applies to banks and not to savings and loan associations.

For these reasons, therefore, we support a simple, two-year extension of the interest rate authority.

We also accept section 2 of H.R. 4246, which extends the President's standby au-

thority to set up wage-price controls. I must point out, however, that we do not believe that a network of general wage-price controls is needed at this time, nor do we believe that the American people would long stand for such regimentation, under present circumstances.

Consequently, in accepting this section, we do so with the advance statement that we do not contemplate any circumstances—short of an all out national emergency—in which the President would establish general wage-price controls without a further specific mandate from the Congress. This would provide evidence that a majority of the people favored such controls and would support these.

I shall be pleased to respond to your questions.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. In an open letter to the American people Kenneth G. Meades, an Englishman and now a New York businessman, wrote about America, the land of opportunity:

I have seen many countries and lived in several of them: No matter what the communist may say, the peoples' paradise is here—on Main Street, U.S.A.

As a comparative newcomer to your country I have seen graft, corruption, crime on the increase, minority groups oppressed, a lowering of moral standards, poverty, discrimination and all the other things which are pointed out as indicative of a sick America. Sadly, these are all true, but the waves of change which wash this country also wash other shores, and the problems Americans seem to claim as theirs alone also belong to the rest of the world. England and France have race riots, there are strikes in Germany and Italy and students demonstrate in South America, China and Russia.

For whatever reasons, the whole world is seething with discontent, with some of it directed against the U.S.A. For this country represents the "haves" in a world of "have nots."

In little more than 300 years Americans have made their land the richest, most powerful land in the world. If you remember they began with nothing but their bare hands, they built the most fabulous way of life man has ever seen—leaving the other nations to snap at Uncle Sam's heels. . . .

In the six years I have lived here America has given opportunity to me, just as she does all the other immigrants to this country. We arrive all colors, races and creeds, speaking the babel of fifty languages. America takes us by the thousands each year and offers us to build for ourselves this life we share with Americans. She does this free and clear—openhandedly sharing her wealth and opportunity with all of us who ask for entrance.

Which other nation can say the same?

So Americans, take stock, you have created a marvelously sophisticated way of life. You and your forefathers did it beginning with nothing. No one sent you Foreign Aid, or the Peace Corps. The World Bank wasn't around to finance you and you didn't politick off the West against the East whilst you built. . . .

Speaking for myself I am proud to be part of the United States of America. Should you as Americans be ashamed?

PUBLIC TELEVISION'S "THE TURNED-ON CRISIS"

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we have all become increasingly aware in the last couple of years of the drug culture which has spread across our Nation. Indeed, the use and abuse of drugs has become so widespread and has reached such proportions that it is no exaggeration to call it a nationwide epidemic.

To help fight this epidemic, many of our media have done drug education programs and series. However, never before has a medium of mass communication attempted to mount as comprehensive a nationwide attack on the problem as public television's current drug education and community action project, "The Turned-On Crisis."

This series combines eight national prime-time programs devoted to an in-depth study of the drug problem with concentrated community action efforts at the local station level. Also as part of the project, a series for teachers and other educators and another for junior high school students will follow later in the year.

In conjunction with this national project, the local public television stations in Boston, WGBH, channels 2 and 44, are devoting between 20 and 30 hours of prime-time programming during February to a massive local campaign. And not surprisingly to those of us who have the privilege of knowing her, Mrs. Jesse F. Sargent, wife of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, has been in the forefront of the citizen groups supporting the local campaign.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD newsstories from the Boston Herald Traveler and the Boston Evening Globe about "The Turned-On Crisis," as well as a release from WGBH concerning the support given the station by the Governor's wife.

In my opinion, Eleanor Roberts, the Herald Traveler reporter, is on target in calling this project "one of the great and unique public service efforts in TV history."

The material follows:

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Jan. 20, 1971]

CHANNELS 2 AND 44 JOIN MASSIVE DRIVE AGAINST DRUG ABUSE (By Eleanor Roberts)

When a television station turns over 20 to 30 hours of prime time—throughout the month of February—to a massive campaign against drug abuse it has to be one of the great and unique public service efforts in TV history.

Chs. 2 and 44 in the Boston area—and 200 Public Broadcasting System stations around the country—will schedule an in-depth study of the drug problem, "Turn-On Crisis", every night at 8, starting Jan. 31 and continuing through February.

The first three programs of the week, Sunday through Tuesday will be live on Ch. 2. The same programs will be repeated on Ch. 44 at 8, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.

There's a practical application to the all-out effort to lick the drug problem. While the Sunday and Monday shows are produced

by WQED, Pittsburgh, the Tuesday programs are turned out by Ch. 2.

And these will tie in with local communities. On Tuesday, Feb. 2, for example, the program is designed to provide further information on the medical and legal aspects of drugs as they relate to Massachusetts.

The following Tuesday, Feb. 9, a discussion on why some young people in the community turn to drugs is scheduled.

And on the same night at 9, "The Advocates" will devote their entire show to "Should All Drugs be Legalized?"

"There is an enormous amount of publicity about drugs and young people but very little real understanding of the problem," David O. Ives, President of Ch. 2 pointed out yesterday at a briefing on "Turned-On Crisis" for community leaders and broadcasting and print media executives.

"Hopefully, the programs will start a great many people thinking about the problem and lead to constructive action in places where there is none."

Celebrities from many fields have given their time and talent to make the programs stimulating, interesting and constructive for both youngsters on drugs and their parents.

Football hero O. J. Simpson moderates the Feb. 1 program, an hour's exchange about the attitudes on drugs, which features Arnold Palmer, Denise Nichols of "Room 222," Greg Morris of "Mission Impossible," comedian Frank Gorshin, U.S. Surgeon General Jesse Steinfeld, Dr. Sidney Cohen and Dr. Helen Nowlis. A good idea to get teen-agers to tune in.

David Susskind hosts a survey of drug prevention programs in schools and communities across the nation; Fred Rogers of "Misterogers Neighborhood" appears on the same program to urge parents towards a better understanding of their children so the drug problem can be avoided. Top rock groups get together in a music/rap session aimed at bringing the meaning of contemporary music into perspective for the adult generation—a neat trick!

Another program takes a look at rehabilitation centers: the celebrated Synanon, Boston's Washingtonian Hospital, the National Institute of Mental Health in Lexington, Ky., and Black Action, Inc., a methadone maintenance program in Pittsburgh.

Ch. 2 has produced a program "Feedback on Getting Help," which focuses on hot lines, store fronts, half-way houses and information on all drug projects now existing—or trying to—in Massachusetts, set for Feb. 16.

A searing docu-drama about a community trying to solve its drug problems; marijuana and the debate on "hard" and "soft" drugs; "The Concept," a special TV production of the successful Broadway play which focuses on the "self-realization" approach to drug rehabilitation, dramatized by members of New York's Daytop Village as they act out a series of improvisations about themselves and their torturous journey back to reality are subject of other programs.

"Turned-On Crisis" is a project that interested, responsible community leaders have backed solidly. Mrs. Francis W. Sargent, wife of the governor, not only has given her time and support to it but spoke movingly about the need for such education at yesterday's meeting.

The John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. has given a substantial grant to assist in the production and promotion. Donnelly Advertising has donated billboard space throughout Greater Boston. Metro Advertising has donated subway poster space within the MBTA system.

The mayor's office (James Breay, executive director for the Council for Drug Rehabilitation) has provided an invaluable source material.

Communities—whether they're affluent or poor the drug problem affects them—are planning various courses of action. Brook-

line is distributing material throughout its school system.

Duxbury has scheduled box suppers at two churches to watch the program. In East Boston, Mrs. E. Marshall Bevins has been promised complete coverage of the series in Boston schools by Supt. Orhenberger, Hingham, Lancaster, Millis, Milford, Marblehead—where ministers are announcing the project in all churches—Reading, Scituate, Watertown and other towns plan total involvement.

[From the Boston Evening Globe, Jan. 15, 1971]

CHANNEL 2 PLANS MONTH-LONG STUDY ON DRUG ISSUE

(By Percy Shain)

There have been concentrated campaigns for worthy causes on television before, but seldom one going every day for a full month. Yet that is the plan for PBS's "The Turned-On Crisis," an in-depth study of the drug problem, that will occupy the attention of WGBH-TV (Ch. 2) for the entire month of February—with some slopover into March.

The plan is for programs six nights in the week which will provide communities in the area with ammunition to cope with the situations they must contend with.

The campaign gets under way Sunday, Jan. 31. Programs will be aired Sundays, Mondays and Tuesdays at 8 p.m. on Ch. 2, repeated Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays on Ch. 44. The Sunday-Monday shows will be produced by WQED, Pittsburgh. The Tuesday programs will be the work of WGBH and will deal with specific drug issues in Massachusetts.

In addition, rehabilitation and self-help groups will appear frequently on "Catch 44," Thursdays and Fridays at 9 p.m., and the "Advocates" show Feb. 9 will be devoted to the question "Should All Drugs Be Legalized?"

The follow-up in March will be "Because We Care," a six-part teacher-training series on the problems of drug abuse, Wednesdays at 2:30 on Ch. 2, Thursdays at 3:30 on Ch. 44; and "Community Challenge," five half-hours in which students will enact the roles of public officials coping with a drug crisis, Thursdays at 1 on Ch. 2, Thursdays at 8 on Ch. 44.

In the fall, "21-Inch Classroom" will broadcast a new in-school series to further the drug education effort.

Station WBZ-TV (Ch. 4) has another kind of campaign going this week to help viewers kick the cigarette habit. Station personalities Tom Ellis, Sonya Hamlin, Norm McDonald, Jack Cole and others are appearing intermittently on the air with charts and slides to emphasize the dangers of smoking, all leading to Zero Hour at 8 p.m. Saturday for the official swearing-off ceremony.

Fruit juice, gum and other alternatives will be suggested at various points during the final day. Then on next week there will be a countdown approach, reminding viewers how many days they have been off cigarettes and helping them to hold firm.

Also in the realm of public service is the United Cerebral Palsy Association telethon which will occupy the screen of WNAC TV (Ch. 7) continuously from Saturday, Jan. 30, at 10:45 p.m. to Sunday, Jan. 31, at 6:30 p.m., except for the periods of 9:15-10 a.m. for the Sunday Mass and 3:05-3:40 p.m. for the Apollo 14 launch.

Steve Lawrence and Eydie Gorme, with Dennis James, will handle the star-filled session from New York, with regular Boston cut-ins featuring local community leaders who will answer phones and record pledges.

[Release from WGBH, Channel 2, Boston]

Jessie F. Sargent, wife of the Governor, spoke today at a press conference in the WGBH studios. Mrs. Sargent, after speaking

to the Fans of Channel 2 on January 4 was made an honorary FAN for her generous contribution of time and support to the FAN'S latest project "The Turned-On Crisis."

Today, Mrs. Sargent, who is deeply concerned about the drug crisis in Massachusetts, again lent her support to that effort. She spoke to a large gathering of press, radio and television people who were invited to WGBH expressly to learn about "The Turned-On Crisis" and how they could help support it.

February, every night at 8:00 is "Turned-On Crisis" month on Channels 2 and 44. The people at WGBH are devoting a major portion of their time during February to serve as an information and referral center for the drug problem.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RIEGLE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 14, 1971, through March 21, 1971, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. CONTE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 30 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 10 minutes, on February 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MONAGAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON, in three instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MADDEN and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. PETTIS in two instances.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. MINSHALL in four instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. WYMAN in four instances.

Mr. MCCOLLISTER.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. ROBISON of New York in four instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in two instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. BADILLO in two instances.

Mr. BYRON in six instances.

Mr. NATCHER in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. COTTER in six instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. MORGAN.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. SISK.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 25, 1971 at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

311. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 209(a) and (b) of title 37, United States Code, to provide increased subsistence allowances for Senior Reserve Officers Training Corps members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

312. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide subsistence allowances for members of the Marine Corps officer candidate programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

313. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of the American Journal of Nursing, New York, N.Y., against the United States, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

314. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Mr. Corbie F. Cochran against the United States, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ECKHART, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 4809. A bill to provide minimum disclosure standards for written consumer product warranties against defect or malfunction; to define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties; to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act in order to improve its consumer protection activities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DORN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. KEE, Mr. ROE, and Mr. MCFALL):

H.R. 4810. A bill to provide both short term and long term assistance to areas of high unemployment through the extension of certain provisions of law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 4811. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4812. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the people of the United States against the lawless and irresponsible use of firearms, and to assist in the prevention and solution of crime by requiring a national registration of firearms, establishing minimum licensing standards for the possession of firearms, and encouraging the enactment of effective State and local firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 4813. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that members of the armed forces be assigned to duty stations near their homes after serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4814. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to protect, manage, and control free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4815. A bill to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 63) and sections 631 and 634 of title 28, United States Code, to permit full-time referees in bankruptcy to perform the duties of a U.S. magistrate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to abolish the referees' salary and expense fund, to provide that fees and charges collected by the clerk of a court of bankruptcy in bankruptcy proceedings be paid into the general fund to the Treasury of the United States, to provide salaries and expenses of referees be paid from the general fund of the Treasury, and to eliminate the statutory criteria presently required to be considered by the Judicial Conference in fixing salaries of full-time referees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits (subject to the existing actuarial reductions) at age 50 whether or not disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4818. A bill to amend section 218 of the Social Security Act to provide that a policeman or fireman who has social security coverage pursuant to State agreement as an individual employee and not as a member of a State or local retirement system may elect to terminate such coverage if he is subsequently required to become a member of such a retirement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself, Mr. POFF, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.R. 4819. A bill to consent to the Interstate Environment Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4821. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4822. A bill to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4823. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to repeal the reporting requirement contained in subsection (b) of section 1308; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4824. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an increase in the amount of the personal exemptions for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1973; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4826. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 1, 1958, as amended, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to permit members of the Reserves and the National Guard to receive retired pay at age 55 for nonregular service under chapter 67 of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4829. A bill to provide that certain members of the Retired Reserve shall be entitled to retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4830. A bill to permit persons discharged from the uniformed services before October 1, 1949, for service-connected disabilities of 100 percent to apply for and, if qualified, be awarded retired pay under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4831. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the budget of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a Student Loan Marketing Association; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4833. A bill to provide Federal assistance in financing the construction of education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4834. A bill to add a new title XII to the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4835. A bill to provide for the disclosure of certain information relating to certain public opinion polls; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4836. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to prohibit the broadcasting of any advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the digestive tract, including the liver and pancreas, and diseases of nutrition, and aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4838. A bill to grant a Federal charter to the Meals for Millions Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4839. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4840. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the period of presumption of service connection for certain cases of multiple sclerosis from 7 to 20 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4841. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a special pension to certain survivors of persons awarded a Medal of Honor posthumously; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4842. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4843. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4844. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4845. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4846. A bill to provide full Federal financing of payments made under the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to recipients who do not meet the duration-of-residence requirements of the applicable State plan, where such payments must nonetheless be made because of court determinations that such requirements are unconstitutional; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 4847. A bill to provide financial assistance for the establishment and maintenance of stable, quality, integrated education in elementary and secondary schools to assist school districts to overcome the adverse edu-

cational effects of minority group isolation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the act of November 26, 1969, to provide for an extension of the date on which the Commission on Government Procurement shall submit its final report; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 4850. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize reduced fares for persons who are at least 65 years of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4852. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for cost-of-living increases in compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, and pension payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4856. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself and Mr. LINK):

H.R. 4858. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the continuation of the investment tax credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in relation to a credit for State income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RYAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 4860. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality

of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BRADEN, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 4861. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide in certain cases for an exchange of credits between the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and the civil service retirement system so as to enable individuals who have some coverage under both systems to obtain maximum benefits based on their combined service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4862. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4863. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a Student Loan Marketing Association; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4864. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 24 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 4865. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Stockbridge-Munsee community, and to make such lands part of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 4866. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4867. A bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4868. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Homestead National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4869. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 4870. A bill to provide for the payment of losses incurred by growers, manufacturers, packers, and distributors as a result of the barring of the use of cyclamates in food after extensive inventories of foods containing such substances had been prepared or packed or packaging, labeling and other materials had been prepared in good faith reliance on the confirmed official listing of cyclamates as generally recognized as safe for use in food under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr.

SCHWENGEL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. THONE, and Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama):

H.R. 4871. A bill to provide for the procurement of voluntary military manpower; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. ABOWEZEK, Mr. BADELLO, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BURTON, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 4872. A bill to establish an independent agency to be known as the U.S. Office of Utility Consumers' Counsel to represent the consumers of the Nation before Federal and State regulatory agencies with respect to matters pertaining to certain electric, gas, telephone, and telegraph utilities; to provide grants and other Federal assistance to State and local governments for the establishment and operation of utility consumers' counsels; to improve methods for obtaining and disseminating information with respect to the operations of utility companies of interest to the Federal Government and other consumers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 4873. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 4874. A bill to allow for the imposition of restrictions on the imports of unshelled filberts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 4875. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. ADABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DOW, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. POBELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. STRATTON):

H.J. Res. 375. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New Jersey and New York for certain amendments to the Waterfront Commission Compact and for entering into the Airport Commission Compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.J. Res. 376. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.J. Res. 377. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALFE:

H.J. Res. 378. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the period from April 17, 1971, through April 25, 1971, as National Photography Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.J. Res. 379. Joint resolution repealing the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WINN:

H.J. Res. 380. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution to declare the sense of the U.S. Congress with respect to the Federal administration of Indian affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 245. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Res. 246. Resolution calling for a national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 247. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 243; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

27. By Mr. BRINKLEY: Memorial of the Georgia General Assembly, requesting and urging the placing of a fitting monument on the grounds of the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C. in honor of the memory of Senator Richard Brevard Russell; to the Committee on House Administration.

28. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the establishment of a National Guard unit for the territory of Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

29. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the oppressive policies of the Soviet Union toward Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

30. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, relative to completion of the Natchez Trace National Parkway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

31. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the establishment of an American Creed Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 4876. A bill for the relief of Eladio Pasamba Amador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4877. A bill for the relief of (Juan) O. Francisco Orbino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4878. A bill for the relief of Miguel Q. Orejudos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4879. A bill for the relief of Joaquin T. Quijencio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4880. A bill for the relief of Francesco Alfano and his brother, Salvatore Alfano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cavalliere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4882. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lim-Nio Jo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4883. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Perna, his wife, Luigina Geitruide, and children, Vincenzo, Carmela Maria Rosaria, Antonio Nazario and Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4884. A bill for the relief of Enrico Provenzano, his wife, Annina, and daughter Carmela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4885. A bill for the relief of Lee T. Sellers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4886. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 4887. A bill for the relief of Willard T. Fenderson; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4888. A bill for the relief of Riziero Pesce, Giuseppa Pesce, and Enrico Pesce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4889. A bill for the relief of Evarista Pietro Tonolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4890. A bill for the relief of Lina Zaretto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4891. A bill for the relief of Luc Pal Emil Fafard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4892. A bill for the relief of Nasser Shahoulain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 4893. A bill for the relief of Our Lady of Guadalupe School in San Bernardino, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 4894. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Donstantinos Papanastasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4895. A bill for the relief of Maria de Jesus Goncalves de Mala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4896. A bill for the relief of Maria Fernanda Pascoal de Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4897. A bill for the relief of Alzira Fernandes Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4898. A bill for the relief of Othon Da Rocha Rebelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4899. A bill for the relief of Rui Carlos Vasconcelos and his daughter, Nair de Fatima Telxela de Sousa Vasconcelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

32. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert N. Hunt, Easton, Md., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

33. Also, petition of the city council, Worcester, Mass., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.