

Anthony A. Alaimo, of Georgia, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of Georgia, vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

Philip W. Tone, of Illinois, to be a U.S. dis-

trict judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Louis Metzger, U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated, in accordance with

the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, 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.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE JAPANESE ECONOMIC THREAT

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a timely speech entitled "The Japanese Economic Threat" has recently come to my attention.

In this pamphlet the author, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, points out the encroachment of Japanese industry into the markets of U.S. industry. Imported Japanese textiles have been ruining the U.S. textile industry with such practices as market flooding. Our domestic steel industry can barely compete, and our shipping industry has floundered.

Mr. President, Japan has erected complicated trade barriers to keep U.S. imports from Japan's domestic markets. Further, Japan sells items abroad for much less than they are offered for sale in Japan. As long as U.S. industry is characterized by union control and excessive labor cost, we cannot compete with Japanese industries. Japanese tax laws are set up to favor big business, and cheap Japanese labor and monopolistic trade practices widen this edge.

Mr. Harrigan's speech was delivered prior to the recent Japanese textile agreement. However, this speech points out the definite need for such an agreement.

The United States can no longer afford to be indifferent to the protection of our domestic industries. These comments deserve the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech entitled "The Japanese Economic Threat" by Mr. Anthony Harrigan be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE JAPANESE ECONOMIC THREAT

(By Anthony Harrigan)

It is time that the United States recognizes that it faces a formidable challenger on the world economic scene—Japan.

The Hudson Institute recently asserted that Japanese living standards will surpass American levels with 15 years.

We should understand that we are witnessing a fundamental rearrangement of the world's powers, economically and militarily. But the American people apparently don't grasp the extent of the Japanese economic challenge and the peril it poses to our national economy and standard of living.

Today, 26 years after the United States defeated Japan, the Japanese can boast of having the third-strongest industrial system in the world. Let me briefly review some of their achievements. They are the world's principal shipbuilders, while our shipyards are no longer able to compete and, in many cases, are kept alive by naval contracts. The

Japanese have a tremendous hold on the electronics business and are rapidly eating into our domestic and foreign markets. The ambition of untold thousands of American teenagers is to own a Japanese-built Honda motorcycle. Half a dozen Japanese makes are sold in this country, whereas the U.S. has only one major motorcycle maker these days. In the last few years, American highways have become crowded with Japanese automobiles. Japan's automakers are squeezing Detroit, costing thousands of American jobs. The Japanese have begun to sell transport aircraft in the United States. Piedmont Airlines is the first U.S. line to use Japanese planes. Japanese copying machines are in widespread use in offices and factories. Japanese textile imports are pushing the U.S. textile industry to the wall, threatening the very existence of an industry that employs 2½ million people. In the last year, textiles from the Far East resulted in the loss of 100,000 jobs in the U.S. textile industry.

The overall impact of Japanese products on our people's buying habits is colossal and, in my opinion, ruinous. There is no evidence whatever that Japanese imports are leveling off. Consider the textile situation. The Japanese have refused to negotiate meaningful voluntary quotas on textile imports. Instead, the Japanese textile industry unilaterally announced certain limited restraints. But the import statistics indicate that these voluntary restraints are meaningless. Imports from Japan and other Far Eastern countries are soaring. The Commerce Department reported August 5 that textile imports are up 10 per cent from May and 47 per cent from June last year. The value of these imports was \$1.7 billion. That means \$1.7 billion in lost business for American manufacturers.

The import situation is equally serious for the steel industry. U.S. steel imports totaled a record 9 million tons in the first half of 1971. Incidentally, Japanese steel sells for \$40 a ton less than American-made steel.

Some Americans don't find danger in the Japanese trade campaign directed at the United States. They ignore the fact that Japan erects complicated trade barriers to keep U.S.-made products out of Japanese markets. Indeed some Americans apparently aren't even dismayed at the idea of the U.S. becoming a service-oriented importer economy. I don't understand where they think the money is going to come from for the U.S. to live well in the future.

The wealth of nations is created by producing goods and by transporting them to buyers. This is the way Great Britain became rich in the 19th century. Each year, we are losing our lead as a producer nation. Japan is the country that's really turning out the ships and other heavy equipment. Moreover, Japan's large, modern merchant marine carries Japanese goods to market. Our merchant marine languishes because of high construction costs and equally high operating costs, resulting from enormously expensive union labor. The majority of American-owned ships has to operate under flags of convenience, the flags of Honduras, Panama and Liberia, for example, so as to be able to hire crews at a cost-effective rate.

The economic challenge posed by Japan—and I suggest that you think of Japan as a single, giant company under centralized direction—is the gravest economic challenge this country has ever faced.

Here in Atlanta, I am reminded of Henry

Grady's famous speech about the Georgia man who died and was buried in a Northern-made suit, in a grave dug by a Northern-made shovel and laid to rest under a piece of stone from the North. Georgia's only contribution was the corpse and the hole in the ground. Well, it is not an exaggeration to say that our entire country is likely to approach that situation by the end of the 1970's, with Japan in the role of the North, unless there is a change in national policy. I can envision a grave dug by a Japanese-made power shovel, a body clad in Japanese textiles, and a hearse made by a Japanese auto-maker.

Those of you who are in service industries may not feel the Japanese economic pressure. But talk to Southern manufacturers—textile, steel or whatever—and you will discover the profound alarm they feel. In South Carolina, which is absolutely dependent on the textile industry for state revenues, plants are shutting down or hours and days of operation are being curtailed because of the flood of Asian imports. In Birmingham, the steel mills are under similar pressure because of Japanese-made steel. In 20 years, Japanese steel production has jumped from five million to 100 million tons and is likely to exceed American production in two years.

Despite the threat to our country's economic well being, there is considerable indifference or open opposition to protection for threatened U.S. industries. Many of our national leaders and opinion-makers are the captives of "free trade" slogans. But as long as we have union monopolies and excessive labor costs which are non-competitive, we cannot live under a one-way free trade system.

To be sure, free trade has an ancient and honorable tradition. Here in the South, we were eager subscribers to the concept when our principal product was cotton. But truly free trade is possible only where free economic conditions exist on all sides. That is to say, the trading partners must subscribe to the same system and permit the same degree of access to their markets. But that's not the situation today. The United States has cut tariffs and otherwise made it easy for Japan and other countries to do business in the United States. The Japanese, however, make it difficult for American products to be sold in Japan. A Cadillac in Tokyo sells for \$25,000 because of import barriers. In addition, Japanese industry operates as a huge cartel, with the government aiding business at every opportunity. As Jenkin Loyd Jones recently pointed out, "while American anti-trust laws would jail executives of any competing American firms who dared join together in fixing prices or otherwise trying to cartelize foreign trade, in Japan the government is in the thick of the conspiracy."

Finally, the Japanese and American wage structures are completely different. Japanese wages are extremely low, whereas U.S. companies must pay high scales.

The free trade enthusiasts say that the answer lies with automation. But that isn't an answer for America. The Japanese can automate their plants as rapidly or more rapidly than American manufacturers. For one thing, the cost of automation is lower in Japan—again because of low labor costs.

We often forget how central to competition are labor costs. In general, employee compensation represents almost 80 per cent of the cost of production. In 1968, corporate

business in the United States received an income of \$403 billion. Of this amount, \$318 billion represented wages, or 79 per cent.

It is impossible to envision any wage reductions in the United States. So the U.S. hasn't any maneuvering room in that area in trying to compete. In addition, American industry is subjected to a multitude of controls, the latest being environmental pollution requirements. Japanese industry isn't faced with these controls or associated costs. Indeed Japanese heavy industry hasn't been faced with anything like the requirements for pollution abatement that have hit American heavy industry in the last three years. And now the productive sectors of American life—industry and the middle class—are being subjected to new demands for vastly expanded welfare as the mammoth food stamp handouts which cost more than \$2 billion a year. The Nixon-Mills Family Assistance legislation, now before the Senate, would double the number of Americans on welfare—a development that will hardly help the productive elements in our country compete successfully with people in other countries.

The seriousness of the situation is reflected in the fact that, with the exception of a small range of specialized products, we now import more than we export. This special range is composed of computers, aircraft, etc. But even our surplus in advanced machinery is declining. You will have noted that the Japanese are interested in producing a special version of the Boeing 747 under license in Japan. It is only common sense to realize that a few years hence the Japanese will be in aircraft production in a big way and deprive us of a vastly profitable business.

Ironically, we made possible the economic growth in Japan and elsewhere. We re-equipped Japanese plants after World War II. We still carry the defense burden for Japan—at immense cost—while Japan spends only a small amount on national defense. Our naval forces guarantee the safety of Japan's oil supplies which are obtained in the Middle East. In other words, the Japanese have shirked their defense obligation, leaving it to the overburdened American taxpayers.

As a result, the United States is profoundly disadvantaged in the fierce trade war being waged by Japan—and I use the words "trade war" advisedly.

In America, we need a keen realization of the new conditions we face. The good life we enjoyed in this country in the past was derived from our economic supremacy—from our success in producing and marketing goods. The wealth our system generated was spread to progressively lower levels of income. We created a huge domestic market for our goods. The Japanese haven't sought to expand their domestic market as we expanded ours. Instead, they aim to achieve enormous gains by monopolizing our domestic market. I see this as an act of economic warfare, for, to the degree that the Japanese are successful, they restrict employment and investment opportunities. They narrow our industrial base. Socially, the flood of Japanese imports compounds our human problems, for a smaller industrial base is less able to absorb the army of new workers entering the labor market annually.

We may well ask: "To what purpose are our states spending millions of dollars on technical and vocational training if such jobs are being lost as a result of Japanese competition?"

O. R. Strackbein, president of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, has rightly said: "We are headed off at the pass by foreign products made under the same patent or process but saturated with low-cost labor." In any contest to reach new low or medium income markets, imports from Japan and other Asian countries can get there first and spoil the market for our own manufacturers who must reckon with

minimum wage laws, not to speak of union pressures.

There are some people in our government and international banking institutions who apparently regard certain of our industries as expendable—the textile industry, for example. But I ask you, given the wage structure in Japan and the country's cartel approach, how can any American industry survive a massive Japanese trade assault? I don't believe that we can survive without mandatory trade quotas in a number of areas, without rigid limits on foreign penetration of domestic markets. The new surcharge on foreign goods is temporary and inadequate. If we continue an open market policy in our dealings with countries having protected industries, we will reverse the process that brought this country to industrial and commercial leadership and which gave America the highest standard of living in the world. Recognition of this is not our only need. We must struggle against the creation of a huge new drone class dependent on welfare or a guaranteed annual wage provided by productive Americans. And we must make every effort to dismantle the monopoly unionism which imposes unreasonable wage demands on industry and which fuels the fires of inflation. We must expose to critical analysis the notions of income redistribution that would deprive energetic Americans of incentives and reduce this nation to an economic backwater in less than a generation.

But as important as all of this is a new trade policy and attitude that will prevent monopolistic Japanese industry—backed by the Japanese government—from taking over our domestic markets and making our people captive consumers for the producers of Japan. This kind of economic subjection to Japan would consign Americans to a far lower level of affluence than we enjoy today and have enjoyed for generations. Here in Atlanta, where businessmen are so mindful of the economic requirements of the future, I hope for clear comprehension of the need for a new, tougher American policy in foreign imports.

IMMEDIATE AID FOR BELEAGUED SCHOOLS IN 410 CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the House of Representatives considers the supplemental appropriations bill this week, it is my hope that an amendment will be offered to fund category "c"—public housing children—of the impact aid law. If accepted, this amendment will provide \$100 million in additional funds to beleaguered schools in more than 410 congressional districts.

The basic principle of the impact aid law is that the Federal Government has an obligation to pay school districts for burdens placed upon them by activities of the Federal Government. We are all aware of the burdens placed upon school districts by the presence of military and other Federal facilities and by the resulting numbers of "a" and "b" children, but the same principle applies as forcefully regarding the presence of large numbers of federally financed low-income public housing units and the resulting concentrations of poor children. By Federal law these units must be exempt from all

State and local taxation. And this tax exemption coupled with the concentrations of large numbers of disadvantaged students has caused enormous strains upon many school systems, and in several cases has contributed to the near breakdown of school systems.

The amendment which I hope will be offered next week will be a start in the direction of the Federal Government's assuming its rightful share of the cost of educating these children. This amendment will probably only appropriate one-third of the authorization for this category, far less than the percentage which is funded under the authorizations for "a" and "b" children, but it will at least be a start. I want to emphasize, however, that by funding category "c" we shall in no way be affecting categories "a" and "b". Funding for public housing children is entirely separate and will not detract at all from funding for "a" and "b" children.

I am inserting in the RECORD today a breakdown by congressional districts of the money which will be made available to school districts following the adoption of this amendment to fund category "c" at \$100 million. As with all of impact aid, these are funds which will go directly into the operating budgets of school districts and will not be bogged down in any way in redtape or bureaucratic fumbling. Therefore, I would urge all Members to carefully consider this amendment and to look upon it as a way for the Federal Government to both assume its proper share of the cost of educating children from public housing and also as a way to provide direct, unencumbered aid to school districts which are desperately in need of such aid.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the breakdown of the \$100 million by congressional districts.

The table follows:

ESTIMATED GRANTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS BASED ON \$100,000,000 APPROPRIATION UNDER PUBLIC LAW 81-874 FOR CHILDREN IN PUBLIC HOUSING

State and Congressional district ¹	Number of ² children	Estimated ³ grant
Alabama:		
1.....	5,789	\$356,023
2.....	6,438	395,637
3.....	6,217	382,346
4.....	3,868	237,882
5.....	5,012	308,238
6.....	7,914	486,711
7.....	6,503	399,935
8.....	5,860	360,390
Alaska.....	1,229	543,611
Arizona:		
1.....	2,323	162,997
2.....	1,275	89,463
3.....	2,180	152,963
Arkansas:		
1.....	3,892	239,358
2.....	3,834	235,791
3.....	3,114	191,511
4.....	2,357	144,956
California:		
1.....	2,236	164,719
2.....	645	47,515
3.....	4,245	312,715
4.....	2,441	179,820
5.....	8,587	632,576
6.....	1,760	129,653
7.....	3,171	233,597
8.....	2,566	189,029
9.....	1,633	120,298
11.....	731	53,850
12.....	1,463	107,774
13.....	2,973	219,011
14.....	4,727	614,889
15.....	3,832	282,291
16.....	3,873	285,311
17.....	4,263	314,041

Footnote at end of table.

State and Congressional district 1	Number of 2 children	Estimated 3 grant	State and Congressional district 1	Number of 2 children	Estimated 3 grant	State and Congressional district 1	Number of 2 children	Estimated 3 grant
California—Continued			Kentucky—Continued			New Jersey—Continued		
18	1,603	\$118,088	3	7,107	\$437,081	12	322	\$34,347
21	4,194	308,958	4	2,132	131,118	13	7,714	822,493
23	582	42,887	5	2,233	137,330	14	5,936	633,173
26	781	57,534	6	5,083	312,605	15	2,360	251,733
29	1,557	114,699	7	1,321	81,242	999	1,378	146,987
30	2,939	216,506	Louisiana:			New Mexico:		
32	926	68,115	1	9,775	601,163	1	2,608	160,392
33	1,470	108,290	2	8,039	494,399	2	1,894	116,481
35	10	737	3	2,609	160,454	New York:		
38	2,103	154,921	4	1,916	117,834	2	52	5,997
999 4	5,884	433,455	5	1,518	93,357	3	303	23,413
Colorado:			6	2,452	141,798	4	369	42,558
1	5,004	420,336	7	3,546	218,079	5	800	92,267
2	60	5,040	8	2,136	131,364	6	1,864	214,981
3	1,177	98,868	Maine:			7	567	65,394
4	355	29,820	1	1,014	84,162	8	4,094	472,141
Connecticut:			2	1,227	101,841	9	3,938	454,149
1	4,668	476,914	Maryland:			10	9,565	1,103,163
2	1,216	124,235	1	2,213	175,934	11	9,161	1,056,569
3	4,282	437,478	3	6,852	544,734	12	1,373	158,507
4	5,829	595,530	4	2,889	229,676	13	7,357	845,141
5	2,072	211,689	5	1,153	91,664	14	6,240	719,687
6	1,495	152,739	6	1,880	149,453	15	347	40,021
Delaware			7	4,133	328,574	16	18,086	2,085,919
District of Columbia			8	1,021	81,170	17	10,344	1,193,008
Florida:			999	608	48,336	18	6,631	764,775
1	2,639	162,299	Massachusetts:			19	7,405	854,043
2	1,690	103,935	1	1,730	188,858	20	8,499	980,218
3	2,799	172,139	2	1,580	172,483	21	6,404	735,261
4	2,291	140,897	3	1,260	137,550	22	3,028	349,229
5	4,558	280,317	4	2,461	268,659	23	1,111	111,066
6	7,125	438,188	5	2,990	326,408	24	257	29,641
7	3,028	186,222	6	1,139	124,341	25	630	72,660
8	2,370	145,755	7	1,755	191,588	26	3,671	423,389
9	2,999	177,772	8	5,242	572,252	27	1,067	123,061
10	684	42,066	9	13,380	1,460,650	28	1,534	176,921
11	6,621	407,192	10	3,264	356,320	29	932	107,491
12	1,716	105,534	11	1,739	189,841	30	865	99,763
999	55	3,383	12	1,960	213,967	31	2,873	351,353
Georgia:			999	1,656	180,780	32	599	69,085
1	5,504	338,496	Michigan:			33	902	104,031
2	4,619	284,068	1	595	45,418	34	329	37,945
3	4,598	282,224	2	985	75,188	35	342	39,444
4	4,675	287,513	3	715	54,578	36	268	20,909
5	13,922	856,203	4	1,448	110,531	37	1,737	200,334
6	5,251	322,937	5	504	38,472	38	5,581	643,675
7	4,295	264,143	6	1,305	99,615	39	1,212	139,784
8	4,503	276,935	7	1,161	88,623	North Carolina:		
9	3,115	191,573	8	1,843	140,682	1	3,238	199,134
10	6,282	386,343	9	935	71,372	2	1,911	117,527
Hawaii			10	944	72,058	3	1,993	122,570
Idaho:			11	2,012	153,583	4	4,386	269,772
1	753	51,706	12	554	59,769	5	4,025	244,204
2	382	26,231	13	5,914	45,435	6	4,254	261,621
Illinois:			14	2,366	138,927	7	2,837	174,476
1	15,929	1,515,910	15	1,443	87,249	8	2,235	137,453
2	3,223	306,722	16	1,148	87,631	9	4,141	254,672
3	3,531	336,034	17	3,011	229,836	10	1,511	92,927
4	883	84,032	18	1,231	93,966	11	2,062	126,813
5	1,752	166,732	Minnesota:			North Dakota:		
6	722	68,710	1	664	45,340	1	1,327	109,478
7	13,059	1,242,782	2	1,053	71,955	2	835	68,888
8	1,351	128,570	3	3,462	236,591	Ohio:		
9	6,482	616,870	4	5,472	373,920	1	889	66,823
10	165	15,703	5	5,028	343,580	2	7,788	585,398
11	793	75,467	6	1,638	111,930	3	3,996	300,366
12	121	11,819	7	1,833	125,255	4	1,004	75,467
13	1,429	135,993	8	2,462	168,233	5	1,503	112,976
14	1,915	182,244	999	78	5,330	6	633	47,581
15	2,882	274,270	Mississippi:			7	852	64,042
16	2,128	202,515	1	1,851	113,833	8	2,308	173,485
17	3,340	317,857	2	1,544	94,956	9	421	31,645
18	3,182	302,820	3	1,297	79,766	10	293	22,091
19	3,258	310,053	4	1,645	101,168	11	3,570	268,345
20	5,222	496,960	5	4,519	277,919	12	2,317	174,161
21	1,637	155,788	Missouri:			13	3,506	263,534
22	2,417	230,018	1	8,540	584,990	14	3,730	280,372
23	5,703	542,736	2	195	13,354	15	659	49,535
999	5,321	506,382	3	2,545	174,333	16	1,413	106,211
Indiana:			4	1,009	69,117	17	3,253	244,517
1	3,715	255,097	5	3,241	222,009	18	12,620	948,603
2	363	24,926	6	765	52,471	19	1,450	108,992
3	2,001	137,402	7	845	57,883	20	693	52,091
4	555	38,110	8	1,203	82,406	Oklahoma:		
5	260	17,853	9	575	39,388	1	2,904	194,568
6	403	27,673	10	2,504	171,191	2	52	796
7	1,024	70,315	999	551	37,744	3	2,919	195,573
8	2,053	140,973	Montana:			4	1,210	81,070
9	1,678	115,223	1	922	75,911	5	3,279	219,693
10	972	66,744	2	865	71,222	6	681	45,627
11	3,446	236,625	Nebraska:			Oregon:		
Iowa:			1	2,967	285,327	1	1,299	137,694
1	536	45,024	2	4,970	477,948	2	512	54,272
2	270	22,680	3	2,888	277,729	3	3,918	415,308
3	182	15,288	Nevada:			4	1,788	189,528
4	403	33,852	1	3,059	199,848	999	620	65,720
5	641	53,844	New Hampshire:			Pennsylvania:		
6	239	20,077	1	3,186	307,516	1	6,026	476,054
7	471	39,564	2	862	83,183	2	6,819	546,601
Kansas:			New Jersey:			3	10,642	840,718
1	792	57,420	1	2,991	319,040	4	1,414	111,706
2	1,429	107,228	2	3,284	343,893	5	2,035	100,765
3	1,548	112,230	3	2,806	299,520	6	2,872	226,888
4	1,303	94,468	4	3,778	402,989	7	746	58,934
5	790	57,275	5	421	44,928	8	286	22,594
Kentucky:			6	482	51,413	9	2,740	216,460
1	4,057	249,506	7	1,151	122,773	10	2,175	222,385
2	2,124	130,626	8	3,871	412,907	11	1,170	92,430
			9	1,053	112,320	12	1,500	118,500
			10	8,722	930,346	13	510	40,290
			11	9,810	1,046,400	14	8,661	684,219

Footnote at end of table.

ESTIMATED GRANTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS BASED ON \$100,000,000 APPROPRIATION UNDER PUBLIC LAW 81-874 FOR CHILDREN IN PUBLIC HOUSING—Continued

State and Congressional district ¹	Number of ² children	Estimated ³ grant
Pennsylvania—Continued		
15	3,427	\$270,733
16	876	69,204
17	3,138	247,902
18	439	34,681
19	520	41,080
20	7,420	586,180
21	1,115	88,085
22	2,175	171,825
23	464	36,656
24	2,779	219,541
25	3,640	287,560
26	2,605	205,795
27	1,912	151,048
999	1,542	121,818
Rhode Island:		
1	6,495	623,520
2	4,863	466,848
South Carolina:		
1	2,695	165,743
2	2,196	101,721
3	1,262	77,613
4	3,306	203,319
5	1,785	109,778
6	525	32,288
South Dakota:		
1		37,840
2		122,960
Tennessee:		
1	2,837	174,476
2	4,571	342,617
3	4,715	289,973
4	3,849	236,714
5	7,873	484,190
6	4,195	257,993
7	2,376	146,124
8	2,703	166,235
9	6,551	402,887
Texas:		
1	2,774	175,224
2	7,937	122,354
3	5,639	356,194
4	2,245	141,809
5	3,744	236,496
6	1,144	72,263
7	2,610	164,865
8	273	17,245
9	3,401	214,830
10	2,397	157,727
11	2,778	175,477
12	1,656	104,604
13	2,131	134,608
14	2,321	146,610
15	3,588	226,642
16	2,766	174,719
17	2,781	179,000
18	491	31,015
19	995	62,851
20	8,068	509,629
21	497	31,361
22	1,136	71,757
23	2,573	162,528
Utah	194	11,913
Vermont	407	33,442
Virginia:		
1	3,318	262,122
2	7,315	577,885
3	5,079	401,241
4	753	59,487
5	650	51,350
6	1,625	128,375
7	300	23,700
9	625	49,375
10	1,586	125,294
Washington:		
1	1,352	89,232
2	1,759	116,094
3	913	60,258
4	859	56,694
6	3,297	217,602
7	10,739	708,774
999	650	42,900
West Virginia:		
1	1,901	116,912
2	618	38,007
3	1,503	92,435
4	1,047	64,391
5	492	30,258
Wisconsin:		
1	122	10,573
2	936	81,120
3	867	74,620
4	234	15,600
5	4,993	432,727
6	406	38,653
7	1,143	99,060
8	852	73,840
10	1,685	146,033
999	342	29,640
Wyoming	333	29,859
Puerto Rico	53,431	4,648,497
Virgin Islands	1,898	165,126
Guam	325	21,558
United States total ⁴		98,269,521

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 29, 1971

¹ Congressional districts having no completed units are omitted.
² Number of school age children based on Office of Education estimate of school age children per public housing unit; that is 1.3 per unit.
³ Estimated grants calculated adding 20 percent to 1970 State "B" rate.
⁴ 999 units undistributed by congressional districts.
⁵ Difference in U.S. total and appropriation caused by the fact that rates for cities, such as New York and Chicago, are somewhat larger than rate of average school district.

DELAWARE FOOTBALL

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
 Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, if I may I would like to draw attention to a singular honor my colleague from the State of Delaware and myself share with the two distinguished Senators from Nebraska.

We all have the privilege of representing States with national championship football teams. The University of Nebraska is the No. 1 major college team and the University of Delaware is the No. 1 small college team. Nebraska's honor may be greater, but we are just as proud of our team.

The University of Delaware Blue Hens have completed their regular season with a 9 and 1 record, the only loss coming to major college Temple. The team led all college division teams in rushing, with an average of 371 yards a game and in total offense, with an average of 515 yards.

This all was done in a season which was expected to be a rebuilding year. Coach Tubby Raymond took a team from which 15 of 22 starters had graduated and built it into a winner.

It certainly was not Coach Raymond's first winner. In the last 3 years his teams have won 27 of 32 games. His record since taking over from Coach Dave Nelson in 1966 is 43 victories and only 18 losses.

Dave Nelson also deserves credit for the fine season for the guidance he offered as athletic director for the University.

It is impossible to name all the great football players who contributed to this fine season, but one should mention Gardy Kahoe and Billy Armstrong, who did most of the ball-carrying; Sam Neff, a fine quarterback, and Ralph Borgess, a defensive tackle, the captain and team leader.

On December 11, the University of Delaware will travel to Atlantic City for its fourth consecutive appearance in the Boardwalk Bowl. The Blue Hens will be favored to make C. W. Post their fourth consecutive victim in that bowl game.

As an alumnus of the University of Delaware and a former member of its football team, I am proud of this great record. So are all the citizens of Delaware who have enjoyed following the team this season.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a column about the Delaware football team by Hal Bodley, sports editor of the Wilmington News-Journal, and a news story about the national

champion University of Delaware football team.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Nov. 22, 1971]

THE DREAM CAME TRUE

(By Hal Bodley)

"What did Ralph say?" Tubby Raymond asked, almost sheepishly.

"That the team's goal is to win the national championship."

"He said what?"

"They want to be national champions. It's in the paper with a big headline today."

"Oh no," exclaimed the Delaware football coach. "I can't believe he said that. We have to replace 15 of 22 starters and . . ."

That was a sunny afternoon on Sept. 17, only hours before the untried Blue Hens were going to open their season with a 39-7 conquest of Gettysburg and start their quest for a second national title.

The Ralph is Capt. Ralph Borgess, an emotional, talented defensive tackle, who kept giving Raymond nightmares with his antics before the season started.

Late in August Borgess shaved his head, all but a little tassel of blond hair that looked like a minor-league pony tail. Raymond took one look at Ralph the first day of practice and turned white. People had to comfort the coach when photographers began to snap pictures. Several days later the picture had been used in newspapers all over the country.

Then, the day before the first game, here was Borgess saying an inexperienced team was hoping to win the national championship.

The first thing Raymond could see when he heard that was 10 locker room bulletin boards with the clipping "Hens Want National Title" tacked up in a priority position.

Saturday, when it was 46-0 and the Blue Hens had polished off Bucknell so convincingly it's not necessary to rehash the victory here, a fellow walked up to the surprisingly calm Borgess and asked him about that interview on Sept. 17.

"I wasn't kidding or fooling or anything like that," said Ralph, whose hair has grown back in nicely, thank you. "Sure, we had some holes on the offensive line, but the defense was so good, so wild, in spring practice I felt we could go all the way. I felt then the defense would play an important part in the season."

"We wanted to have the reputation of being mean, not just good. We've been trying to improve our aggressiveness and our pass rush all season. When you look back to other teams, they have had their highs and lows. Look at what happened to us after we beat Temple last year. We lost to Lehigh. This year we feel like we've continued to improve each week. There has been no big let-down."

Raymond was standing a few feet away from his captain in the moldy Lewisburg, Pa., dressing room and was trying to hear every word.

"It's been a great bunch of boys," said Raymond, whose 9-1 season this autumn pushes his record to a remarkable 43-18 since taking over for Dave Nelson after the 1965 campaign. "I still say when you have two or three kids who get together and decide to do something, and they bring four or five along with them, it's contagious. Ralph has been a tremendous captain, but what he has done has been contagious. He has made the whole group a group of leaders and I can't think of a better tribute."

The subject of the Sept. 17 story was brought up and Raymond grimaced again.

"You can set goals," said the coach, "but the national championship? Winning the

Lambert Cup and having a big part in deciding who goes to the Boardwalk Bowl seemed much more realistic."

So, the Blue Hens will win the Lambert Cup, will play C. W. Post in the Boardwalk Bowl and will get the national championship, and will probably be recognized as the No. 1 small-college team in America by the prestigious Washington Touchdown Club.

Take nothing away from the champs of 1963, but the thing people will remember this team for is that it won it all. In 1963, the Hens were unbeaten in eight games, but the finale with Bucknell was canceled because of President Kennedy's assassination. They won the United Press International crown, but not the one given by the Associated Press. This time, they will get both.

And then there were all those records. "I've never seen a better Delaware team," said Bucknell Coach Fred Prender after the Hens had rolled up 364 yards rushing and another 206 passing on the cold afternoon at Memorial Stadium. "This is the best Delaware defense and the best offense. What else can I say?"

Raymond stood on his front lawn last night and tried to think of ways to describe the feeling inside.

"I had a special feeling when Jack Turner played for us. I thought we'd never have a runner like him. Then there was Mike Brown and Tom DiMuzio and others. Somehow kids come along and you wonder how you'll ever replace them. Right now, I feel that way about Garry Kahoe and Bill Armstrong. Boy, have they given me a thrill watching them run."

Tubby Raymond refuses to rate his teams. He doesn't want to call this one or that one his best. "It wouldn't be fair to the others," he says.

What Raymond will remember about this team, though, is that it was a group of boys who made up their minds what they were going to do, then went out and did it.

The dream came true. On second thought, maybe it wasn't a dream.

BLUE HENS UPI NATIONAL CHAMPIONS!!!

Delaware, which rolled to a 9-1 season including victories over two major colleges, has been named national small-college football champion by the United Press International board of coaches.

The Blue Hens, whose victims included Villanova and Rutgers—both major colleges—collected 20 first place votes from the 32 coaches participating in the final week of balloting. The only Delaware loss came to Temple—another major college. It was the second time Delaware was named national champion, the other title coming in 1963.

McNeese State of Louisiana (9-0-1), which has been second in the ranking through much of the latter part of the season, finished second behind Delaware with five first place votes and 267 points. The top-ranked Blue Hens' final point total was 306.

Eastern Michigan, which finished its season at 7-0-2, received three first place votes and finished third ahead of Tennessee State and C. W. Post. The fifth-ranked Pioneers will play Delaware Dec. 11 in the Boardwalk Bowl in Atlantic City, N.J.

Competing the top 10 were Arkansas Tech, Samford, Northern Colorado, Louisiana Tech and Howard Payne. Seventh-ranked Samford (8-1) will be hosting the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl in Birmingham, Ala., Nov. 25 against unranked Ohio Wesleyan. Ninth-ranked Louisiana Tech's post-season action will be with No. 3 Eastern Michigan in the Pioneer Bowl at Wichita Falls, Texas, Dec. 11.

The second 10 was headed by Chico State, which is bound for the Camelia Bowl against Boise State Dec. 11 at Sacramento, Calif. Following were Western Kentucky, Boise State, Westminster of Pa., and Southwest Texas State. Twice-beaten Alcorn A & M was

16th, Livingston of Ala., 17th and St. John's of Minn., 18th. The top 20 was completed by Pacific Coast Athletic Association champion Long Beach State and Akron.

The Blue Hens also won the Lambert Cup as the top middle-sized college football team in the East for the fourth consecutive year Tuesday.

The Blue Hens, who posted a 9-1 record, were the unanimous choice of the eight-man selection committee. C. W. Post and West Chester tied for second place.

Rounding out the top 10 were Bridgeport, Lehigh, Coast Guard, Williams, Amherst, Middlebury and Central Connecticut.

FINAL UPI SMALL-COLLEGE POLL

1. Delaware (20) 9-1	306
2. McNeese State (5) 9-0-1	267
3. Eastern Michigan (3) 7-0-2	233
4. Tennessee State (1) 8-1	185
5. C. W. Post 8-1	130
6. Arkansas Tech 11-0	95
7. Samford 8-1	78
8. Northern Colorado (2) 8-1-1	75
9. Louisiana Tech 8-2	74
10. Howard Payne 9-1-1	48
11. Chico State 9-1	47
12. Western Kentucky 8-2	42
13. Boise State 9-2	29
14. Westminster, Pa. 8-0	25
15. Southwest Texas State 8-1-1	22
16. Alcorn A. & M. (1) 6-2	21
17. Livingston, Ala. 8-1	20
18. St. John's, Minn., 8-1	18
19. Long Beach State 8-3	15
20. Akron 8-2	11

PAT SULLIVAN WINS HEISMAN TROPHY

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, voters for the Heisman trophy have chosen Pat Sullivan of Auburn University as the outstanding college football player for 1971. They made a wise choice, and no one deserved the award more.

Auburn University and the State of Alabama could not have had a finer representative than this truly outstanding young man from Birmingham.

Pat is simply a super football player and has been since high school. His record at Auburn was not made in 1 year. He is not a senior year wonder alone.

Pat Sullivan was a fantastic passing and running quarterback when he was a sophomore, and he led the Nation in total offense with 285.6 yards when he was a junior.

He was responsible for 26 touchdowns last year and finished sixth in the Heisman trophy balloting. This year, he added 26 more touchdowns and went all the way to place first in the balloting.

Pat compiled his superb record in the heat of battle in one of the very toughest conferences in the Nation. Football is king in the South, and we play it good, and we play it tough. Pat Sullivan was a winner in a field of winners. It makes a difference.

His worth to the total team effort has been clearly evident throughout a fine career. He has guided Auburn to three highly successful football seasons.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Pat Sullivan is

considerably more than a great football player. He is a fine Christian young man, devoted husband and father, and unfailing friend and leader to his fellow students.

Though gifted as an athlete and praised many times for his athletic accomplishments, Pat Sullivan is humble and appreciative of the contributions of others to his success.

When he won the Heisman Trophy last week, he was certainly a gracious winner, and I am certain that had he not won the award, he would have been an equally gracious loser. He did not say, "Well, it's all so true, you see. I am in fact the greatest football player in the country."

Amazingly, the young man who placed second to Sullivan made just such an admission. At least 1,597 voters would disagree with him and did.

They chose Pat Sullivan, and I am delighted that they did. I am proud to represent Auburn University as Congressman for Alabama's Third Congressional District.

It is an outstanding academic institution, and its athletic program is outstanding as well. Proof of the fact? Why, Pat Sullivan, of course.

SAVING OUR WILD HORSES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the wide interest among the young people of my district in the preservation of our wild horses, I thought others might find this article of interest.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 25, 1971] COWBOYS IN COPTERS ACT TO SAVE LAST OF WILD HORSE HERDS

LOVELL, WYO.—Cowboys on horses and in helicopters have stepped in to save one of the nation's last wild horse herds from possible extinction in the rocky, snow-covered Pryor Mountains along the Wyoming-Montana border.

The Bureau of Land Management cowboys last week trimmed the Pryor Mountain wild horse range herd from 157 to about 100, giving the remainder a chance to live off the 32,000-acre range.

The available range feed was not sufficient to support the growing number of horses, descendants of domestic herds belonging to the nearby Crow Indian Reservation and area ranchers. The first proposal to thin the herd was a "quiet, dignified elimination by gun or drugs."

That ignited such an uproar from animal protection groups and other environmentalists that the Bureau of Land Management was forced to come up with another plan. It was decided to try to thin the herd by culling out the colts and loner stallions.

That method eliminated the danger of destroying Spanish mustang bloodlines and also improved the sex ratio, according to Rex Cleary, district manager for the bureau, a branch of the Department of Interior.

Starting about a month ago, five cowboys on horses attempted to drive the animals into what is called Big Coulee, a natural corral, where the herd would be cut to a ratio of 60 per cent mares and 40 per cent stallions.

After only two of the spindly, man-shy colts were captured the snow became too deep to progress any further on horseback and the bureau was forced to switch tactics.

The New West then took over. Helicopters were used to take the cowboys to the back reaches of the wilderness, where the colts were roped, wrapped in styrofoam pads, and put into baskets attached to the helicopter for the long ride to the corrals here.

The culling of the herd became necessary when forage became inadequate to support both deer and the wild horses.

Clearly said the inadequate amount of food did not affect the deer, which simply moved on to greener pastures. But the wild horses like to stay in their home grounds—even if they starve to death.

Clearly said 10 colts were captured, probably all that were left. The rest, perhaps as many as eight, were probably already victims of the winter.

The bachelor stallions—wild mustangs that roamed virtually alone in the wilderness, either too young, too old or too weak to keep a harem of mares—were corralled near the edge of the wild horse range.

An organization known as Wild Horse Organized Assistance, Inc., or WHOA, volunteered to find new homes for the colts.

Velma B. Johnson, Reno, Nev., popularly known as "Wild Horse Annie," and the Crow Indians volunteered to act as an "adoption agency" for colts and stallions taken out of the area.

The colts will be given away, probably by a drawing, while the Crow Indians of southeastern Montana say they will break the stallions, if possible, and either find homes for them or let them live out their lives on the Crow Reservation.

FREEZE ON PROFESSORS' SALARIES

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, 1971, the attached resolution was introduced in the Fayetteville section of the university faculty senate, University of Arkansas, by Prof. Ernie Deane. The faculty adopted the resolution and I would like to insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

Professor Deane moved *Whereas*, certain inequities and injustices have been inflicted upon more than 300 faculty members of this University under certain interpretations of the intent of the presidential "freeze" on salaries ordered August 15, 1971, and

Whereas, these affected faculty members had contracted in good faith with the University prior to the presidential order to perform certain duties during the 1971-72 school year in return for specified salaries, and they are faithfully performing those duties, and

Whereas, the University is not presently permitted to honor its contracts with these faculty members in the matter of salaries, and

Whereas, meanwhile, the salaries of more than 300 other University faculty members have not been adversely affected by the presidential "freeze" and the University is fulfilling its contracts with them, now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate of the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville takes note that these conditions constitute unjust and inequitable treatment of certain members of this faculty, these members thus be-

ing denied equal rights under the law, and

Be It Further Resolved, that the Faculty Senate herewith protests these inequities and injustices and respectfully petitions agencies and officials concerned to remove same, and

Be It Further Resolved, that this protest and petition be directed to, but not limited to, the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Arkansas, members of the Arkansas delegation to the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the University of Arkansas, members of the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas, and the federal Office of Emergency Preparedness; and the secretary of the Faculty Senate is directed to send copies of the protest and petition to each of these officials and agencies without delay.

THE NEED FOR GREATER FUNDING OF SICKLE CELL ANEMIA RESEARCH

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed legislation which gives us sound reasons to hope that cancer can be conquered in the foreseeable future. We should now turn our attention to another dreaded disease, sickle cell anemia, known as SCA. The administration has increased its SCA research and treatment budget fivefold to a new total of \$6 million. Meantime, a research team at Blodgett Memorial Hospital in Grand Rapids, Mich., my hometown, has discovered a treatment for the critical stage of SCA. The need for greater funding of SCA research and treatment has been examined in an editorial in the Grand Rapids Press. I commend a reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

PUTTING A SCOURGE IN FOCUS

A Blodgett Memorial Hospital research team headed by Robert N. Naibandian, M.D., associate pathologist, has received national acclaim for discovering a treatment for the critical stage of sickle cell anemia, along with a method to prevent crises and progression of the disease. Although no cure has yet been found for SCA, which strikes Negroes almost exclusively, the results of the work here and elsewhere have raised hopes that a cure can be developed, and the findings already have resulted in massive efforts locally to uncover the disease and educate the public as to its nature, dangers and ways of keeping the incidence of SCA to a minimum.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has called attention to some facts on SCA reported by the American Medical Association. According to the AMA, an estimated 50,000 Americans are dying of the disease. Another 2,000,000 are carrying the SCA gene. When two such persons mate, there is a 25 per cent chance that their offspring will have the fatal disease.

Even more to the point is the AMA's observation that in 1967 there were an estimated 1,155 new cases of SCA reported, as compared with 813 new cases of muscular dystrophy. But volunteers raised \$7,900,000 that year for muscular dystrophy and less than \$100,000 for SCA.

We don't accept the Post-Dispatch's implication that this disparity is to be accounted for by the fact that only blacks are stricken with SCA. The disease simply hasn't

had the publicity that some others have, possibly because its outward effects have been less discernible.

But as the Post-Dispatch also notes, "in belated recognition of this health program, Congress is considering bills to increase funding for research and treatment of SCA." We in Grand Rapids have special reasons to urge Congress to act positively on the proposed legislation, for it is largely because of the efforts of the local research team that hopes of finding a cure have been so greatly strengthened.

THE UNITED NATIONS FACES THE NEXT 25 YEARS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith a very significant article on the United Nations written by Dr. Thomas Patrick Melady, the American Ambassador to Burundi.

Dr. Melady, an expert on Africa and the author of several books on the third world of underdeveloped nations, wrote this article for publication in the July 1971 issue of the Catholic World. It is worthy of the attention of all of us.

The article follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS FACES THE NEXT 25 YEARS

(By Dr. Thomas Patrick Melady)

The twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations has come and gone. Forty-five heads of state or government and ninety-one foreign ministers attended the twenty-fifth United Nations General Assembly. It was an unprecedented moment of international diplomacy. All of these high international personalities engaged in multilateral and bilateral talks.

President Nixon gave a major policy address at the United Nations on October 23, 1970. Secretary of State Rogers had bilateral meetings with twenty-one heads of state or government.

President Nixon, after listening to the speech of the world's longest reigning head of state, His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, stressed in his address United States support for the United Nations and its programs. The President gave great emphasis to the ability of the United Nations to work in the field of the family of man's struggle for a better life; in mankind's war on the triple curse of poverty, illiteracy, and disease. He especially suggested that the United Nations concentrate on reducing the gap between the rich and the poor in the family of man; curb the pollution of the world environment, protect the seabed resources for the benefit of all, limit the galloping birth rate, assure the humane treatment of prisoners of war, and take appropriate action against drug abuse and air piracy.

The Silver Anniversary recorded some distinct accomplishments. There were also some clear disappointments. Inspired by the President's address, the United Nations proclaimed that the seabed beyond the area of international jurisdiction was a "common heritage" of the family of man. Many observers believed that this declaration may be recorded as one of the greatest accomplishments of the twenty-fifth anniversary, as it will especially protect for the developing countries their future access to the revenues

that will be produced from these international resources. In order to implement this concept, the Assembly called for a conference on seabeds and the Law of the Sea in 1973.

The Assembly also:

1. Established a United Nations Volunteer Corps.

2. Set targets and adopted a comprehensive strategy for the second development decade.

3. Spoke strongly on the humane treatment of prisoners of war, aerial hijacking, and illicit drug abuse.

The clear disappointments included the failure to make any progress on peacekeeping. The Assembly also failed to approve a United States-sponsored proposal to create a committee to examine ways to improve the role of the International Court of Justice. Failure to enact the proposal for a United Nations Commissioner to protect Human Rights caused disappointment in humanitarian circles.

The United Nations is an international forum, and some feel this aspect was exaggerated at the twenty-fifth session which adopted five major declarations. They were:

1. The declaration on friendly relations between states.

2. The strategy for the second development decade.

3. Strengthening international security.

4. The declaration on the twenty-fifth anniversary.

5. The declaration on the tenth anniversary of the colonialism resolution.

While the first three were regarded by most observers as appropriate forward-moving steps for the world body, the last two generated a great deal of controversy. The last one particularly was regarded as being unbalanced, as it gave the United Nations blessing to the use of violence by liberation movements and called for further mandatory sanctions in southern Africa.

There were fifty founding members at San Francisco in 1945. Part way through the twenty-fifth anniversary session in 1970, the Fiji Islands were admitted as the 127th member of the world body.

The admission of the 127th member generated some concern about the advisability of automatically admitting mini-states to the United Nations solely because they become independent.

The anniversary session was the occasion for many to re-evaluate the United Nations. Among these was the President's Commission for the Observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary. The Commission, headed by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, was concerned about the decline in public support for the United Nations among Americans. While around 80% of Americans once believed that the United Nations was the best hope for peace, only around 50% so believed this in 1970. While very few felt that the United Nations was in danger of collapse, there was clear indication that many in the twenty-fifth anniversary year regarded the institution as somewhat irrelevant to the modern world situation.

However, the world at long last has in the United Nations an international institution with worldwide membership which is dedicated to saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. And furthermore we have a going organization which has as its goals "to reaffirm faith in the fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, and in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small . . . To promote social progress and better standards of life . . ."

The United Nations has six principal organs to implement these noble goals. They are the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat.

They are all well established and functioning mechanisms. For the first time in history such an organization exists.

PRESENCE OF THIRD WORLD

The presence of the Third World at the United Nations is a significant new political development of the past decade. Every September each new General Assembly of the United Nations unfolds another chapter in the postwar rise of the Third World and the significant changes this has brought in international affairs. Today, any observer standing at the top of the escalator used by United Nations delegates at the General Assembly building in New York can read—in microcosm—the story of Afro-Asia emergence in the sight of a turban, a sari, or a boubou. It is like holding up a mirror to the emergence of the Third World.

In 1955, the tenth anniversary of the United Nations, the late Dag Hammarskjöld cited in his annual report "the great upheaval in the relationship of nations and peoples that is underway" and pointed out that "the peoples of Asia today, and of Africa tomorrow, are moving toward a new relationship with what history calls the West." By 1957, as the pace of the change quickened, Mr. Hammarskjöld reported:

"The United Nations reflects, but is in no sense a cause of, the renaissance of Asia, the awakening of Africa, and the other great changes that are under way in the balance of power and relationships of the peoples are likewise part of the dynamic of history itself. As always, they bring with them many grave problems of adjustment."

The mirror threw back a much different image from that of 1945, when the United Nations was mainly a white man's club. The people of color who, in 1945, constituted the majority of the world's population were hardly represented. By the time the United Nations celebrated its twentieth anniversary in 1965, this situation had significantly changed—from eleven Afro-Asian states present in 1945 to sixty-five in 1967. And the four new nations of the Caribbean that are inhabited predominantly by the peoples of color also can be added to the Third World. In 1970, with the admission of Fiji, the majority of the 127 members were Third World states.

The presence of the Third World in the United Nations has turned it into a truly global institution. The point was made dramatically by Pope Paul VI on his visit to the United Nations on October 4, 1965, when he declared:

"Permit us to congratulate you on having had the wisdom to open this Assembly to the young peoples, to the States which have recently attained independence and national freedom. Their presence here is the proof of the universality and magnanimity which inspire the principle of this institution."

Once the impact of the new nations was felt at the United Nations, a significant change in the items under discussion on the annual General Assembly Agenda could be observed. The Third World brought into the halls of the United Nations the poor man and made him a topic of concern for the major powers.

For the Third World nations, the United Nations is a unique opportunity and a special instrument. Through their permanent missions to the United Nations they are able to maintain contact with fellow Third World countries without the heavy commitment of men and money to diplomatic missions in all these countries. Thus most Afro-Asian states assign their leading diplomats to the United Nations post.

More important, the United Nations is the only place in the world where the influence of these countries outweighs their economic and military strength. And it is through the Secretariat and the Secretary-General that

their influence is particularly felt. This strength was clearly evident in the arrangements for the visit of Pope Paul VI to the United Nations in October 1965. The Third World nations enthusiastically supported the visit because they felt that the Pope would add the prestige and influence of the Holy See in support of their three central concerns: war, peace and disarmament; efforts to eliminate racism and colonialism; aid programs to reduce poverty, illiteracy and disease. As expected, Pope Paul's visit was significant on all three counts.

The support coming for the Third World nations at the United Nations by the Holy See and other international religious and humanitarian groups has influenced the whole complex of the United Nations—from the offices of the Secretary-General and specialized agencies to the periphery of non-governmental bodies. All three central concerns of the Third World are now in the forefront of United Nations interest. This is a far cry from the grim prediction that the admission of these "small, poor states" would distract the United Nations from the major problems facing the world in favor of the narrow interests of these countries. The opposite has happened: the Third World has humanized the United Nations and sustained a larger view of a world struggling to achieve the vision of mankind ever evolving toward a better life for all.

The presence of the Third World has almost transformed the United Nations into a fully universal institution. The China question is the one main question to be resolved in this regard. One has the feeling that, as we enter the second twenty-five year period, we are at the eve of an equitable solution to this problem that has been a vexing one for all advocates of universality. Here again, there was no predestined guarantee that the United Nations would solve this problem the moment it appeared on the agenda of the United Nations. Nevertheless the United Nations machinery provided the forum for over ten years of discussion and this dialogue has in it the seeds of eventual solution.

THREE NEW SOURCES OF CRITICISM

Three new schools of criticism for the United Nations have developed in the past few years. First, the advocates of rapid evolution from the United Nations institution to a world government have been disappointed that the United Nations did not evolve to a new super-world sovereignty in its first twenty-five years. In the late 40's and the early 50's there was in Western circles a small but articulate group supporting the United States as a means to a goal that they wanted—world government. As a matter of fact, world government was never envisaged as the end-product of the new institution launched in 1945 at San Francisco. The United Nations is not a supra-state. It does not legislate, though it provides machinery for member states to cooperate in an organization of sovereign states.

The world government enthusiasts in the first few years of the United Nations seized upon it as a means to accomplish their end. Now, twenty-five years later, while the United Nations has facilitated greater conversation and in many ways has implemented Teilhard de Chardin's vision of universal pluralism, it has not resulted in world government. This group of early enthusiasts has, in a way, soured on the United Nations and has joined the original isolationists and others in criticizing it.

Second, Israel always has had an articulate group of supporters. Since the United Nations facilitated, if not sponsored, the birth of the state of Israel in 1947, the pro-Israel enthusiasts enlarged their affection for Israel to include the United Nations. It was a matter of course in the 50's to find that American organizations who were wholeheartedly

supporting Israel were also in the pro-United Nations group.

In the past few years Israel had been witnessing some difficulties in the United Nations. The strengthened nationalism of the Arab states plus their *marriage de convenance* with select Afro-Asian countries has given them a vastly strengthened posture at the United Nations. In the 1970 General Assembly, Israel was defeated on several key matters affecting its interests. This new development has resulted in some of the pro-Israeli supporters cooling their affections towards the United Nations.

Another area of criticism of the United Nations has been the subsidiary role that it has played in any attempts at resolving the Vietnam conflict. These critics hold that "somehow" the United Nations should have been able to resolve this problem. As a matter of fact Vietnam never did emerge as a full-scale world conflict. Nor is the United Nations involved in the present negotiations.

This criticism is based on the assumption that the United Nations should contain properties of greatness—if not magic—that would allow it to resolve—and to everyone's satisfaction—the problems plaguing mankind. It has not been able to do this in the case of Vietnam. Should the United Nations be "written off" for this and other defects and non-accomplishments?

These three developments are unfortunate and, while it is only perhaps natural for groups with overriding primary interests to be disappointed when the United Nations no longer coincidentally supports their interest, one would hope that they would rise above the temptation to do harm to an institution that Pope Paul VI so clearly had hailed as the leading universal secular facility to serve the family of man.

ANGER OF EXTREME POLEMICS

There is another, more serious, danger now present in the United Nations. Some of the new members whose independence came in the wake of what they regarded as oppressive foreign domination and who still see parts—albeit small—of the Third World under foreign control, are highly emotional on some of these very sensitive issues. When the complicated questions of southern Africa—colonialism, human rights, and so forth—emerged on the agenda of either the General Assembly or the Security Council, there has been the tendency in the past few years for certain of the newer nations to seize this opportunity to engage in inflammatory polemics.

This is contrary to the tradition that inspired the founding fathers of the United Nations. Both physical and emotional violence was to be avoided within the walls of the serious global institution of the United Nations. The representatives of the sovereign states were to set forth their thesis arguments in a calm, cool, and collected fashion. Unfortunately, in the past several years this has not been the case. Although not the only one, the Committee of twenty-four—the General Assembly's Special Committee on Decolonization—has been among the offenders. In early 1971 both the United Kingdom and the United States withdrew from membership on this committee. Many committed believers of the United Nations are concerned that, if the tendency to engage in highly emotional polemics continues at the United Nations, its usefulness as an institution of dialogue, as an institution of universal pluralism, will be impaired.

CHALLENGE: TO RENEW

In looking back over the twenty-five years and glancing even further back over the attempts of mankind in the past to facilitate conversation and to reduce the tendency to confrontation, we can, as President Nixon remarked to the United States staff at the United Nations, be thankful that mankind's vision has evolved from a point where an

international institution was established and has survived twenty-five years. All of us, regardless of our interests, should avoid the temptation to attack and criticize. We should avoid participating with those who would destroy the United Nations. Our challenge is to engage in reform; to work quietly and patiently to improve the institution.

Tellhard de Chardin, one of mankind's leading prophets of universal pluralism, has said "The task before us now, if we should not perish, is to shake off our ancient prejudices, and to build the earth."

The United Nations has emerged from man's arduous journey. It, like man, is not perfect. But, like man, the United Nations has, in its essence, the seeds of greater perfection.

The task for us now is to seek the greater perfection of an institution that evolved in mankind's nobler moments. Reform has always taken more courage to implement than destruction. But, as Tellhard said, "the future of the earth is in our hands. How shall we decide?"

COMMENCEMENT AND COMMISSIONING EXERCISES, TEXAS A. & M. UNIVERSITY, MAY 8, 1971

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the graduating class of 1971 of the Texas A. & M. University at College Station assembled for their commencement and commissioning exercises, they were addressed by three great and well known men: Dr. Abner McCall, president of Baylor University; Gen. John D. Ryan, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force and their own president, the Honorable Jack Williams.

I include the words of these three gentlemen in the RECORD.

The addresses of the aforementioned follow:

COMMENCEMENT AND COMMISSIONING EXERCISES, TEXAS A. & M. UNIVERSITY, 1971
(Address by Dr. Abner V. McCall, president, Baylor University)

I regard it as a privilege to participate in the 1971 Commencement Exercises of Texas A&M University. For almost forty years I have been visiting this gymnasium with Baylor basketball teams and hearing the Aggies in the stands demanding that Baylor be stomped, and generally their demands have been satisfied. I am glad for once to be here on this neutral occasion and hope to come away with at least a tie.

Baylor awarded an honorary degree to my good friend, the late Earl Rudder, President of Texas A&M, for his contributions to higher education in Texas. Under President Rudder, Texas A&M made remarkable progress and within a decade became the finest public university in the Southwest. You who graduate today can be proud indeed that you have earned a degree from Texas A&M.

I also have the greatest respect and admiration for your new president, Dr. Jack K. Williams. In my opinion the Board of Directors of Texas A&M has hit another home run in selecting him to lead the university. I am sure that under him the remarkable progress of Texas A&M as an educational institution of excellence will continue without letup.

The student bodies of a few universities seem to believe that ranking first in athletic competition is of highest priority. In the last

decade Texas A&M seems to have joined Baylor in emphasizing character building on the football field. Baylor has not won a football championship in forty-six years. From our experience I want to assure you football fans at A&M that the first twenty years are the hardest; and after that, you get somewhat used to not ever being No. 1 in football. Perhaps the Texas A&M students can in answer to the shouts of a neighboring Texas institution start shouting, "We're No. 1 in Education." For the educator utopia will be here when students get so concerned about who's number one in education.

The students of many American colleges and universities seem to believe today that a college or university should rank first and give first priority to being an instrument of social or political action to reform the nation and the world. It is about this current and popular belief of many students and faculty members that I want to speak briefly today. All universities have some of these students and teachers, and many universities have so many of them that they seem to be in control of these universities. These idealistic students and teachers are appalled that previous generations have not solved the ancient problems of war, crime, corruption, poverty, racial prejudice, and religious bigotry. They want to drop everything else, mobilize the campus, and convert it into an instrument of social and political reform, and proceed with the revolution. They want instant peace, honesty, love, contentment, plenty, and all the other characteristics of instant utopia.

Before I became a college president, I occasionally read a book. One field in which I had a peculiar interest was the various Utopian schemes which men have devised for society. Many plans for the perfect society have been written by the world's intellectuals. Some of the better known are:

Plato's *Republic*.

Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*.

Campanella's *City of the Sun*.

Fenelon's *Telemachus*.

Butler's *Erewhon*.

Rabelais' *Abbey of Theleme*.

Bacon's *New Atlantis*.

Andrea's *Christianopolis*.

Cabet's *Icaria*.

Hertzka's *Freeland*.

Most of these, including More's *Utopia*, were written during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The discovery of America inspired these schemes for the perfect society. Land was the basis of the agricultural economy of Europe. The discovery of apparently unlimited land in the New World inspired the intellectuals of the Old World to dream of new societies in which the limitations of the Old World could be cast off and mankind given a second chance at Eden. The ancient, cumbersome and corrupt institutions of the Old World could be left behind and people could start free all over again without the old limitations. Unlimited fertile land, the means of production of agricultural wealth, could mean the end of hunger, nakedness and poverty, and food, clothing and plenty for all. Unlimited new land could mean the end of serfdom, domestic oppression and strife, and of wars over territory. A brave new world seemed to be a possibility.

About a hundred of these Utopian schemes were actually tried during our early history on this continent. A hundred thousand people were involved in these various schemes for the perfect society. Most of you know that Jamestown started as such a socialist society and that for the first two years the Puritans lived, or rather starved, under a communistic theocracy. Others which were tried during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries include: Bohemia Manor, the Community of the Contented, Ephrata, the Shaker Community, Jerusalem, Harmony, Economy, Zoar, New Harmony, Hopedale,

Skaneateles, Brook Farm, Fruitlands, Utopia, Modern Times, Bethel, Aurora, Bishop Hill, Amasa, Oneida, Putney, Icaria, Orderville, and Topolobampo. None worked out as planned. In spite of unlimited freedom, unlimited land, and religious zeal all foundered on the rocks of human imperfection—laziness, greed, selfishness, dishonesty, bigotry, prejudice, hatred, etc.

The typical experience was that of Ephrata started by Johan Beissel in Pennsylvania in 1735—a German Seventh Day Baptist society organized as a communistic, celibate society. They flourished for a while under the economic guidance of three brothers named Eckerling and the spiritual guidance of Father Beissel. Then the three brothers Eckerling insisted on the right to marry so Father Beissel expelled them from the community, and the material prosperity went with them. Then Father Beissel began to fool around with the "spiritual maidens," as the women were called, and caused dissension and disorder; and the material and spiritual prosperity of Ephrata ended. In all the utopian communities someone always ran off with the money, or fooled around with the spiritual maidens and broke up utopia. The problem with utopia is that one can never find perfect people to live therein.

I mention these historical utopian communities because many university students and teachers today are once again intrigued by the discovery of the possibilities of the new technological world and promises they see of another chance at Eden. The historian Arnold Toynbee has observed that the distinctive achievement of the 20th Century is not the discovery of nuclear power or the conquest of space but that for the first time in the history of mankind it is possible with our modern means of production and distribution to adequately feed, clothe, and house everyone on earth. As Toynbee puts it—"The poor need no longer be with us. For the first time man has acquired such mastery over the forces and resources of the earth that he can eliminate poverty on the earth. The modern agriculture and technological revolution has increased the productive power of man a thousand-fold. In agriculture, mining, manufacture, and transportation one man by applying brainpower to controlled energy can often do more than a hundred men could do a decade or two ago.

Many predict this technological revolution will produce more profound changes in society than the Industrial Revolution. All observe that to participate in this cognitive technology will require far more training and education than hitherto required.

We have already found out that there is little place in the new technology for the untrained and uneducated who have nothing to offer but muscle power. This is one reason why we have been expanding and improving our educational program in America. I believe this is the reason also why many have come to believe that more and better education is the answer to all our problems.

In 1876 in his inaugural address President Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins University boasted:

"The opening of a university means a wish for less misery among the poor, less ignorance in the schools, less bigotry in the temple, less suffering in the hospital, less fraud in business, less folly in politics, and among other things it means more wisdom in legislation, more intelligence, more happiness, more religion."

I wonder whether President Gilman would make the same boast if he came back now 95 years later and looked at what is happening in Washington a few miles from Johns Hopkins University.

About 10 years ago when Elvis J. Stahr, Jr. was inaugurated as president of Indiana University he orated:

"Postulate what worthy goals you will for man in this modern world: justice, knowl-

edge, human dignity, economic stability, international concord, the conquest of space, government by and for the people, the opportunity of every child, every man and woman to realize the best that God put in him—and ignorance is the bar, education is the gate, to each such goal."

In 1963 President Lyndon Johnson declared it to be national policy that everyone would be afforded all the education he could take regardless of race, color, national origin, or economic condition. Congress also declared this to be national policy. In Texas John Connally was three times elected Governor with the main plank of his platform being to bring excellence to education in Texas. Education was thought by many to be the solution of all our local, state, and national problems; and much was expected of our growing colleges and universities. We asked for and received billions of dollars in additional support and many more of us—students, faculty, and administrators—began to believe that the colleges and universities were leading the way to the brave new world.

Now a decade after Elvis Stahr spoke, we find that after his experience with a university he left the battle to become president of the Audubon Society. It is no doubt easier to watch birds than students today, and there are days when I envy him. And vast disappointment and disillusionment have set in as to the ability of our colleges and universities to solve our major problems or even to make an immediate significant contribution to their solution.

I for one believe that the colleges and universities of America do not have the means to make a substantial immediate contribution to the solutions of the pressing problems of our nation today, and I do not think they should be expected to do so. Their contribution is not immediate but can be seen only from the perspective of decades as better trained and educated graduates slowly have their effect on society.

Furthermore, most of our modern educational effort is not really relevant to the solution of some of our basic problems. Our educational efforts are primarily directed at communicating knowledge and mental skills and techniques. It is not designed to make people good—less selfish and more compassionate, less bigoted and more tolerant. Increased knowledge and mental skills alone will not make people compassionate, tolerant, charitable, or liberty-loving. Our most pressing national and world problems arise out of racial and religious prejudice, bigotry and hatred, out of man's indifference to the suffering of his fellow man, out of all forms of man's inhumanity to man. If the time ever comes when every American holds a Doctor of Philosophy degree, I seriously doubt if we will be any nearer Utopia than today, and I speak with some experience in working with those who hold Ph.D. degrees. I know a good number of mean, crabby holders of Ph.D. degrees.

Our educational institutions are more concerned with making people smart than good, and it is the failure of people to be good enough that caused the utopian scheme of our early history to fail and which causes most of our problems today.

I don't have the road maps to Utopia, but I know that you can't have Utopia with all problems solved unless you have angels for citizens; and converting ordinary citizens into angel-like citizens is a process that colleges and universities have certainly not mastered. If it is ever perfected, it will certainly not be a quick process with instant results as demanded by many of our present day students and teachers.

For the time being, progress toward the solution of our age-old pressing problems, personally and nationally, comes slow, painfully slow; and a Bachelor's degree even from Texas A&M University is at the most only a commencement of effort on these problems.

However, I for one welcome you to join the Establishment and join in the slow, uncertain, difficult task of building a better Texas and America. We need your help.

ADDRESS BY GEN. JOHN D. RYAN, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE

Dr. Williams, distinguished guests, members of the staff and faculty, cadets of the Corps, ladies and gentlemen—

It is a distinct pleasure for me to offer congratulations to you Air Force and Army ROTC graduates today. As you enter the military profession, you follow in the great tradition of this country, the state of Texas and this educational institution.

As graduates of Texas A&M, you are starting out to fill the boots of great men who have performed notably in all the services of this nation. In the time available today, I could not begin to tell you about all the outstanding Aggies who became leaders in our military services. But, if you're setting your sights of emulating these men, I ought to mention a couple who will serve as examples of the Aggie officer.

Many of you have probably seen "Patton", the recent World War II movie. The movie did not bring out the key part a Texas A&M graduate played in General Patton's remarkable drive through France. The Aggie was Otto P. Weyland, at that time a Brigadier General commanding Nineteenth Tactical Air Command. Patton was willing to leave an exposed flank as he swept towards Germany. When his drive began, he told General Weyland, "I am going to depend on you to protect my right flank with your airplanes." General Weyland did just that. Some 30,000 Germans, who might have driven into Patton's rear, were frustrated by Weyland's fighters and light bombers. For three weeks, the German commander tried to move his divisions to attack, but he could not. Finally, it became obvious to him that to save his organization, he would have to retreat. But the incessant air attacks broke up his forces and demoralized them. A short time later, the German forces surrendered.

O. P. Weyland went on to command tactical air forces in the Korean conflict and then became Commander, Tactical Air Command. He was the first Texas Aggie to achieve four star rank in the Air Force.

Another Aggie who achieved eminence was General Bernard A. Schriever who, in the late 'fifties and early 'sixties, headed up this country's largest and most important military research and development effort.

In 1957 the Russians launched "Sputnik", the first earth-orbiting satellite, indicating the advanced level of their missile development program. The United States needed a program to keep our technological efforts ahead of theirs, and it was needed fast. General Schriever was given the job of developing the nation's long range missile force. He introduced new development-management concepts that were revolutionary at that time. They were used to produce the Thor, Atlas, Titan and Minuteman missiles. General Schriever took a calculated risk in implementing these procedures, but his courage and foresight paid off. The United States was able to successfully field a timely deterrent capability. This ballistic missile capability is, of course, still a viable one. General Schriever also attained four star rank and capped his career by becoming Commander, Air Force Systems Command.

These are but two of the outstanding graduates of this great institution. I have selected them because they exemplify the military contributions made by Texas A&M graduates, whether on the field of battle or in the technical area. There have been many other Aggies who have carried on the tradition of service to country in all the Services. That isn't surprising to anyone who has visited this impressive campus and felt the "Spirit of Aggieland" that permeates the

air. It's the kind of spirit and tradition that inspires a man to do his best. Sometimes, however, I think this spirit might drive some men too far. As a West Pointer, I still haven't gotten over the Army-Aggie football game of two years ago.

I think it is highly significant that, while nation-wide participation in ROTC has declined, it has not declined at Texas A&M. This is directly related to the elite reputation of the Corps of Cadets and the caliber of the young men of the Corps.

Just as there is not time to mention all the outstanding Aggie graduates of past years, there is not time to mention all the outstanding men in this Class. Two who are typical of these are your two leaders, Van Taylor and Tommy Bain. As long as Texas A&M continues to turn out men like them, the Corps will retain its elite status.

When you report to your first duty station and say you are an Aggie—say it proudly. I assure you, your qualifications are well known. We need more than ever before the kind of officer A&M produces. As you enter the Service, I hope you feel needed—because you are.

But there are some elements of our society that would have you believe otherwise. They would have you believe, in fact, that military people are not even wanted. The anti-military movement is felt all over the country. As President Nixon noted—"It is Open Season on the Armed Forces. Military programs are ridiculed as needless, if not deliberate waste. The military profession is derided in some of the so-called best circles of America. Patriotism is considered by some to be a backward fetish of the uneducated and unsophisticated. Nationalism is hailed and applauded as a panacea for the ills of every nation—except the United States."

The focal point of this criticism is the war in Vietnam. Its opponents cannot—or will not—understand its relationship to the interests of the United States. But this is not the first time Americans have protested war. History tells us that there has been citizen opposition to every war we have ever fought. In fact, barely half the population supported the Revolution. It is not surprising, therefore to find a measure of anti-war or anti-military sentiment in America today. It is the American tradition. And we must accept this as a test of our ability to give a forthright account of our military goals and achievements. This we have been trying to do. Sometimes though, it seems a most difficult task.

The irony in this situation is that we in the military constitute the most anti-war group of all. Our first job is to try to prevent war. The big difference between us and other anti-war groups is in the method of prevention. We believe that only by maintaining strong military forces can America prevent potential aggressor nations from making war on us and our allies.

You are entering military life at a time that is crucial for the military and for the nation. On the one hand, we are faced with pressures here at home to further reduce military spending and use the money for domestic needs. On the other hand, we have the growing Soviet threat and to a lesser degree, for the immediate future at least, the threat of Red China.

Let me address the money priority problem first. The best experts in government today indicate there would not be a significant drop in defense expenditures if the war in Vietnam ended tomorrow. We would still have the requirement for force modernization which would place demands on money now being spent in Vietnam. But, even with spending on Vietnam, the defense share of the nation's budget has not changed significantly as a result of the war. Since 1969, the Defense Department share of the federal budget has decreased.

For this coming fiscal year—1972—it represents just 32 percent of the federal budget, the lowest since 1950. In fact, in terms of buying power, the fiscal year 1972 defense budget has decreased 24 percent below the 1968 budget peak while other federal programs have increased 19 percent. So there has been a reordering of national priorities.

Now, I'm not saying that increased spending isn't needed in the domestic sector for programs like poverty, urban renewal and pollution control. I'm simply pointing out that we in the defense business are taking most of the cost of the war out of our own hides—that is, out of other military programs, not out of these domestic programs, and we're doing it while trying to maintain an adequate deterrent to world war.

This brings us to the other crucial factor, which is the need for a strong defense. This is directly related, of course, to the threat we face from potential aggressors. Chief among these is Russia. What are Russia's real intentions towards the United States and the Free World? Over thirty years ago, Winston Churchill said, "I cannot forecast to you the action of Russia. It is a riddle wrapped up in a mystery inside an enigma." Those words still ring true when we speak of Russia's internal operations.

But, in my judgment, there can be little doubt about her external operations—her foreign policy. It seems clear to me that Russia is actively expanding her sphere of interest and trying to reduce our own. Even before the end of World War II, Soviet intransigence at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences signaled that a peaceful world, based upon cooperation of the allies, might not be possible.

Since World War II, Russia has followed a policy of aggression against the Free World. The Soviets have modernized their conventional armed forces and developed a worldwide nuclear attack capability equal to our own.

Today, she has over 40 percent more ICBM launchers than we have, and she is still producing them; we have leveled off. Russian missiles can deliver twice as much megatonnage as ours. They have about 200 long range bombers and over 700 medium range bombers, and have been developing and flying a new swing-wing strategic bomber with greater potential than our own FB-111. Russia has a large submarine fleet and is building nuclear submarines rapidly. Her Navy is cruising the Mediterranean in force and recently began operating in the Indian Ocean, where she has never sent military ships before. She has conducted naval maneuvers in the Caribbean, cruising as close to our shores as Cuba.

Overall, the Warsaw Pact nations continue to modernize their ground and air forces without sacrificing numerical superiority. To say Russia is doing all these things to defend herself against the United States is illogical. For many years, the United States had a clear nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union and we could have overpowered her—but that was not our intention. Rather we were preserving the right of self-determination for those people who wished to remain free. No, the real purpose of the Russian build-up, in my judgment, is clear. It is apparent that we must maintain our Realistic Deterrent in order to discourage aggression.

Now, as you know, we are engaged in Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) with Russia. Our expectations for these can be summed up in the words of Secretary of State Rogers: "These talks could be abortive, they could be highly successful in terms of mankind." He added, "What counts is how successful they are." We in the military support SALT, of course, and we have high hopes for the outcome of the talks.

Don't forget that Russia is not our only potential adversary. The threat to our free-

dom is going to continue for a long time. As long as we face a threat, we are going to need men who are willing to spend their lives in defense of this country. So if you make the military a career, rest assured you are undertaking an important job.

With your help and the backing of the people of this nation, the Armed Forces of the United States will be able to successfully defend the country. To do this, we are constantly improving the quality of our Armed Forces. At the same time, the size of the military establishment is shrinking—so this improvement in quality is doubly important.

The key to quality is people—people like you new Second Lieutenants. We are doing all we can to make the Services attractive to intelligent, motivated, able young people. Let me describe some of the improvements being made in all the Services to improve the quality of military life. To begin with, we are increasing starting pay to compete with industry. We realize it doesn't do much good to say, "Just stick with us a few years and you'll catch up with your classmates in industry." You want to start out on a par with them.

We are improving housing for both married and single officers, and we hope to increase off-base housing allowances this year. We hope soon that we can permit bachelor officers who want to live off-base to do so. At present, bachelor officers generally are required to live on-base.

We are paying more attention to what the young officer has to say, what he thinks, and what he wants to do. Junior officers today play a larger part than ever in air base management. In addition, most Army and Air Force bases have Junior Officers' Councils which meet with commanders to discuss problems of military life and offer solutions and advice.

Just as everything in life is more challenging these days, the services are increasing the challenge faced by the young officer. We do this by moving him up in the middle management structure faster than we used to. For example, in the 'fifties an Air Force officer would labor five to six years to make Captain. Now it's only three years of active duty. And so on up the promotion ladder.

By speeding up promotions, we accomplish two things. First, of course, we increase the young man's pay at a faster rate. Second, by promoting him we increase his responsibilities and find out how well he can "cut the mustard". Those who can't cut it are offered the opportunity of pursuing another career while they are still young enough to make the transition easily. Those who can cut it continue to advance in grade. And those who can really cut it—the fast burners—move ahead at an accelerated pace. Under the latest Air Force promotion criteria, it is possible for a man in the last category to be promoted to full Colonel in only 13 to 15 years, compared to the 21 years it normally takes.

Turning to the future, what is ahead for each of you? Will man, as the essential element in war, be eliminated by the advance of technology, as some have predicted? Will there be a place for man in the military a few years hence?

I think so. The U.S. Army is forging ahead with some exciting new concepts of warfare that are light years removed from the old concepts of trench and foxhole warfare. One of these is the so-called "automated battlefield", described a few months ago by General Westmoreland. Utilizing technology proved in Vietnam—sensors, radar, communications, night vision devices and automatic data processing—commanders will be able to run a ground battle with precision never before possible. However, the complex gadgetry must be directed and operated by men.

In the Air Force, we are developing new fighters like this F-15 and A-X and bombers like the B-1. We will soon have a new Air-

borne Warning and Control System (AWACS), aircraft and new tactical transports to complement the strategic airlift capability of the C-5.

Beyond the seventies, we will enter the hypersonic flight age. Flights at more than 4,000 miles an hour, now attainable only by experimental aircraft, will not be uncommon. We are already looking at space shuttles— aerospace vehicles able to operate in space or in the earth's atmosphere. All of these things will require outstanding performance from outstanding young men, whether they are pilots, research or project engineers, supply officers, or personnel experts. The challenge is there.

Before I close, let me remind you that the reason the United States needs military hardware and employs military people is not to wage war, but to deter it. Your goal as military officers, like mine, is peace. Our country is constantly striving toward this goal. President Nixon expressed this thought in his Inaugural Address. He said, "... The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker. This honor now beckons America—the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil and on to that high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of civilization. If we succeed, generations to come will say of us now living that we mastered our moment, that we helped make the world safe for mankind. This is our summons to greatness."

Thank you and good luck.

ADDRESS BY DR. JACK K. WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT,
TEXAS A. & M. UNIVERSITY

At this point in these proceedings, I have the privilege and deep satisfaction of welcoming this class of graduates into the larger body of Texas A&M former students—an ever-increasing group of distinguished ladies and gentlemen which now numbers approximately 50,000. This great group of former students extends you fraternal greetings and wishes you well.

From this day in your life, you are a part of the public embodiment of the aspirations of Texas A&M University. As such, you are charged herewith to do your full share toward the fulfillment of the dreams of those who founded this great university—dreams that would have you encourage the love of truth and stand in unwavering strength against its detractors—dreams that would commit you to use your education as a force directed against ignorance, poverty, and the inhumanity of the unreasoning conscience.

For its part, your alma mater pledges to you that it will protect in every academic and ethical way the full measure of respect and acceptability which your A&M diploma does now and must always carry.

Certainly, you take your diploma into a world faced with problems of depressing magnitude—a world wherein the enemies of human freedom and human dignity are numerous and have great strength. As greatly gifted men and women, you and your colleagues in this nation have in your hands the lamp of freedom. If that lamp is extinguished in our great nation, then humanity will grope in darkness.

I close these remarks with a reminder that knowledge and intellectual grasp are not perfect possessions and may not be expected to flourish unattended. Knowledge must be fed continuously with new knowledge; and intellectual grasp must be considered of the moment, not of the age.

For knowledge is, on the one hand, an awareness of things done and, on the other, an awareness of the things to be done. Intellectual grasp is, on the one hand, a source of pride in what one understands and, on the other, a source of humility in the realization of what one has yet to understand.

These priceless possessions—knowledge and intellectual grasp—are cutting tools with which each of you may shape a life of usefulness, a life worthy of being remembered, a life that will bring you the deep contentment which comes only to the courageous, the faithful, and those who labor in the selfishness of service.

Good fortune and Godspeed to each of you.

IRS OFFICIALS WELL EQUIPPED TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ON PRICES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, many small businessmen in my district are concerned as to how to comply with the present regulations of the wage-price freeze regarding costs, wages, price increases, and posting prices without going out of business. The following article highlights some of the confusion:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1971]

IRS OFFICIALS WELL-EQUIPPED TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ON PRICES

(By David E. Rosenbaum)

WASHINGTON, November 20.—Say you own a hardware store. Can you raise prices and increase profits on hammers and take a loss on screw drivers?

"Yes," said the Internal Revenue Service office in Jamaica, Queens, "as long as you don't increase your usual mark-up for that line of goods and don't increase the profit margin of your whole store."

"No," said the office in Hackensack, N.J. "You can raise the price of any item 2.5 per cent if your costs go up, and that's it."

"We don't know," said a woman in a Chicago office after checking with her boss. "Why don't you call back in a few days when we have better directives."

Thus, at the end of the first week of the Government's economic stabilization program, many of the Federal officials who are charged with answering the public's inquiries about the program are still confused.

CONFUSING NOT SURPRISING

The confusion is not surprising. The Government agents in the field have been given nothing to go on except copies of the official regulations, which are written in legalese, and sketchy questions and answers prepared by the Cost of Living Council, the Pay Board and the Price Commission.

Considering this handicap, the officials, especially in the large cities, are remarkably well informed. At both offices checked in New York City—the one in Jamaica and the one on Church Street in Manhattan—the agents gave the correct answers to all the questions they were asked.

In addition to the one about hammers and screwdrivers, the following questions were posed:

"Can I raise the salary of some of my employes more than 5.5 per cent if, over all, my payroll doesn't go up any more than that percentage?"

"Can I pay Christmas bonuses this year, since we had such a profitable year, even though I didn't pay bonuses last year when we didn't have much profit?"

"One of the fellows who work here lives in a big apartment building. His landlord is claiming he can raise his rent because some of the other apartments in the building were going for the higher rent before the freeze. Is the landlord right?"

A DIFFICULT QUESTION

The hammers and screw drivers questions is a difficult one. The Price Commission's guidelines do not address the question specifically, although the answer can be derived from a careful reading of the regulations.

The rule, according to officials at the Price Commission, is that the over-all mark-up on a category of goods cannot be raised. Within the category, the mark-up may go up or down. Further, the entire profit margin of the store, as a percentage of the store's sales, cannot go up, although the profit margin on any single item could be increased.

Hammers and screw drivers are clearly within the same category of items, so their prices may go up or down as long as the over-all rules are not violated.

The 2.5 per cent figure that was cited by the agent in Hackensack and several other offices as the maximum allowable price increase is, in fact, a national goal set by the Price Commission, not a limitation on any company or individual.

Most officials knew the right answer to the question about raising one employe more than another, stating that this could be done as long as the over-all payroll for the store did not go up by more than 5.5 per cent.

MORE OF A PROBLEM

The rent question posed more of a problem. "New guidelines are coming out, but, as of now, no rents can be raised," said the woman in Chicago.

The correct answer was read by the agent in Duluth, Minn., directly from the Price Commission's questions and answers:

"If at least 10 per cent of similar apartments were being rented for a higher price during the period from July 16 to Aug. 13, the landlord may raise the rent to that level if the lease permits the increase."

The question about Christmas bonuses also stopped a number of offices.

The correct answer, supplied by about half of the officials, was that the bonus may be paid if it was the past practice of the employer to pay bonuses. If the hardware store owner had paid a bonus in other good years, then he can pay the bonus again this year.

And several of the agents provided additional information with their answers:

"Listen, I'd go ahead and pay the Christmas bonuses," an I.R.S. official in a Rocky Mountain State suggested. "You're not going to complain, and your employes aren't going to. So even if you're paying a little more than what is absolutely allowed, nothing's ever going to happen."

A THANKSGIVING MESSAGE

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly assaulted these days with reports of how much is wrong with our country. In the interest of maintaining some perspective on conditions, a radio commentator in my area chose the Thanksgiving season to editorialize on the many advantages and blessings we enjoy. For the consideration of all my colleagues, I submit the commentary of Michael Morgan for station WHAM in Rochester, N.Y.:

WHAM RADIO 1180 EDITORIAL

Thanksgiving is a time for gratitude . . . gratitude for the freedoms and blessings we enjoy.

To put those freedoms and blessings into perspective, we quote from an editorial originally aired on WKRC, Cincinnati:

Suppose you woke up one morning, and overnight, the following things had happened in the United States:

All paychecks slashed seventy-five percent . . . forty million TV sets destroyed . . . fourteen out of every fifteen miles of paved highway torn up . . . sixty million Americans transferred back to the farms . . . sixty percent of our steelmaking capacity abandoned, along with two-thirds of our petroleum industry . . . nineteen out of every twenty cars junked . . . two out of every three miles of railroad track torn up . . . nine out of every ten telephones ripped out, and seven out of ten houses torn down.

By doing all this, the United States would be on a level with Soviet Russia.

Without mentioning the basic freedom that goes into making this country what it is, we have plenty to be thankful for.

VFW RESOLUTION

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Golden Heart Post No. 3629 in Fairbanks, Alaska, recently held a special meeting where they unanimously passed a resolution urging President Nixon and the U.S. Congress to reassess the role of the United States in the United Nations and cease U.S. foreign aid to any U.N. member who opposed the United States on the crucial China question.

Because the issue of the admission of the Peoples Republic of China has caused such great controversy, it is important that concerned citizens be given the opportunity to express their opinions and offer constructive suggestions for the future course of American policy.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has expelled a loyal member of the U.N., the Nationalist Republic of China; and

Whereas Nationalist China has been a peace-loving nation, an ally of the United States, and has faithfully discharged all of its United Nations Charter obligations; and

Whereas this expulsion has been termed "dangerous" by the United States Ambassador to the U.N., and can only be injurious to the nations comprising the free world; and

Whereas the United Nations has admitted Communist China, an avowed foe of the United States and the rest of the free world, to its membership; and

Whereas rule in Communist China is maintained by terror and mass execution, and its Communist government does not legitimately represent the beliefs of most of the people of mainland China; and

Whereas Communist China now has a seat on the U.N. Security Council and can veto any positive action by the United Nations; and

Whereas the United States has been the financial mainstay of the U.N., paying far in excess of its proper share of the cost of U.N. housekeeping activities; and

Whereas U.S. foreign aid has assisted many of the countries which voted against the United States position on the two-China question; and

Whereas this vote, as well as other hostile actions by U.S.-aided countries, clearly demonstrates that our policy of foreign assistance has not worked as intended; and

Whereas the United States is now under unprecedented peacetime wage and price controls and the American people have been asked to make numerous sacrifices to bolster the economy; and

Whereas free nations all over the world will lose confidence in the United States if action is not taken to counter this devastating U.N. vote;

Therefore Be It Resolved by Golden Heart Post No. 3629, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Fairbanks, Alaska, that President Nixon and the United States Congress are urged to carefully reassess the value of United States membership in the United Nations with the possible goal in mind of the U.S. withdrawal from the questionable international organization, and in any event, to cease U.S. foreign aid to any U.N. member which opposed the United States on the crucial China question.

ESTUARINE RESOURCE TECHNOLOGY

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in order for our Nation to meet the environmental challenge, it is imperative that educational institutions begin to offer the basic practical programs which will train individuals to work on the complex, technological problem which threatens our ecosystem.

The biological complexity of the estuary, for example, can only be fully understood by a specialist who devotes his major efforts to this unique marine area.

The Charles County Community College in La Plata, Md., has developed a program on estuarine resource technology which is designed to meet the crying need for highly trained manpower in this field. This is a commendable program and I would like to insert for the information of my colleagues a brief description of the curriculum and its intended results.

The article follows:

ESTUARINE RESOURCE TECHNOLOGY

America's coastlines are fringed by a maze of wetlands, commonly identified as bays, sloughs, inlets, sounds, salt marshes and lagoons. These sprawling areas where salt and fresh water meet are estuaries.

These fertile and productive zones provide habitats, spawning grounds, and nursery areas for a wide variety of fish, shellfish, migratory birds and animals. It is estimated that three quarters of the commercial fish and shellfish are produced or nurtured in estuarine areas.

Today the estuaries are threatened by both man and nature. Man, with his pollution is probably the biggest threat. Estuaries too often receive untreated municipal and industrial waste and heavy silt loads from construction of homes, highways and factories. Biologically, chemically, and physically, estuaries are among the most complex of all environmental systems, and highly specialized training is required to produce personnel familiar with the problems and techniques of estuarine investigation.

The Estuarine Resource Technology program at Charles County Community College

is designed to meet this challenge by training in two years, a well rounded research aide, capable of performing a wide variety of field and laboratory functions in the estuarine environment. A manpower requirement study conducted for the college by a consulting firm prior to initiation of the program, revealed a current and increasing need for this type of technician.

The curriculum will include conventional academic course work with an emphasis on field and the sciences, and is unique in its focus on practical field studies conducted in small groups. The student's performance will be constantly evaluated in a manner similar to that he would be subjected to by a future employer.

At the end of two years the student will be a well qualified research aide ready to join a working group. He will, of course, have an option to continue for a four year degree in a related field of biology or chemistry. Elements of the curriculum have therefore been selected to provide for transfer with minimum loss of academic credits.

Beginning with his first semester and continuing throughout the program, the student will work with modern "state-of-the-art" field and laboratory equipment. A 50 foot diesel-powered Navy utility boat and two 19 foot outboards have been equipped to perform all types of estuarine study, an a 25 foot mobile laboratory trailer will be positioned as needed to support field activities.

The curriculum is presented in the tables which follow:

THE SUGGESTED CURRICULUM

Course	Credit hours	
	1st semester	2d semester
Freshman year:		
Theory and Techniques of Field Sampling (Bio. 100)	2	
Principles of Estuarine Ecology (Bio. 107)		4
Concepts of Biology (Bio. 105)	3	
Technical Mathematics (Math. 150)	4	
Technical Mathematics II (Math. 151)		4
General Chemistry (Chem. 120)	4	
General Chemistry (Chem. 121)		4
Composition and Rhetoric (Eng. 101)	3	
Business and Professional Speaking (SPH 103)		3
Total	16	15
Sophomore year:		
Applied Estuarine Ecology (Ert. 201)	4	
Estuarine Problem Analysis (Ert. 202)		4
Microbiology (Bio. 201)	4	
Report Writing (Eng. 205)	3	
Instrumentation Laboratory (Chem. 105)		3
Industrial Waste Control (Pat. 205)		3
Introduction to Statistics (Math. 230)		3
Wastewater Operations (Pat. 103)		3
Sanitary Chemistry (Chem. 252)	3	
Fishery Biology (Bio. 210)—optional		1.3
Water Safety and First Aid (Ped. 109)	1	
Total	15	16

¹ Summer only.

Note: Problems in Estuarine Research (Bio. 199) (2 credits)—by arrangement with faculty.

BIOLOGY COURSE OFFERINGS

Principles of Biology.
Concepts of Biology.
Aquatic Ecology and Water Pollution.
Microbiology.
Introduction to Marine Biology.
Human Physiology.
Descriptive Physical Oceanography.
Experimental Ecology.
Marine Instrumentation.
Estuarine Geology.
Human Genetics.
Marine Geology.
Fisheries Biology.
Fishery Management.
Teachers Workshop: 1. Ecology; 2. Environmental Science.
Principles of Estuarine Ecology.
Theory & Techniques of Field Sampling.

NO DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION FOR
RED CHINA—II**HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Jules Monnerot, in "Sociology and Psychology of Communism," said:

If, in spite of everything, opponents (of the communists) continue to hope against hope, it is a good sign. It then becomes possible to exploit the human tendency to confuse desire—in this case the desire for peace at any price—with reality. The technique consists in keeping the desire supplied with illusions to attach itself to.

My last newsletter pointed out that of the 119 nations having diplomatic relations with either the Republic of China or Red China, not one had diplomatic relations with both. It is apparent that diplomatic relations with one of these two governments excludes diplomatic relations with the other. Even relations at the consular level are with one or the other, but not both. Of the three nations having only consular relations with either Nationalist or Red China, none has relations with both.

The reason for the mutually exclusive nature of relations with these governments is simple. Both governments claim to be the sole legitimate representatives of the Chinese people. The animosity existing between the Nationalists and Communists has, if anything, increased over the years as relatives and friends of those who were forced to flee the mainland have been ruthlessly eliminated by Mao Tse-tung in his continuous purging of the Chinese people—see newsletter 71-33. The Communists also understand that the island of Taiwan is an essential increment in the strategic Western defense perimeter of the United States, that it serves as an important logistical base for opposition to Communist aggression in the Indochina area; that it is the hub of our intelligence-gathering activities directed toward the mainland; that the existence of the Republic of China serves as a rallying point and symbol of hope for the vast influential overseas Chinese community, various anti-Communist groups on the mainland, and for the oppressed Chinese people in general; and that their conquest of the Republic of China would serve to establish absolute Communist dominance over all of Asia.

The Red Chinese have not shifted their position on the matter of the Republic of China 1 inch in 20 years. Two days after the U.N. vote which expelled the Republic of China, Radio Peking reiterated this position. While scornfully characterizing the actions of United States and Japanese representatives at the U.N. as "running hither and thither, just like ants on a hot pan," Radio Peking stated:

Taiwan is an inalienable part of the territory of the People's Republic of China, and all arguments such as "two China," "one China, one Taiwan," "the status of Taiwan remains to be determined" and similar absurdities are illegal, absurd and entirely untenable.

CXVII—2726—Part 33

The next day the Communist People's Daily in Peking added this demand:

The United States must withdraw all its armed forces and military installations from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait. The Chinese people are determined to liberate their sacred territory of Taiwan.

Translated out of the Marxist-Leninist jargon this means that the Chinese Communists plan to conquer the Republic of China and to make this possible we must leave the area. It should be pointed out that the Red China have a standing army five times as large as that of the Republic of China and have deployed 25 to 30 medium range ballistic missiles, some reportedly targeted on the Republic of China.

The conflict between the Republic of China and Red China is insoluble as long as the Communist Party of China continues to engage in its crushing regimentation of the Chinese people living on the mainland and to openly threaten aggression against the Republic of China. Any support for one side correspondingly weakens the other.

Diplomatic recognition of the Communists as the legitimate government of mainland China would not only result in severing relations with the Republic of China, but would immensely strengthen the Chinese Communists internally, increasing their economic and military strength. It is fascinating to observe the glaring inconsistency of those who argue on the one hand that we should sever diplomatic relations with nations such as Greece, with the obvious implication that our extension of diplomatic recognition benefits the government of the "Greek colonels" of which they disapprove, and on the other hand downplay or deny the equally obvious fact that diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communists by the United States would be an invaluable benefit to Mao.

While the Republic of China can survive without membership in the U.N. as do South Korea, West Germany, and so forth, menaced as it is by Peking it could not long survive should the United States seal it into total isolation by establishing diplomatic relations with Red China. One would think that those who give long speeches denouncing "neoisolationist" attitudes in the United States would understand this.

There can be no "two-China" policy, especially for the United States. While some might desire that it be otherwise, it is truly a fatal illusion.

FINANCING THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress has been wrapped up with the developments in the United Nations. The vote to unseat the Government of Nationalist China and admit the government of Peking brought cries of outrage in this body, along with shouts of praise.

Many observers feel our reaction was expressed in debate over the foreign aid bill, and our threats to realine our payments to the world body.

Mr. Speaker, there is increasing doubt as to the wisdom of the United States bearing a disproportionate share of the burdens of keeping the United Nations running in a time when this society is faced with a financial crisis of its own.

An excellent article, written by Dick Davis for the Contra Costa Times on November 11, 1971, deals with this very issue and an idea expressed by my good friend, Senator ALAN CRANSTON.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in hopes it may provide food for thought to my colleagues:

U.S. Senator Alan Cranston proposes weighting the voting system in the United Nations so that the present one-nation, one-vote system would be revised.

At about the same time Cranston was making his proposal in Washington, The Times received a letter from Lillian Spicer of 70 Cora Court, Walnut Creek.

"Ordinarily, a large number of people do not enjoy reading a list of statistics," she writes, "One list, though, which may prove of interest to many people today, very well could show just how, financially-wise, the UN stands.

"Why not show the debts, paid and/or owed by each country involved, starting with when the UN first began and totalling the amounts as of today? Such an organization costs a tremendous amount of money to be in existence.

"This could prove to be most enlightening about the countries which have the greatest number of votes and which ones actually pay for the privilege of having the right to vote.

"How about it, Mr. Editor, would you be willing to use some extra space and research time in finding and listing this information for the average and very much concerned citizens of this country?"

We would indeed. However, we understand that NBC's Nightly News Program, originating in New York, just the other night showed how far behind both Russia and the United States are in their payments, with Russia still owing about half its indebtedness.

From the beginning of the UN in 1946 through 1970, total spending by the United Nations and related agencies totalled \$9.2 billion. The United States has spent \$3.8 billion in support, or carried 41 per cent of the financial load during this quarter-century period.

But let's put Senator Cranston's and Mrs. Spicer's basic arguments together and see what happens.

Suppose, for instance, nations are assessed payments to the United Nations based on their population. Wouldn't this overcome the current arguments against the United States contributing a disproportionately heavy share to keep the UN operating?

Or is this too idealistic since the Soviet Union has always found some reason for being displeased with the UN when it comes time to pay its share of the assessments?

And what of Red China? Does it value UN membership to the extent of agreeing to pay its fair share of an assessment based on population? Or would such a change cause mainland China to refuse to take its seat?

Quite possibly there is some merit in Senator Cranston's proposal since countries currently representing only 4 per cent of the world's population, if his figures are accurate, constitute a majority of the UN voting power.

"One suggestion," Cranston said, "is distributing the vote in accordance with population, with ceiling and basement limits. There

might be one vote for each country with population up to 5 million and one vote for every 5 million people after that, up to a ceiling limit."

Cranston suggests a maximum of 30 votes, and under his formula this is the number China, India, the United States and Soviet Union each would have. Of course, the Soviet Union would add 10 more votes—nine from the Ukraine and one from Byelorussia.

There would be 462 votes in the 131-nation General Assembly, with 87 nations retaining one vote and 44 having additional votes.

Cranston believes his resolution would be backed by at least 60 Senators. There is no indication of how the Nixon administration would react.

All of this, at this particular time, however, becomes just a bit premature and academic since it couldn't be introduced to the UN General Assembly before September, 1972.

Meanwhile, it should be suggested to our elected representatives in Congress that they look into the possibility of having UN expenses shared—on the basis of population.

It might also be suggested that unless the Soviet Union ponies up with its overdue debt to the UN, the United States can hardly be blamed for trimming its contributions considerably.

Equalizing assessments within the United Nations, based on populations of the countries represented, would be not only reasonable. It would remove the stigma from the United States for having to carry a disproportionate amount of this financial load.

Then all nations could be truly equal in the UN, couldn't they? Provided, of course, they are prepared to pay their dues and past-due bills forthwith.

WILD HORSES OF THE WESTERN PLAINS

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I support the proposed legislation to preserve and protect the wild horses of the Western Plains. It is essential legislation. The legislation will impose upon the Secretary of the Interior with the cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture the duty of conservation and protection of free-roaming horses and burros on specific areas of the ranges in the Western States. The proposed legislation provides for a nine-member Joint Advisory Board which will be obligated to report to the Secretary of the Interior with recommendations of care, custody, and protection of wild horses and burros on the last of the frontiers of the West.

Similar legislation has been passed by the Senate—S. 1116. The matter is now in conference. It is legislation of merit. It provides for protection of a species of wildlife that is historically synonymous with the "Wild West." It provides for reasonable enforcement of penalties for wrongful and willful slaughter of wild horses. The bison and buffalo became the victims of uncontrolled conservation management of the plains and prairies as the West was settled. The native species of the Western Plains is now protected in the national parks of America. I am hopeful that the pending legislation will be promptly enacted to protect the wild horses of the Western Plains. The failure

to do so will ultimately result in the inhumane extinction of wildlife that was once so characteristic of the plains of the West. There is no substitute for constructive conservation. I am a cosponsor of the legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support the legislation. The useless destruction of free-roaming wild horses as a sport is repulsive to reasonable men everywhere. It is an insult to our ancestry. It is a disgrace to the living. It is a loss to our country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time for action. Wild horses are born free under the big sky of the Western prairies. They have no protection from the natural elements of the habitat and the severity of the changing seasons. But they are entitled to protection from the highly mechanized hunt, abuse, and bullet of the few that are destined to destroy—for pleasure or whatever.

I joined in sponsoring essential legislation to conserve the wildlife of the Western Plains. I am pleased that hundreds of young people from my State have supported my effort for conservation and preservation of wildlife. I have received many, many letters from schoolchildren and recently I received a petition with the signatures of 262 young Americans that have the self-initiative to care about the future of the heritage of this great land. I include the petition at this point in the official RECORD—and I ask in the names of young Americans everywhere that the Members of this House of the people act today in the interest of conservation and preservation of all natural habitat and wildlife in the interest of those that constitute a new generation that will be truly the future custodians and guardians of the heritage of America.

The petition and names follow:

PETITION, JULY 10, 1971

We, the undersigned, do protest the killing of the mustangs:

Lori Hamilton, Doris Hamilton, Ranae Julin, Mrs. Walter Marynke, Madeline M. Julin, Marcia Julin, Mildred Holland, Marcia Holland, Mr. and Mrs. K. E. Benson.

Vilma L. Hansen, Carol Austin, Jane M. Austin, Charles M. Austin, Lora Austin, Clarice Tschetter.

R. W. Tschetter, Jack D. Hamilton, Jolene Albers, Mrs. C. J. Vanvelzen, Mrs. R. E. Ageton, Leslie Forshe, Jeanne Richter, Janice Richter, Joe Alick.

Arlene Frazier, Linda Frazier, Pan Voels, Debbie VanWyhe, Randy S. Sunby, Marlene Albers, Kathy Briggie, Colleen Flickbohm.

Pam Briggie, Debbie Sunby, Sue Keim, Nancy Leaders, Pam Parker, Sonja Thoreson.

Peggy Lueders, Dave Cauley, Linda Meyer, Gretchen Frick, Tom Burke, Don Decker, Steven Eujen.

Marian B., Paul D., Kris U., Terry Keiser, Mark Amundson, Tony Nelson, Terry Gunderson.

John Egan, Bill Shields, Russel Gorrell, Crystal Whitely, Marlene Whitely, L. Smith, Scott Thompson, J. Nicolay, Cathy Hansen, Jean Mickelson.

Renita Mobler, Michel Gustafson, Steve Jarman, Ina Erickson, Jan Eisenhauer, Craig Sanford, Jim Helund.

Mrs. R. Ageton, Sam Britts, Roger Brown, Kevin McKenzie, Mary Jo Fisher, Julie Muncie, Jim Devore.

Bobby Leafstedt, Barb Harmon, Dristy Wiese, Dris Stapleton, Sue Egan, Renee Harp, Barb Kautz, Chari Tschetter, Paul Christensen.

Allen Gullickson, Tami Jibben, Steve Nel-

son, Joyce Smits, Jackie Gregersen, Shirley Motzen, Lois Slack.

Sharon Pike, Kenneth M. Imminger, Craig L. Lueders, Marshall Hoffman, Scott Christensen, John Matthias, Paul Bennet.

Tom Wolles, Jerome Ranek, M. Degen, R. E. DeRoad, Kathy Willis, Debbie Letcher, Kay Waag, Emily Harrington, Charis Kuper.

Katie Jameson, Sue Joyce, Barb Cole, Becky Gappa, Jody Peterson, G. Thompson, Greg Julson.

Tom Torgerson, Rick Stauffacher, Jeff DeSchepper, Mrs. Geo. Graham, Mrs. R. L. Lueders, Gene Rinck, Magnus Jensen, Orlin Berge.

Hollie Jackson, R. H. Craig, Mrs. Avis Loore, Cher Knock, Cattie Tobin, Jim Verdoor, Steve Lueders.

Mrs. David Strom, Frank Visch, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Hubbard, C. J. Fishback, Mr. and Mrs. D. K. Jorgensen, Mr. and Mrs. Zach Aberle.

Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Larson, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Peterson, Mr. and Mrs. Max Pierce, Mrs. Harold Krueger, Roland L. Lueders, Sheila Clausen, Michele Bucknell, Carol Col-lison.

Theresa Garry, Mrs. Roger Poling, Cindy Friessen, Mrs. Phil Miedema, Sharon Moore, Jane Thomas, Karen Smith, Pam Skinner, Ed Wiederstein.

Marilyn Nelson, Karen Arneson, Mike Duncan, I. Kondert, Sue Willinger, Stanly Porter, Beth Oube.

Jane Rud, Steve Nelson, Pat Thurmond, Jim Swanson, Marilyn Schumaker, S. Strumm, Vicki Thingelstad, Michal T.

Mary Gullant, Rebecca Richards, D. Olson, George Lee, Jane Meese, Glenda Cummings, Irene Mathews, Candy Bellmann.

Donna J. Rovang, Jackie Wells, Mary Holm, Reid Hanson, Steve Zellman, Lynne Craig, Eudora Stegner.

Lorris Dodge, Marlene Hardick, Karen Hatlestad, Renee' Peterson, Vicki Warner, David Granberg, Lynn Warner.

Mrs. Magnus Jensen, John O., Lucille M. Aukes, Mrs. B. Grontham, Mrs. Michael Batten, Ron Douthet, Lawrence Satterlee, Olive Gillespie, Wendy Covington.

Judi Holte, Joanne Thompson, Becky Sanders, Daniel Kruse, Barbara Pohl, Le Anne Sungreve.

Poppy Lear, Gale Hansen, Laurel Watson, Richard Richards, Michelle Koehn, Jim Rose, Elaine Schumacher, Gretchen Huchthausen.

C. Skutstad, Judy Wengers, Randy Pittmann, Rick Scott, Jeff McIntyre, Jeff Wighstreet, Robert Denny, Greg Anderson, Sam Boone.

David Kuhlmeier, Michele Bucknell, Cindy Mutch, Carol Buhler, Cathy Begey, Bev Peterson, Mary Duffek, Lois Dejong.

Tammy Ford, R. Julin, John Harrington, Mrs. J. L. Miller, Angela Miller, Lloyd Stivers, C. Kapp.

Mrs. Ronald G. Holthe, Mrs. Bill Hayduk, Marsha Stene, Mrs. Don Sundby, Mrs. Eldo Stene, Mrs. Ole Stene, Patty Albers, Myrna Stene.

Wayne Bryan, Vicki Holthe, Mrs. Gary Westling, Jody Grimes, Brad Hues, Tammie Harmon, Connie Jensen, Alan Blyn.

Gloria Gunderson, Sara Thompson, Karen Gaffney, Don Levsen, Karen Majeske, Jan Dodge, Julie Aning, David Kuhlmeier, Royce R. Huber.

POST EXCHANGE, PX SCANDALS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee has recently issued a report strongly crit-

ical of the Army in connection with the scandals connected with the operations of post exchanges and service clubs.

The Army has apparently missed the point of the hearings, because it has placed at the head of its investigations unit Col. Henry Tufts, the officer the Senate subcommittee believes presided over a whitewash of the scandals.

Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register, has written two articles concerning this report and I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

SENATE REPORT CONDEMNS ARMY
STANDARDS IN VIETNAM
(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A 300-page congressional report on "Fraud on Corruption in the Management of Military Club Systems" stands as a strong condemnation of standards of conduct of the Army in Vietnam when it was commanded by Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

The report is also a condemnation of Army Chief of Staff Westmoreland's lack of cooperation with the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee during the more than two years of its investigation.

Associate counsel Lavern J. Duffy has documented his investigation in the face of Army denials and resistance to demands for information.

The report begins with efforts by Duffy and other investigators to obtain copies of Criminal Investigation Division (CID) investigative reports from Augsburg, Germany. The CID material linked Sgt. Maj. William Woodriddle and a little band of sergeants with alleged looting of slot machines in military clubs in Europe.

TRANSFER TO UNITED STATES

After a look at the European operation, the report follows the assignment of the "Khaki Mafia" from Europe to Fort Benning, Ga., where the operation was pretty much as it had been in Europe. The CID in the United States was ineffective primarily because access to reports of the earlier Augsburg probe was banned by the office of Provost Marshal General Carl Turner.

Initially, Turner told his subordinates that the order to hold the Augsburg file came from Gen. Harold K. Johnson, then the Army chief of staff. However, later, under oath before the committee, Turner testified the decision was made by him and not by Johnson.

There were men like Warrant Officer Reis Kash, of the CID, who wanted to push the inquiry but they were handicapped by orders for a "restrictive" interview with Woodriddle and his associates.

The Fort Benning case was closed on Jan. 16, 1968, with out the CID officer having been given access to the reports of the earlier Augsburg investigation. Woodriddle remained in the Army and he was transferred to Vietnam where he was to serve as the command sergeant major for the Military Assistance Command.

Woodriddle's actions in Vietnam finally resulted in a federal grand jury in the central district of California handing down a 21-count indictment against him and a half dozen other sergeants for alleged conspiracy to defraud the United States, false and fraudulent claims against the United States, bribery of public officials and concealment of material facts.

The case took nearly two years to unwind. Some of the delay was attributed to decisions by Army Secretary Stanley Resor and his Army counsel's office to resist the efforts of the Senate subcommittee to obtain access to CID reports. Acting Chairman Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn) and Counsel Duffy argued that access to the reports was essential because only in the CID reports could they ob-

tain a clear look at the facts as presented at the time some of the crucial decisions were being made regarding the coverup of the sergeant's activities.

MORAL ATMOSPHERE

"At issue in the matter of corruption of military personnel is another consideration one step removed from the simple giving and taking of bribes," the report said. "It is the moral atmosphere this kind of behavior creates within the American military community.

"If laws and ethics can be openly violated with impunity in one part of military life—in the operation of NCO clubs for example—the lawlessness and unethical practices may be initiated elsewhere," the report said.

The report noted that one sergeant extended his tour of duty in Germany to continue to enjoy illicit profits. The extended tours of duty were arranged by paying off assignments clerks in Washington.

"The corruption that began in the club system, therefore, extended to personnel assignments branch of the Department of the Army," the report stated.

The laxity of Westmoreland's office involved the complaints against Brig. Gen. Earl F. Cole, and his assignment to command the Army Exchange System in Europe. The assignment was approved by Westmoreland, who was a personal friend, despite evidence in the CID files that later resulted in Duffy closing in on Cole.

In July, 1970, Cole was demoted to colonel, stripped of his Distinguished Service Medal and retired from the Army. The committee report went through the chronology of events to demonstrate that the Army had notified the Senate committee that all charges against Cole had been dropped in February 1970.

VIETNAM IGNORED

However, as soon as the Army discovered that Duffy had new information dealing with Cole's activity in Vietnam and in Europe, there was renewed aggressiveness within the military service on the Cole case and he was ushered out.

The specific charge against Cole was that he "failed to maintain a high degree of personal and professional integrity" when he commanded the European post exchange system during 1969.

By focusing on Cole's European activities, the Army downplayed Cole's Vietnam tour when he was directly under the command of Westmoreland in Vietnam.

Although Cole was reduced in rank and stripped of his medal for his conduct in Europe, there was no Army judgment against him in connection with his activities during his tour in Vietnam.

Certainly, there were strong questions concerning Cole's handling of complaints by Maj. Clement St. Martin regarding allegations about the favoritism accorded to William Crum, multi-million dollar-a-year vendor of slot machines, beer and liquor in the Far East.

Also, there was strong evidence questioning actions by Cole to aid Crum on illegal importation of automobiles through use of the club purchase orders and club storage facilities.

The United States Army has made a point that corruption is a normal part of dealing with the Vietnamese government. Reading the 300-page congressional report raises the same questions concerning the U.S. Army activities in Vietnam.

CID HEAD CRITICIZED IN ALLEGED PX COVERUP
(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—In March, 1971, the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee criticized Col. Henry H. Tufts for what members considered a whitewash of Brig. Earl F. Cole.

Yet six months later the Army chief of

staff Gen. William C. Westmoreland approved Col. Tufts to head a revamped and expanded investigation unit with central authority for all Army investigations worldwide.

Tufts previously was the top professional soldier in the old Army Criminal Investigation Division, which was reorganized after congressional criticism of laxity in pursuing investigations of personnel.

However, a 300-page report issued Nov. 1, 1971, makes it clear that the reorganization did not placate the Senate subcommittee, primarily Senators Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), the acting chairman, and Edward J. Gurney (R-Fla.).

TUFTS HELD RESPONSIBLE

The report pin points the responsibility of Tufts in the enforcement laxity, which led to a "pattern of corruption and criminality within the military system."

"Too often, dishonest practices were considered the normal and customary means of operation," the report said. "Testimony and documentary evidence showed the military services failed to properly administer and police the operations of the nonappropriated funds which are used to finance military clubs and the PX systems throughout the world."

Ribicoff and Gurney questioned Westmoreland's efforts to keep Tufts in a command position in the CID Agency in light of the report.

"A significant amount of the blame for the spread of corruption must be shared by the several investigative agencies of the military services which frequently failed to enforce existing regulations, and sometimes did not even make an attempt to do so," the report said. The document outlined many examples of laxity within the Army CID during the time Col. Tufts was the top military man.

BARRIERS WERE CREATED

The report was especially critical of "senior officers . . . (who) took actions that prevented the (lower echelon) CID agents from doing their work."

"For example, in Korea, Augsburg, (Germany), Fort Benning, (Georgia), and Vietnam, CID agents uncovered information that should have led to stepped up investigative effort and ultimately to prosecution." But "on several occasions, the barriers were created by the senior military police officer in the Army."

CRUM'S MONOPOLY TOLD

The report was critical particularly of Tufts' actions with regard to the alleged months long cover-up in the case against Gen. Cole. Cole was deeply involved in favoritism for William Crum and his Sarl Electronics firm, the Tom brothers and others in Vietnam and later in Europe when Cole headed the European PX system.

"Crum established and maintained a virtual monopoly over competing firms in the selling and leasing of nonappropriated fund activities of slot machines, amusement machines and other equipment," the report said. "Crum's success in monopolizing the business is attributable to the assistance and protection he received from Gen. Cole, deputy chief of staff for personnel and administration in Vietnam.

"Cole, who had administrative control over the service club system and the Army CID in Vietnam," the report continued, "was aware of the customs violations and other improper activities of William Crum. In spite of his knowledge of Crum's improprieties, Cole intimidated certain Army CID units and their personnel and deterred them from further investigations of the activities of Crum and Sarl Electronics."

The report blamed the "failure of his (Cole's) superiors in Vietnam" that "enabled Cole to continue his improper activities in Europe where he favored certain vendors,

among them the Tom brothers (two brothers of Chinese background), who had been in Vietnam."

ARMY WHITWASH IS CHARGED

While the subcommittee was investigating Cole, "the Department of the Army continued to cover up and 'whitewash' its investigations of Gen. Cole."

"The Army, in fact, prematurely closed its case on Gen. Cole on Feb. 9, 1970," the report said. This had the approval of Col. Tufts, the congressional investigators said.

However, when the Army learned the subcommittee was proceeding with its investigation and had uncovered evidence indicating improprieties in Cole's activities in Europe, the Army reopened its case on March 11, 1970.

"The evidence in question was in the hands of the Army long before the Cole case was closed in February, 1970, although the (Washington office of) CID had not pursued the matter," the report said.

LEADS REJECTED BY TUFTS, WESTMORELAND

Brig. Gen. Harley Moore, formerly the Army's top CID officer in Europe, had requested that Tuft's office run down more than 25 leads, but this was rejected by Tuft's office in Washington after some consultation with Westmoreland and the Army general counsel, Robert E. Jordan III.

At the hearings in March, Gen. Moore, a man with more than 25 years experience in Army police work, was asked his professional view of the premature closing of the Cole case.

"He (Moore) called the Army's action 'abysmally negligent,'" the report noted. "The attempt by the Army to cover up the Cole matter was a calculated plan to ease Cole out of the service with the least possible embarrassment to the Army," Moore told the congressmen.

GIFTS TO WESTMORELAND FROM CRUM

Two gifts to Westmoreland, one a silver cigaret case and the other a jade figurine for his wife, were among the items that could embarrass high military circles, the report said. It said the cigaret case was supposed to be a gift from officers under Westmoreland's command. It actually came from William Crum through Gen. Cole, the report said. The jade figurine came from the Tom brothers.

Westmoreland sent the cigaret box and the jade figurine back to Cole in April, 1970, two months after the premature closing of the Cole case by Tufts and three months before the much criticized decision to permit Cole to resign after being reduced in rank. That action against Cole on July 30, 1970, was taken on grounds that Cole used "executive influence" on behalf of the Tom brothers when he headed the European PX system.

RAN INTO CID ROADBLOCKS

Gen. Moore told that he "ran into roadblocks from the CID in Washington" that were "completely unusual."

"In December, 1970, I received a document from the CID agency stating they would not pursue certain investigative leads in the United States. This letter was signed by Col. Henry Tufts, the commander of the CID agency," Moore testified.

When the Army reopened the Cole investigation, "Investigators in the field were not encouraged to pursue the inquiry." CID Investigator James R. Johnson traveled to Washington "to brief Army General Counsel Jordan and his deputy, Kenly R. Webster, and Col. Tufts and his assistant, Colonel (Thomas) Zane.

"According to Moore," the report continued, "Johnson returned to Germany with the impression 'in essence that the people he briefed weren't too anxious to have us continue the case.'"

UNION MONOPOLY POWER FUELS INFLATION

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting nationwide poll was conducted recently by the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J.

One of the questions read:

Do you think union demands for higher wages and benefits will cause higher prices and more inflation, or can companies meet union demands without raising prices?

Mr. Speaker, 63 percent of the union families in the country say that these demands do indeed cause higher prices and more inflation.

These families instinctively know, as does the general public, that unrestrained union power is a key factor in bringing our Nation to the brink of economic disaster.

Most respected economists agree on this point. As Henry Hazlitt notes, the Government has been turned "into a union-organizing agency and virtually compels employers to make substantial concessions to union demands no matter how unreasonable."

This resulted in the wage-price freeze that is now melding into phase II of the new economic policy. Unfortunately, the new economic policy treats the symptoms of the problem rather than the disease, which is compulsory unionism. And that is one of the reasons why I am sponsoring this National Right to Work legislation.

Writer John Davenport recently noted:

What ails the economy is not the free price and profit system as such, but the fact that it is afflicted in a single sector by a powerful and pervasive monopoly element.

I refer, of course, to the power of labor unions to force up wages and costs year after year without regard to general productivity advance. The effective and courageous way to deal with union monopoly power is large-scale revision of our present permissive labor laws and their administration. This is the missing ingredient from the President's program and had it been undertaken in good time we might never have arrived at our present impasse.

Mr. Davenport, the former editor of Barron's and member of the board of Fortune, also noted:

The wage-price freeze in itself does nothing to get at the tap roots of union power and, indeed, controls if perpetuated may in the longer run enhance that power. It should not be forgotten that during a regime of controls in World War II and during the Korean War that organized labor gained some of its most costly victories—notably the spread of the union shop contracts which force workers to pay union dues as the price of holding their jobs and which automatically swell union treasuries with funds that can then be used for political purposes.

Mr. Davenport's prescription for giving the American people what they want and deserve; namely, price stability and expanding job opportunities for all Amer-

icans, is essential labor reform. Here is how he describes it:

The objective of sound labor reform is not to smash all unions, but to bring them back under the sweep of the law as it applies to other private associations and to individuals.

Unions should be what they set out to be; namely purely voluntary organizations, purged of their present coercive and often violent practices. The scope of collective bargaining needs sharp limitation to the end of preventing unions from closing down whole industries, not to mention vital state and municipal services.

The legal means for effecting these reforms are various, but in general we need to apply to unions the spirit, if not the letter, of our anti-monopoly laws to the end of freeing up the labor market, protecting the rights of working men themselves, and meeting the needs of the long-suffering public which is the chief loser under present arrangements.

Americans everywhere are keenly aware that the Nation's economy has entered a vital period. Action taken by us in the next few months will have a profound influence on the future of the country.

Clearly, excessive union power has steered the American ship of state to the brink of disaster. It thus makes sound economic sense to eliminate the root cause of this unhealthy concentration of power: compulsory union membership.

Anything else, to paraphrase a comment made by a nationally syndicated columnist during one of the recurring railroad crises a few years ago, would amount to putting a band-aid on a compound fracture. "At the bottom of this whole thing," he noted, "is the vice of compulsory unionism."

Nearly 1 year ago, Jenkin Lloyd Jones wrote a most perceptive column.

Part of what he said deserves reiteration.

Where are we going? It's pretty plain. Unions, having priced more and more American goods out of the international trade and having made foreign imports even more alluring, are beginning to demand high protective tariffs which could trigger international retaliation and perhaps a world-wide depression. Outraged consumers are beginning to demand wage-price controls which would mean the end of the free market and free wage negotiations.

The cure?

It won't be simple. But the right of unions to cut off the water was not handed down among the Ten Commandments, and the compelling of a worker to join and obey a union in order to hold a job is probably going to have to go.

Indeed, compulsory unionism must go. Let us set in motion the machinery to reach this goal. Let us adopt this national right to work law.

The articles by Mr. Davenport and Mr. Jones follows:

[From Human Events, Sept. 11, 1971]

WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS UNNEEDED—CONGRESS MUST CURB LABOR UNION MONOPOLY

(By John A. Davenport)

Despite widespread acclaim in many quarters, and an initial favorable reaction from the stock market, President Nixon's so-called new economic program is neither entirely new nor internally consistent.

In its international aspects the program deserves praise and support, since it has been

clear for some time that the dollar is overvalued in terms of other currencies and that a readjustment of exchange rates is a prime necessity. But in coupling dollar devaluation abroad with a general price and wage freeze at home the President has embarked on a dangerous expedient where possible short-term gains must be measured against long-term losses both for the economy and for the principles of the free market which the President says he is seeking to uphold.

With respect to short-term gains the wage-price freeze may temporarily dampen inflationary expectations which usually follow monetary devaluation and in this case cutting loose from the fiction of \$35 gold, and one must charitably suppose that this was the determining factor in the President's decision.

Moreover, if the freeze momentarily slows the upward pressure on wages and costs, which is the chief cause of our difficulties, it may allow production, productivity and employment to expand and the economy may well work its way onto higher ground. But when these possibilities are conceded, the fact stands the President has not come to grips with the fundamental causes of inflation and unemployment, and with every day that passes the program will face new administrative difficulties.

As to that, Mr. Nixon now finds himself playing the role of King Canute bidding the tides of inflation to recede and even the little waves to be quiet. In their hearts both he and his advisers know that this cannot really be effected by government ukase and the frenetic activity of the pitifully unprepared Office of Emergency Preparedness and the new Cost of Living Council.

Already the price freeze has left the steel industry in the curious position of having raised prices on structural steel but now being denied contemplated raises in the price of tin-plate products and other items. Similar distortions are appearing in textiles and other industries and applications for exceptions are bound to multiply both as regards prices and wages.

If these exceptions are granted, then price stabilization becomes just another name for unbridled governmental discretion by officials who cannot possibly know what a fair price or fair wage for any particular class of workers really is. If exceptions are not granted, then we may confidently expect the emergence of grey and black markets.

Large producers in the public eye may officially adhere to ceiling prices, or as in the case of automobiles, patriotically announce a roll-back. But especially among smaller firms this semblance of stabilization will be accompanied by covert but perfectly legal readjustments in trade discounts and extras that nullify official orders and guidelines.

The truth is that an enterprise economy can no more function without continuous price and profit adjustments than a gasoline engine can perform without its vital timing and distributor mechanism.

But the difficulties of enforcing controls, and the harm done if they are enforced, is not the crucial point. The crucial point is that the freeze is at best an indirect and one might almost say surreptitious way of dealing with what ails the economy.

What ails the economy is not the free price and profit system as such but the fact that it is afflicted in a single sector by a powerful and pervasive monopoly element. I refer of course to the power of labor unions to force up wages and costs year after year without regard to general productivity advance.

For while organized labor constitutes something less than 25 percent of the U.S. working force, its grip on our basic industries is wholly critical. It is this monopoly power which forces producers to raise prices if they can, and if they can't to cut back pro-

duction with resulting unemployment. And it is this monopoly power (aided by unwise minimum wage laws) which has thus far defeated all attempts to achieve stabilization and high employment levels by traditional fiscal and monetary means.

The wage-price freeze in itself does nothing to get at the tap roots of union power and, indeed, controls if perpetuated may in the longer run enhance that power. It should not be forgotten that it was during a regime of controls in World War II and during the Korean War that organized labor gained some of its most costly victories—notably the spread of union shop contracts which force workers to pay union dues as the price of holding their jobs and which automatically swell union treasuries with funds that can then be used for political purposes. The explanation of this is not far to seek.

Faced by a government control board, unions will accompany exorbitant wage demands with "sweeteners" such as demand for the union shop, or the closed shop, or changes in work rules. In an effort to chip off a few cents from the wage package, the government agency will swiftly capitulate in other matters, the more so because such boards are always politically motivated. Union muscle will thus be increased rather than diminished for the years ahead by throwing wage settlements into the arena of politics.

The effective and courageous way to deal with union monopoly power is large-scale revision of our present permissive labor laws and their administration. This is the missing ingredient from the President's program and had it been undertaken in good time we might never have arrived at the present impasse.

The objective of sound labor reform is not to smash all unions, but to bring them back under the sweep of the law as it applies to other private associations and to individuals. Unions should be what they set out to be; namely purely voluntary organizations, purged of their present coercive and often violent practices. The scope of collective bargaining needs sharp limitation to the end of preventing unions from closing down whole industries, not to mention vital state and municipal services.

The legal means for effecting these reforms are various, but in general we need to apply to unions the spirit, if not the letter of our anti-monopoly laws to the end of freeing up the labor market, protecting the rights of working men themselves, and meeting the needs of the long-suffering public which is the chief loser under present arrangements.

Combined with prudent fiscal and credit policies, such legislative reform would give the American people what they want and deserve: namely, price stability and expanding job opportunities for all able and willing to work. Good for the economy at home, such a program would also yield high dividends abroad.

In seeking a realignment of world exchange rates and in temporarily cutting the dollar loose from \$35 gold, the President has made a first step in reconstructing a more rational international order. But it is only that. If the effort is to succeed, whether under a "floating" or fixed exchange rate system, it is essential that the U.S. permanently conquer both inflation and unemployment; and on the evidence the wage-price freeze and controls will not turn the trick.

Foreign nations like Canada that have tried controls and so-called "incomes policy" have had to abandon these palliatives as wholly ineffective. Indeed, "incomes policy" is really only another name for evading the tough realities that now confront us.

Beyond all this, controls pose a symbolic issue for the American people. The U.S. has grown great by combining a philosophy of limited government with a free market economy which allocates goods and services

through free choice and tends to disperse power and decision. Such a system requires that government lay down the rules of the road and provide among other things an adequate monetary framework. It is directly threatened, however, by bureaucratic controls which in the end must lead to the socialization of the economy and the endangering of our higher liberties. Free men need free markets.

The President instinctively knows this. It is time he translated principles into practice by redeeming his pledge to lift the wage-price freeze promptly at the end of 90 days, by resisting pressure to set up permanent stabilization machinery and by setting in motion now the reform of labor legislation which would make controls wholly superfluous. The result could be the strengthening both of the U.S. economy and the world economy. It could be the beginning of a truly new economic policy—a policy worthy of our traditions and legitimate expectations.

[From a column syndicated nationally by General Features Corp., Dec. 5, 1970]

UNION DEMANDS COULD SIGNAL END TO FREE MARKET

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Is labor union power in America leading us all into an economic strait-jacket? Could be. And if it could be, the fault lies not with union labor or even the most ambitious labor leaders, but with an imbalance of the law that makes the abuse of union power inevitable, and the suppression of that abuse by government inevitable, as well.

The greatest unresolved problem in human economy is how to make the laborer worthy of his hire and the hire worthy of his labor.

When the 19th-century factory system destroyed cottage industry, it succeeded also in breaking rural serfdom by offering employment opportunities other than scratching and harvesting the land. But as the cities burgeoned and increasing thousands depended for their daily bread upon the opening of the factory gates, the power of the factory-owner grew enormously. As his machines improved and production increased, he was reluctant to pass on a fair share of the benefits to his hired hands.

Instead, the threat of the lockout became ever more devastating and the lightly taxed profits to the few plus the spread of wage-slavery to the many led Karl Marx to assume the coming collapse of the whole system.

Three things made Marx a bad prophet. First were the anti-trust laws, most stringently enforced in America, which made it unlawful for industrialists to band together in order to diminish competition, rig prices and depress wages. Second was the income tax, putting the largest burden of taxation upon those with the highest ability to pay. Third was the rise of union labor.

The union turned the feeble power of the individual worker into the collective clout of the work-force. The power of the boss met its match in collective bargaining.

The mistake was made, however, in not foreseeing that union power, if subjected to no regulation, could develop the same evils that had been demonstrated by unregulated industrial power.

Whereas, once combinations of employers could say to workers, "Take what we offer you or you will not eat," now union power can say to employers, "Give what we demand or you will not produce," and to the general public, "Unless we win, what you need you will not have!"

It is unfair to curse union leadership for unrealistic wage demands. Indeed, the most moderate wage demands are likely to come from Mafia-controlled unions where a corrupt leadership is willing to write "sweet-heart" contracts for a price. Honest union leaders are under pressure from the rank-and-file to equal the highest percentage

raise obtained by any other union. The result, quite naturally, is mad escalation.

And this feeds inflation. Unions understand this and in the recent General Motors settlement an unlimited "cost-of-living" wage increase was achieved. It will be impossible for the self-employed, the farmers, the retirees or most of the people in the service industries to obtain for themselves similar protection from rises in the cost of living.

Thus the UAW becomes the beneficiary of special privilege—exemption from a condition which its own action will help produce.

The auto worker whose wage increases outrun his productivity can be paid only by lower profits or increased prices. The UAW settlement will be a tax upon all auto users. It may kill the much-hoped-for American minicar in its cradle.

The \$18,000-a-year plumber imposes a tax on all home buyers. The \$17,000-a-year brick layer shows up in super-market prices. One railway union, having made wage demands that even it concedes the railroads cannot pay, is now suggesting federal subsidies, which means its intention to charge part of its wages to the taxpayers, who are everybody.

Where are we going? It's pretty plain. Unions, having priced more and more American goods out of the international trade and having made foreign imports even more alluring, are beginning to demand high protective tariffs which could trigger international retaliation and perhaps a worldwide depression. Outraged consumers are beginning to demand wage-price controls which would mean the end of the free market and free wage negotiations.

The cure?

It won't be simple. But the right of unions to cut off the water was not handed down among the Ten Commandments, and the compelling of a worker to join and obey a union in order to hold a job is probably going to have to go.

CHEESE IMPORT QUOTAS SHOULD BE EXTENDED AS TARIFF COMMISSION HAS RECOMMENDED

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon should act promptly to implement the recommendation of the Tariff Commission and establish quotas for quota-type cheeses costing over 47 cents a pound.

In 1970 a milk use basis, about one-fourth of all dairy imports were these types of cheeses. As a result President Nixon asked the Tariff Commission to investigate these imports and report to him. The President is to be commended for his concern and action in this respect.

After the proper hearings the Tariff Commission, on July 28, recommended to the President that this tariff loophole be closed and that cheese costing over 47 cents a pound be placed under quota the same as cheese costing under 47 cents a pound. In other words the 47-cent price break should be eliminated. At that same time the Commission made recommendations as to what this quota level should be.

Four months have elapsed since then and the President has not acted.

Unfortunately, during this period the import total of these cheeses—costing over 47 cents—has increased by 10 to 15 percent over the same period last year, based on totals reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture through September 30. It is unfortunate that these imports continue without limitation at a time when our own U.S. dairy production is increasing. The longer the President delays the longer the period in which the importers can take advantage of this nonquota status and continue to increase their imports.

All of the evidence is in as a result of the public hearings which the Tariff Commission held. The President should act on this basis and impose the necessary quotas.

ALBANIA'S SHORT-LIVED FREEDOM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday will be the 59th anniversary of the independence of Albania, a tiny Balkan country that has never enjoyed more than a brief taste of freedom. Before November 28, 1912, when the National Assembly declared Albania's independence from the Ottoman Empire, it had been ruled through the centuries by Romans, Bulgarians, Serbs, and Normans, as well as Turks.

Since obtaining its freedom as a result of the First Balkan War, Albania has experienced numerous kinds of government. These have included, in bewildering succession, monarchy with William of Wied as King; a period of anarchy; occupation by Austria-Hungary, Italy, Serbia, Greece, France, and Bulgaria during World War I; a republic with Ahmed Bey Zog as President; a return to monarchy with the President proclaiming himself King Zog I; conquest by the Fascists, with Italy's King Vittorio Emanuele III becoming also King of Albania; occupation by the German National Socialists; and finally, since World War II, a Communist dictatorship. Even the last has had its variations, Albania being dominated first by the Soviet Union and since 1961 by Red China.

Ordinarily the anniversary of independence would be a day of rejoicing, an occasion for celebrating the birthday of one's nation. It would be a day of observance, a time for recognizing the contributions of patriotic ancestors to the cause of freedom. It would be a day of dedication and inspiration, on which every loyal citizen resolved to preserve inviolate his country's independence and the liberties of its citizens. Last, but not least, the anniversary of independence would be a day of thanksgiving, a time for expressing gratitude to the Ruler of all nations for the precious gift of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, November 28, 1971, will not be a day of rejoicing, observance, dedication, or thanksgiving for the peo-

ple of Albania. Instead it will be just another day of incarceration in a Communist concentration camp. May God speed the day when Albania will once again live in freedom and have good reason to celebrate the anniversary of its independence.

H.R. 351 FOR A POSITIVE SOLUTION TO THE U.S. FINANCIAL CRISIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as the U.S. Government announces an \$821 million deficit in foreign trade for the month of October following a \$107 million deficit in September, New York, our second most populated State, announces that it faces "social bankruptcy" as a result of squandering its taxpayers' money to pay for political promises. And, as usual, the political leaders in dodging the cause of the financial plight ignore the fact that they helped create the crisis in large measure by their role in appeasing the proletarian masses. They seek to solve the problem by calling for higher taxes and devaluation of the dollar. Reportedly, the international banking interests and their financially elite fellow travelers in the United States have aided and abetted in the collapse of the U.S. dollar. French and Swiss banks are reportedly loaded with newly transferred American bank accounts with their owners awaiting the revaluation of their country's dollar so that by a mere book-keeping transaction they can profit by the crisis they assisted in creating.

The American people will have to understand that share-the-wealth domestic programs are not free and world redistribution of U.S. gold and jobs to emerging nations only prove to be a gimmick whereby the international financial barons enrich themselves and become so powerful that by the mere transferring of their holdings they can bring a nation to its knees without a shot being fired.

What will be the proposed policy of our country in solving our money crisis? The same policy as in the past? The policies of the monarch are always those of his creditors. Those who own the gold and control the wealth will continue to dictate U.S. money policies.

The gold and other wealth of this Nation have been earned and paid for by the U.S. taxpayers who will shortly be told, in compliance with a so-called goal of world equalization of the wealth, that their money is not worth what it used to be. Yet no one will tell the American people who got the gold, and business will go on as usual.

That is why I introduced H.R. 351, a bill to buy back the Federal Reserve bank stock and reinstate control over the people's money with the Congress as is provided in the U.S. Constitution. The people may not approve of everything Congress does, but at least they know who Congressmen are, and if they disapprove of their actions, they can defeat them

at the polls. International bankers and other world manipulators of wealth are for the most part unknown to the public and leave the people no recourse to protect their earnings and investments.

I include in the RECORD the related newscippings and H.R. 351:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 27, 1971]

TRADE DEFICIT \$821 MILLION FOR OCTOBER
(By James L. Rowe, Jr.)

The United States suffered a severe trade deficit in October, the government announced yesterday, but the domestic economy showed an encouraging upsurge as the Commerce Department's composite index of leading indicators of business activity rose 1.2 per cent.

The trade imbalance—the excess of what the country imported over what it exported—reached \$821.4 million last month, virtually assuring that the U.S. will run its first trade deficit since 1893.

Government officials said that the sharp "deterioration" in the nation's trade in October (after a surplus of \$265 million in September) reflected to a strong degree the East and Gulf Coast dock strikes that began Oct. 1. The government moved in court yesterday to send 45,100 striking dock workers back to work.

In other news on the economy yesterday, the stock market showed a post-Thanksgiving rally with the Dow Jones Industrial Average rising 17.96 points. The Price Commission, meanwhile, received a request for a 23.9 increase in third class mail rates from the U.S. Postal Service. The commission turned down the request of a large Virginia furniture manufacturer, Basset Furniture Industries, Inc., for a 1.8 per cent increase [Details on Page D6].

Harold C. Passer, assistant secretary of commerce for economic affairs, said the East and Gulf Coast dock strikes hampered "analysis of the import surcharge and the upward float of other currencies relative to the dollar." On Aug. 15, President Nixon imposed a 10 per cent surcharge on all imports subject to tariffs, with certain exceptions.

Mr. Nixon said the surcharge was an attempt to offset the nation's declining position in world trade. Since Aug. 15, when the United States also stopped cashing in dollars for gold, a number of currencies have been appreciating in value in terms of the dollar—making U.S. exports cheaper and imports into the United States more expensive.

But October's decline in imports—about \$714 million below September's import level—was not nearly as steep as the export dip. Exports in October were \$1.8 billion below September, which was the first month since March that the nation sold more goods abroad than foreign countries sold here.

Passer said the steeper decline in exports resulted from several factors:

In anticipation of the dock strike, shipments were accelerated in September "and consequently shipments declined in October; this affected exports more than imports."

The end of the West Coast dock strike, in which the government got a back-to-work order early in October, "produced a greater surge of imports than of exports" because waiting ships had to be unloaded "before such vessels can be reloaded with exports."

More of the nation's waterborne imports than exports go through West Coast ports.

More U.S. imports are "bulk" items such as oil, natural gas and iron ore, which do not need the service of dockworkers.

A spokesman for the Council of Economic Advisers called the October trade showing "bizarre."

"The thing is that the dock strike really so distorts the figures that it just isn't possible to draw any firm conclusions," he said.

So far this year, the nation has run a deficit of nearly \$1.5 billion in its trade account

with the world. After three surplus months—January, February, and March—the nation has run deficits in every month but September, when it had a \$265.4 million surplus.

Government officials, who had been talking in terms of a \$1 billion trade deficit a few months ago, now privately expect the deficit will end up closer to \$2 billion. In 1970, the nation had a trade surplus of about \$2.1 billion.

Since the dock strikes on the East and Gulf coasts continued through November, "we can expect a very distorted showing in November, too," the CEA spokesman said.

The deficit might not be as great, however, one economist noted, since some of the distortions which affected October—such as unloading imports before exports could be shipped out—will be gone. Nevertheless, most observers expect a sizeable deficit for November.

For the first 10 months of 1971, Passer noted, "the merchandise trade balance has recorded an adverse swing of \$4 billion from the same period a year ago—from a surplus of \$2.6 billion in 1970 to a deficit of \$1.5 billion in 1971. Exports have advanced by \$937 million, or less than 3 per cent, while imports have increased by \$5 billion, or more than 15 per cent."

Despite the surcharge, the volume of imports has increased each month since August. Passer said October collections of \$112 million "indicate that perhaps two-thirds of that month's dutiable imports were covered by the surcharge."

Not only are the trade figures difficult to interpret because of the dock strike distortion, the President's "sweeping change in government economic policy on Aug. 15" make the advances in the leading indicator index difficult to assess, Passer said.

"The indicators are still on a decisive up-trend, however," Passer said, "and this is consistent with private forecasts of a vigorous expansion of the economy in 1972."

The preliminary "leading indicators" report includes eight of the 12 components of the index. The index often tends to foreshadow developments in the economy at large.

When the preliminary September figures came out, the index recorded a 0.3 per cent decline, but when the full index was compiled, it showed an increase of 0.2 per cent.

In October, the preliminary index advanced from 127.1 per cent of the 1967 base to 128.6 per cent. Four of the eight indicators increased, one remained constant, while three declined.

The components which showed an "improved" rate over September included building permits, which increased from an annual rate of 1.9 million in the previous month to 2.22 million in October, and new orders for durable goods, which rose to an annual rate of \$31.06 billion in October compared with \$31.03 in September.

New claims for unemployment insurance fell to 310,000 in October compared with 324,000 in September (a decrease in this figure is treated as "improved") while the average workweek expanded to 39.7 hours from 39.6 hours in September.

The price-labor cost ratio was unchanged at 96.6. Industrial materials prices declined, as did stock prices, and contracts and orders for plant and equipment.

Since the low point of the automobile strike in late 1970, the leading indicators index has advanced 13 per cent.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 24, 1971]

STATE ON BRINK OF BANKRUPTCY, SAYS GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER

(By Owen Fitzgerald and Thomas Poster)

The state and local governments are on the brink of "bankruptcy" and face massive budget cuts, Gov. Rockefeller said yesterday in an extraordinary pre-Thanksgiving Day

announcement. He also warned of higher taxes.

After conferring for two hours with top state, legislative and county executives, Rockefeller said the state is in a "state of emergency" and that new demands would be made on the Nixon administration and Congress for revenue sharing and a federal takeover of welfare and medicaid costs.

SEES "SOCIAL BANKRUPTCY"

The governor said his administration is facing "social bankruptcy" rather than legal bankruptcy and might not be able to deliver services or pay its bills.

Senate Majority Leader Earl W. Brydges (R-Niagara) went even further. Complaining that the state is being short-changed by getting only 11 cents on each dollar Washington collects in taxes, Brydges said: "Either we assert the rights of the states to participate in the federal income tax and insist that the feds take over medicare and welfare costs or the alternative would be bankruptcy and the inability of the state to pay enough to keep the localities alive."

LEGAL BANKRUPTCY, TOO

Asked if he believes the state's fiscal crisis is bad enough to "legally" drive the state and local governments into bankruptcy, Brydges shot back: "I do. Yes, for both the state and localities."

The 11 county executives who met with Rockefeller, all Republicans, represent the biggest governments in New York outside New York City. Later they met with Mayor Lindsay and the other Big Six mayors at City Hall.

All of the City Hall conferees said they would favor increased state taxes rather than see cuts in state aid to their localities.

Asked earlier what taxes are possible, Rockefeller said, "I don't rule out any increases on any taxes."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 27, 1971]

SHIFT ON IMPORT TAX HINTED

(By Hobart Rowen)

The Nixon administration now appears more willing than it was just a few weeks ago to lift the controversial 10-per cent import surcharge it put into effect Aug. 15.

Concern at home and abroad that the surcharge—designed to help cure an American trade and balance of payments deficit—would trigger a worldwide recession has modified the administration's position.

Until now, Treasury Secretary John B. Connally and other spokesmen said that the surcharge would be maintained as a bargaining device to force America's trading partners to do three things:

Raise the value of their currencies so that the new relationship of the dollar to other monies would favor the United States. (A cheaper dollar makes American exports more attractive, tends to make imports more expensive.)

Abandon many discriminatory trading practices—quotas and other devices—that affect American exports.

Share in the "burden" of Free World defense by paying more of the direct costs.

Now, borrowing from the semantics of the wage-price program, the administration is ready to modify these demands by removing the surcharge in a "Phase I" that would see a shift in currency relationships averaging about a 10- to 12-per cent depreciation of the dollar.

It would leave most of the other demands on the trade and defense matters to a "Phase II," lasting perhaps one to two years. During Phase II, an effort also would get under way on a complete overhaul of the international monetary system, which in effect was discarded on August 15.

In statements by officials earlier this week—notably, one by Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns—the administration tried to

holist a signal that it was anxious to get at least an interim settlement on these important monetary and trade questions.

After a meeting with the President and Connally on Wednesday, Burns pointedly said that "the President expects definite progress" to be made at a meeting of the Group of Ten Finance Ministers in Rome, Nov. 30 and Dec. 1.

But the key to any deal—and this so far is unresolved—is a European proposal for a 5-per cent increase in the price of gold, which would accomplish a direct devaluation of the dollar by that amount. This will be discussed not only in Rome, but at the summit meeting of President Nixon and President Pompidou of France in the Azores Dec. 13.

Authoritative sources said yesterday that President Nixon has not changed his earlier stance against an increase in the price of gold. But the fear of world-wide recession has triggered a new willingness to seek a compromise.

Some of the pressure within the administration to adjust Connally's hitherto hard-line stand has come from State Department officials and presidential aide Henry Kissinger, who are concerned about the impact of U.S. foreign economic policy on American political and military alliances.

Burns also has pressed Connally publicly for greater speed in reaching an agreement.

An additional source of pressure has been the recent weakness of the U.S. stock market, reflecting fears that the surcharge, if kept in place, would be followed by retaliation—then contracting world trade and depression.

As Connally and Burns prepare to leave for Rome Sunday for next week's meeting of the Group of Ten Finance Ministers, much attention will focus on the official price of gold, now \$35 an ounce.

Since the initiation of President Nixon's New Economic Policy on August 15, the U.S. government no longer cashes in foreign-held dollars for gold. But European governments nonetheless have pressed for an increase in the price for both political and trade reasons.

The political rationale in Europe is that an increase in the dollar price of gold thus devaluing the dollar, would appear to be a U.S. "contribution" to a realignment of exchange rates, and help convince voters in Europe that their governments were not saddled with the whole responsibility for changing currency rates.

This is important because some European economies are in a recession, and rightly or wrongly, the recent upward revaluations of currency have taken some of the blame.

An equally important consideration is that trade is affected not only by the relationship of the dollar to other currencies—say to the Deutschmark and the French franc—but by the relationship of these currencies to each other.

Germany and France, for example, are important trading competitors and, while Germany is willing to revalue its currency substantially to meet U.S. demands, it does not want to move so far out of line with the franc that it gives France a big trading edge.

But the French so far have refused to revalue their currency upward by any amount, which means that the Germans will not, allow the D-mark to go up as much as they might otherwise.

The way out, it appears, is to increase the price of gold by about 5 per cent. The dollar would be devalued by 5 per cent, and a revaluation of the mark by 7 per cent would provide a "swing" of 12 per cent in favor of the dollar.

A debate on the gold issue has raged within the administration, which all along has argued that the issue is only political, and not economic. But a hard posture against a price increase appears to be weakening, and the clue to this may be the separation, in Ameri-

can officials' minds, of the gold price question and the gold convertibility question.

On convertibility, it is learned, there is no American "give" for Phase I. If a gold price increase is to be considered favorably, it is reported, dollars will remain non-convertible, even at the higher price. Any convertibility would be a separate issue, waiting on the Phase II negotiations for the basic reform of the international monetary system.

In recent weeks, the administration has been pressed hard at home as well as abroad on the gold price issue. Sen. ——— and Rep. ——— have introduced a bill which would permit an increase of as much as 10 per cent in the price of gold.

But Nixon's men have been reluctant to go along. First of all, they do not want to give away a big bargaining chip for the Rome and later meetings. Beyond that, they fear that Democratic candidates next year will make political capital of such a decision by accusing President Nixon of devaluing the dollar.

A 10- to 12-per cent average devaluation of the dollar would not be too far from what already has been achieved in world currency markets since the dollar was allowed to float on August 15. Private estimates are that appreciation of other currencies has provided an average devaluation of the dollar by 7 per cent.

According to officials here and abroad, each average "point" in dollar devaluation, make American exports cheaper and hence more attractive, is worth about \$800 million in trade. The 10- to 12-per cent goal would create a favorable annual swing of some \$8 billion to \$10 billion. This is well under the \$13 billion originally demanded by Connally, but later trade and defense burden-sharing arrangements conceivably could contribute more.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 29, 1971]

MONEY DEBATE PRELIMINARIES START IN ROME

ROME.—European Common Market treasury ministers today discussed ways of forming a united front against the dollar. American money men led by Treasury Secretary John B. Connally polished their own sales pitch.

Treasury and finance ministers and bankers from the world's 10 wealthiest non-Communist nations gathered in Rome for a two-day meeting argument over who should revalue their currencies.

Although the formal meeting does not open until tomorrow, the ministers met in a series of bilateral chats today to clear the air in the world monetary crisis.

FIVE ARE COMMART MEMBERS

Five Common Market members who also belong to the Group of 10—West Germany, France, Italy, The Netherlands and Belgium—scheduled a formal meeting tomorrow morning to forge some kind of united policy on the monetary crisis.

The other five members of the Group of 10 are Britain, Sweden, Canada, Japan and the United States. Switzerland will attend as an observer.

Britain will make its views known when Chancellor of the Exchequer Anthony Barber talks with Italy's Treasury Minister Mario Ferrari Aggradi today.

WANT HIGHER GOLD PRICE

America's nine colleagues have insisted that the United States devalue the dollar by increasing the official price of gold. Connally has refused to consider this, suggesting instead that all the other countries simply increase the value of their currencies.

European sources said they expect Connally to present some sort of compromise at the Rome meeting which would call for a slight devaluation of the dollar, perhaps 5 per cent, in exchange for a revaluation upward of some other currencies, notably the West German mark and the Japanese yen.

American sources do not tell it that way. Although Connally recently told business leaders in New York the United States must be 'flexible' in the current world money crisis, he remained firm against devaluation.

SURCHARGE ALSO ISSUE

The Europeans also want abolition of the 10 percent surcharge that President Nixon imposed on most imports Aug. 15 when he launched his new economic policy.

Both sides agree that no final decision on a monetary deal is likely to come at the Rome meeting. Nixon is meeting with President Georges Pompidou of France and Prime Minister Edward Heath of Britain within weeks and any devaluation decision would come only after those meetings.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1971]

THE PAYMENTS DEFICIT—AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

Secretary Connally keeps talking as though trade were the same thing as the balance of payments. It is not. From July to September of this year, the net outflow of merchandise trade—the excess of imports over exports. In other words—was no more than one-tenth of the deficit in the balance of payments.

The other nine-tenths of the deficit is nothing but money—capital on its way to new investment, profits, interest, gifts and so forth. In his speech in New York this week, Mr. Connally was using the recent and very severe payments deficit as proof of the immediate need for trade reform. But that is hardly the whole message.

The largest single item in the United States' current international accounts is entitled "Errors and Omissions." Wisdom in these matters begins with the truth that the basic figures are not very accurate. There are huge gaps and discrepancies, resulting from a data collection system that has a great many holes in it. Unlike sugar and automobiles, money does not have to go through customs. One of the curiosities of our international accounts in recent years is the enormous increase in the Errors and Omissions accounts. Last year it was over a billion dollars. This year in the second quarter alone it was \$2.3 billion. In the third quarter, it was in the range of \$5 billion. Since the total deficit in the balance of payments that quarter was about \$10 billion, half of it was the surge of unreported and untraceable money accounted under Errors and Omissions.

There is nothing very mysterious about this money. It is, in large and rising proportion, capital going abroad to speculate against the value of the dollar, which is falling steadily. If one had converted \$100 into yen last August 15, when Mr. Nixon announced his intention of forcing down the dollar exchange rates, one could convert it back into something like \$109.50 today. People who jumped into the German mark last spring would have made even more. As a way to make a living it is said to be hard on the ulcers, but there are those who love it.

Among the various perils confronting this republic, the tides of outbound speculative capital are not a very serious matter. It all has to come back, after all, to make a profit. A currency speculator may find Frankfurt a nice place to spend a few months, but he doesn't necessarily want to live there.

The relatively small trade deficit has a relationship, of course, to the dramatic outflow of gamblers' money that has swollen recent balance of payments totals. When a country with a long pattern of trade surpluses suddenly begins to sell less than it buys, the event attracts the attention of dealers who smell the possibility of devaluation. That is the point at which this country arrived last summer, and which is now being reported in the payments statistics.

There is a kernel of real danger in this situation, but it is not strictly a matter of the international accounts. An over-valued dollar means a very sharp rise in imports,

which undersell domestic industry on a large scale with predictable political results. Foreign governments, particularly the western Europeans and the Japanese, would be wise to take very seriously those pages of Mr. Connally's New York speech in which he discusses this effect. Mr. Connally and Mr. Nixon have been accused of protectionism in their current economic policy. Mr. Connally is, unfortunately, correct when he says that the alternative to this policy would be a bitter wave of the crudest and most discriminatory protectionist legislation here. The immediate concern here is less the abstractions of the balance of payments than the hard figures of employment, the rate at which imports rise, and labor's stake in exports.

The question is still whether the present American tactics are going to take Mr. Connally where he wants to go. He is giving a very persuasive impression that he will settle no single item until he can get a huge comprehensive solution to the whole range of issues that are summed up in the balance of payments. But when half of that deficit is anonymously represented by the Errors and Omissions account, and when there are some grave doubts as to the precise accuracy of other accounts, a careful man would not choose to be dogmatic about the precise solution required.

Mr. Connally graphically described in New York some of the restraints that the Japanese have put on international competition in their own markets. And he quite correctly chided the Europeans for discriminating against Japan. But to reform these traditions will be the work of many months, if not years. In any event, no one can say with any degree of assurance what effect the new exchange rates will have on the great worldwide movements of goods and investments. New rates may make some of the trade disputes less difficult to solve.

The best rule now is to take one thing at a time, beginning with the new exchange rates for the dollar. As long as the ultimate exchange rates are in doubt, the heavy flows of speculative funds will continue. Our customers abroad will continue to have reason to postpone buying goods that might be cheaper in a few weeks. The current uncertainty over parities only aggravates the weaknesses in our position. The finance ministers of the major trading nations are now scheduled to meet at the end of this month in Rome. That is Mr. Connally's opportunity to set aside temporarily his other concerns—trade restrictions and defense-burden sharing—and pursue prompt agreement on the dollar exchange rates.

H.R. 351

A Bill To Vest in the Government of the United States the Full, Absolute, Complete, and Unconditional Ownership of the Twelve Federal Reserve Banks

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby authorized and directed forthwith to purchase the capital stock of the twelve Federal Reserve banks and branches, and agencies thereof, and to pay to the owners thereof, the par value of such stock at the date of purchase.

(b) All member banks of the Federal Reserve System are hereby required and directed to deliver forthwith to the Treasurer of the United States, by the execution and delivery of such documents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, all the stock of said Federal Reserve banks owned or controlled by them, together with all claims of any kind or nature in and to the capital assets of the said Federal Reserve banks, it being the intention of this Act to vest in the Government of the United States

the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the said Federal Reserve banks.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

UNEMPLOYMENT OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with growing unemployment in this country—a situation that threatens the livelihood of every American today. But, one of the hardest hit by this economic decline is the area to which we gave top priority in the fifties and sixties.

Mr. Speaker, I remember well the days when then President John F. Kennedy set this Nation's sights toward a landing on the moon. We were a Nation struck with fear that the Soviet Union was exceeding us in the scientific and technological fields.

This Nation responded to the need as it always has, producing thousands of engineers and technicians to bring about the spectacular scientific exploits that reassured us as to our technological supremacy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with thousands of these professionals drawing unemployment compensation, because our thirst for knowledge has been replaced by a greater concern for thrift.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) wrote about the problem in an excellent article for the September 1971 issue of *Chem Tech*. A response to that letter, from Alan C. Nixon, the employment chairman of the American Chemical Society, notes the gratitude of many scientists for the remarks made by Senator KENNEDY. This response also includes the text of a measure authored by Assemblyman Ken Meade of the California State Legislature that is designed to head off the problem of unemployment in the scientific community.

Mr. Speaker, I submit both that response and the drafted legislation to the RECORD in hopes that my colleagues will recognize the need for similar protection from the Congress:

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 2967

An act to add Article 5 (commencing with Section 9900) to Chapter 2 of Part 1 of Division 3 of the Unemployment Insurance Code, relating to employment, and making an appropriation therefor

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2967, as amended, Meade (Ed.). Scientific manpower.

Adds Art. 5 (commencing with Sec. 9900), Ch. 2, Pt. 1, Div. 3, U.I.C.

Creates Office of Scientific Manpower within Division of Job Training, Development and Placement of Department of Human Resources Development in charge of a director. Declares functions of office to provide grants to unemployed scientists, as defined, under which such persons may be assigned unused

laboratory space and facilities to conduct investigation and research in the field of their specialties. Limits grants to 36 months, and provides stipends for grantees of up to \$700 per month, and other benefits.

Creates advisory committee appointed by Governor and composed of scientists meeting certain qualifications. Specifies requirements applicants for grants shall meet, disposition of patents granted for research projects, and other related matters.

Appropriates unspecified amount from General Fund to the Office of Scientific Manpower for purposes of this act.

Vote— $\frac{2}{3}$; Appropriation—Yes; Fiscal Committee—Yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Article 5 (commencing with Section 9900) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 1 of Division 3 of the Unemployment Insurance Code, to read:

Article 5. Office of Scientific Manpower

9900. The Legislature hereby finds and declares that economic conditions in this state have had great impact upon the scientific and technological community in California, resulting in a large number of unemployed scientists; that these persons constitute a great resource of this state which should not be wasted; that economic changes have disrupted the pursuits of a great number of these scientists to an unprecedented degree; and that temporary assistance to these persons during this period of readjustment will help retain in this state for its future benefit these scientifically trained persons of unique and diversified skills and experiences.

9901. There is in the Division of Job Training, Development and Placement the Office of Scientific Manpower. The office shall be in the charge of a director, who shall be appointed by the Chief of the Division of Job Training, Development and Placement.

9902. The director shall appoint two assistants who shall be scientists trained in scientific administration.

9903. The director shall create an advisory committee of 20 scientists appointed by the Governor from nominations furnished by any professional society of scientists with a membership greater than 50. At least one member of the advisory committee shall be from one of the five professional societies with the largest membership in this state. Members of the advisory committee shall serve without pay, but shall receive their traveling and other expenses.

9904. The Office of Scientific Manpower shall maintain a file of all laboratory space under the control of every state university, college, department, and agency which may be made available for use by scientists under the provisions of this article. Within 30 days of the effective date of this article, every person in charge of laboratory facilities under the control of every state university, college, department, or agency shall survey the facilities under his direction and report the number of laboratory spaces unfilled and available for use pursuant to this article.

9905. The director shall develop a program for the assignment of qualified, unemployed scientists to laboratories having available space.

9906. Any scientist desiring assignment to such space shall submit his application in a form and with such information as the director shall prescribe. In addition, the applicant shall meet all of the following requirements:

(a) He shall have been a resident of this state for one year prior to his application.

(b) He shall be unemployed or under notice of termination of employment.

(c) His most recent employment shall have been in this state.

(d) He shall be a professional scientist meeting all the membership requirements for

the professional society representing his scientific specialty.

9907. A person in involuntary early retirement with a pension reduced in amount from the pension payable in the event of normal retirement is eligible under this article if he otherwise meets all the requirements of Section 9906. For such person, however, the amount of any stipend payable under this article shall be reduced by the amount of such pension.

9908. An applicant may submit, in addition to such information as the director shall require, relevant biographical data and information on experience and education. The applicant may present a specific research proposal or indicate a preference for work at a specific laboratory.

9909. An applicant selected will be assigned space available in a participating laboratory in accordance with his field of study and the facilities available. The applicant's proposed program of research shall be subject to acceptance by the agency; in charge of the laboratory. The applicant shall have the full use of the entire facilities of the laboratory to which he is assigned to the extent that the regular program and mission of the particular laboratory permit. With respect to matters of laboratory procedure and safety, the applicant shall be subject to the agency in charge of the laboratory. It is the intent of the Legislature that research programs under this article shall be flexible and that individual applicants shall work on research projects of their own choosing to the maximum extent possible.

9910. An applicant who is accepted for participation under the provisions of this article shall receive a grant to conduct a program of research at a designated laboratory extending in duration no longer than 36 months. The grantee shall receive a stipend of not more than seven hundred dollars (\$700) per month as determined by the director on the basis of the grantee's need, experience, and background, and subject to the availability of funds. The provisions of the grant shall in addition contain an allowance for laboratory expenses and supplies, and all such expenses and supplies used by a grantee, including any increase in insurance against loss incurred by the laboratory as a direct result of the activities of the grantee, shall be accounted for and compensated under the provisions of the grant, within such limitations as are imposed by the director in each case.

9911. A grantee may accept employment at any time, and in such case his grant shall terminate. A grantee shall be allowed up to five days per month to seek employment without reduction in stipend. Other absence because of illness or emergency will be allowed up to 15 days per year without reduction in stipend. The monthly stipend shall be reduced proportionately for additional absence.

9912. A grantee may publish the results of his research under a grant awarded pursuant to this article in any recognized scientific journal.

9913. A grantee may apply for a United States patent as a result of any research or investigation carried out under a grant pursuant to this article, through the agency in charge of the laboratory. The grantee shall assign any patent granted by the United States as a result of such research or investigation to the state, but he shall be entitled to one-half of any royalties as a result of such patent. Any foreign patents granted shall be the property of the grantee. If the agency in charge of the laboratory declines to process an application for a United States patent, the grantee may do so himself, and in such event any patent issued need not be assigned to the state.

9914. A grantee shall be encouraged to enroll in courses of instruction offered at any

community college, state college, or the University of California in the field of his specialty or a related field. Tuition fees for such courses shall be payable from funds available for the purposes of this article.

SEC. 2. There is hereby appropriated the sum of _____ dollars (\$_____) from the General Fund to the Office of Scientific Manpower for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of Article 5 (commencing with Section 9900) of Chapter 2 of Part 1 of Division 3 of the Unemployment Insurance Code.

CALIFORNIA SECTION,
AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY,
Berkeley, Calif., November 12, 1971.

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: This letter is inspired by your article in the Magazine, Chem Tech, for September, 1971. I want to commend you for your efforts on behalf of the country to save the scientific resources being squandered by the present unemployment of scientists and engineers.

While I commend your efforts, I am appalled with the misery that is occurring because the reaction of the Federal government is so slow. I am afraid that a great deal of the money which is being spent is being wasted by disbursing it to too many levels of government. In addition, I feel that in some of the conversion efforts that are being made people are being trained for non-existent jobs.

Speaking for scientists, which I am better equipped to do (I am Chairman of the Employment Committee of the California Section of the American Chemical Society) I feel the important thing is to keep scientists doing science. In this way they will have an opportunity to keep their skills sharp and to make useful contributions to scientific research and will probably develop information or products which would pay for the outlay in the long run. In most cases, scientists are perfectly capable of re-training themselves on a job if they can get it and the diversity in the practice of science is so wide that this actually is what usually happens when a person gets a new job.

Acting on the philosophy outlined above, we in the California Section, have worked with Senator Meade in the California Legislature to develop the attached AB 2967 which is designed to withdraw California scientists from the ranks of the unemployed and let them work with subsistence type support in labs owned by the people of California. This not only has the advantages outlined above, but it would also introduce into the predominantly academic community in which these labs are located, thousands of skilled, sophisticated, industrially oriented persons who would give a tremendous shot in the arm to the academic community in terms of their awareness of industrial and environmental needs and practices.

Again, let me say that I greatly appreciate your interest in the problems of scientists and engineers and your attempts to do something about them.

Very truly yours,

ALAN C. NIXON,
Employment Chairman.

A YOUNG MAN'S PRAYER

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently at a political gathering in my congress-

sional district a young student at San Jose State College, Mr. Paul W. Haddon, was invited to deliver the invocation.

Mr. Haddon's prayer was well delivered, but its true power lay in the words and thoughts which it contained. It was truly a young man's prayer, but it applied equally to every human being, regardless of age.

I believe Mr. Haddon's prayer should be made available to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A YOUNG MAN'S PRAYER (By Paul W. Haddon)

Heavenly Father, we ask your blessing on our assembly here this evening.

Draw us together, in unity of purpose and vision, and help us to transcend all barriers of age, temperament, background, and all else that threatens to divide us.

Grant us, a spirit of unity and youth, in our enthusiasm, our courage, our Faith and our optimism.

Father, teach us, that youth means the predominance of courage over timidity, of adventure over love of ease.

This often exists in a man of sixty, more than in a boy of sixteen.

Nobody grows old, merely by a number of years, we grow old by deserting our ideals.

We know Father, that years may wrinkle the soul.

Worry, doubt, self distrust, fear and despair, these bow the heart and turn the spirit back to dust.

Father, whether sixty or sixteen, there is in every human being's heart, the love of wonder, the sweet amazement at the stars and star-like things, the undaunted challenge of events, the unflinching child-like appetite for what-next, and joy at the game of living.

Father, make us ever mindful, that we are as old as our doubt, as young as our faith; as old as our fear, as young as our self-confidence, as old as our despair and as young as our hope.

THE TRUE AMERICAN RECORD IN VIETNAM

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most despicable and ill-deserved charges against our men in Vietnam has been that of indifference to human misery. They are real Americans, and like most Americans, they seek to help alleviate suffering by young and old, as well as to maintain the freedom of choice that is the essence of the American way.

Sp5c. Jay S. Marion of Manchester, N.H., and his work for Vietnamese orphans is a good case in point. We are proud of Jay Marion and in the same sense of accomplishment for America that Jay feels for his wards, I include in the RECORD at this point the recent account in the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader, of Jay's splendid work:

QUEEN CITYAN SEEKS HELP FOR VIETNAMESE ORPHANS

A Manchester Vietnam Army veteran, still stationed there, is calling upon his fellow Granite Staters to help him help ease the troubles of children in an orphanage in Phu Bai.

Specialist Five Jay S. Marion, son of Mr. and Mrs. O. M. Marion of RFD 1, Manchester, has taken a considerable amount of interest in an orphanage run by two Catholic nuns, and is seeking help to aid the children in the war-torn country.

The orphanage, An-Khail, cares for 70 children ages two to seven and is located near the 101st Airborne Division's base camp in Phu Bai.

According to SP5 Marion, clothing is the No. 1 problem, especially with the winter months fast approaching. "Toys aren't a necessity," he writes, "but any sent would be better than the bottle caps, sticks, stones and rubbish piles that they play in now."

Deeply touched with their problems, SP5 Marion confessed he would like to take all the youngsters home with him but realizes it would be an impossibility.

In an effort to help a little, SP5 Marion has taken it upon himself to act as a clearinghouse for any articles Granite Staters are able to send for the children.

Items may be sent to SP5 Marion at his address: C Troop, 2/17 Cav., 101st Airborne Div. (Ambl), APO San Francisco, 96383.

THE 197TH INFANTRY BRIGADE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the following letter which the Honorable Howard H. "Bo" Callaway, a former Member of this body and now a civilian aide to the Secretary of the Army, has called to my attention concerning the 197th Infantry Brigade at Fort Benning, Ga. This brigade is, indeed, outstanding and is well on its way to becoming an all volunteer unit. It is commanded by Col. Willard Latham and his leadership is best shown by his recent selection to become chief of staff at Fort Benning in January of 1972.

The letter follows:

ARLINGTON, VA.,
November 16, 1971.

Col. WILLARD LATHAM,
Commander, 197th Infantry Brigade,
Fort Benning, Ga.

DEAR WILL: It has been an honor for me to revisit your Brigade just before you relinquish Command after 22 months of a very high order of commandship. Your Brigade was one of the seven initial units given permission to do "Unit of Choice" recruiting. You and your Brigade went into this program promptly, wholeheartedly and with great energy and imagination. Your Brigade has enlisted about 1550 men for your unit. The first group of these men has returned to your Brigade for Advanced Individual Training. They will be a credit to you and your Brigade. Your record adds great credibility to your statement that your Brigade can be an all-volunteer unit by the Summer of 1972.

Not only have you set the stage for a great accomplishment in the effective command and training of a very large Brigade during this transition period, but you have had a great and beneficial effect on raising the Public Image of the Army in the area in which you have recruited. Your efforts in the field of community relations have paid off handsomely.

I am sure the Army is proud of your accomplishments as Commanding Officer of the 197th Infantry Brigade. I am proud of you and your unit. I shall watch your progress to

higher responsibilities with a great deal of interest. Best wishes to you and yours.

Sincerely,

BRUCE C. CLARKE,
General, U.S. Army, Retired.

THE DUFF'S OF QUICKSAND CREEK

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the achievements of a remarkable Kentucky couple, Lionel and Frankie Duff, who for 28 years kept bright the lamp of learning in a remote Appalachian hollow in Knott County.

In a three-room brown schoolhouse, hard by the banks of the Middle Fork of Quicksand Creek, these dedicated teachers, graduates of the University of Kentucky, have spent not only their time but money from their own pockets to keep the school at Decoy going.

Their efforts have not been without reward, and Lionel Duff's words best describe that reward:

I wanted to show people it could be done, to show people that kids from the hills and hollows could go to school and learn and then go into the world and take their places in society . . . It's been proven.

Reporter Leah Larkin has written an interesting story about the Duffs, which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on November 11, 1971. I include this story in the RECORD.

THE DUFF'S: THEY NURTURE LEARNING IN THE MOUNTAINS

(By Leah Larkin)

Back up in the mountains of Knott County, many miles of crumbling dirt and gravel road away from the cities, past a few blackened mining companies, a couple of burning slag heaps and acres and acres of hills and valleys covered with trees, is a three-room brown, wooden schoolhouse.

It's on the Middle Fork of Quicksand Creek in Eastern Kentucky in a place called Decoy. Along with a post office, a church, a community center and two country stores, the school serves 28 families, about 165 people, who live higher up in the mountains above Quicksand's Middle Fork.

The school, and those who run it, make Decoy a bit different from other Appalachian communities.

Twenty-eight years ago Lionel and Frankie Duff began teaching at the little school in Decoy. Together they have taught the eight grades in the old wooden structure. They have done more than just teach. Through the years, they have spent nearly \$12,000 of their own money to improve the school. They have helped get a community center for Decoy and contributed about \$15,000 to the cost of the building. The Duffs don't boast about their contributions. They have to be pressed to reveal actual figures. Their efforts have brought national, even international, recognition to this remote area in Kentucky's mountains. And their devotion and concern have probably changed the future for some of Decoy's children.

"I grew up here. I realized the problems of the kids. I wanted the kids to be able to go on to high school. I knew they needed us. We got involved and couldn't quit," said

Mrs. Duff who was born in Decoy 57 years ago.

Her father worked for the logging company which built the school in 1927. She remembers going to school in the building just after it was built. And she feels a kinship with the people of Decoy.

"Almost all of these children are my relatives," she says as she looks around at some of the 45 children who attend the school. She talks about them, their parents, whom their parents married, and how that makes them distant cousins of hers.

Her husband, too, is intrigued with genealogy and he shows the chart he made, a genealogy tree of Decoy families. "Some of the children here are eighth generation," Duff said. "We've traced most of them back to the Revolution." The chart hangs in one of the classrooms surrounded by old school pictures. Children can look at it, trace their family branch, and see how they are related to one another.

Duff, a native of Hazard, retired last year after teaching in Decoy for 28 years. He is now executive director of the Hindman Settlement School, an hour's drive from Decoy, and he continues to share his wife's dedication to education and Appalachian children.

"I wanted to show people it could be done, to show people that kids from the hills and hollows could go to school and learn and then go into the world and take their places in society," Duff said. He's proud of their success. "It's been proven. We have kids from here who have been successful all over the country." He mentioned some of them: The boy working in Los Angeles as a geologist; the boy in Florida working with an electronics company; the two girls teaching in California; the boy with an aircraft company in Minnesota.

Now there are 14 children from Decoy attending high school—some at the Hindman Settlement School and some at Breathitt County High in Jackson. Five from Decoy are now in college. That's an impressive record for a community isolated in Appalachia with a total population of 165. What the Duffs have done with the school in Decoy is equally impressive.

Because the Decoy school is so small compared to most, "We usually just got the bare necessities from the board of education," Mrs. Duff said. "Erasers, chalk, water buckets, dippers, brooms and coal."

It takes more than that to run a school. So the Duffs, both of whom have teacher's certificates from the University of Kentucky, used their money to buy library books, encyclopedias, art supplies, etc. They spent both time and money improving the school building. In the early '60s they put in bathrooms and a kitchen. They bought a stove and refrigerator for the school. When they realized that many of the children were coming to school on empty stomachs, they started buying food and preparing breakfast for them. Now they receive government funds for both school lunches and breakfasts.

They helped buy a new furnace for the school, paint the building, put up wall boards and build a basement. Members of the community have helped out with the labor. And in recent years they have been blessed with outside assistance. Various church and college groups from all over the country now come to Decoy for summer work camps. Many of the groups have acted as sponsors and provided funds to help the Duffs with their projects.

The Duffs credit the outside interest and attention on Decoy to folk dancing. According to Doug, the Duffs' son who is recreation director at the Hindman Settlement School, it all started one summer back in the '50s. His parents went to summer school and took a course in folk dancing. They liked it so much they made it part of the curriculum at Decoy.

"They (Mr. and Mrs. Duff) used the dancing to get the students out of the community," Doug said. Financing the trips themselves, the Duffs would take a group of students to dance festivals at Berea College and other area schools. Through the years their dancing improved. They were asked to perform at other festivals, and even on television. Decoy folk dancers have been on television in Lexington, Toledo and Huntington, Duff said. They have traveled in every direction, as far as Boston, Florida and Denver.

"It's important to get the kids out. It gives them confidence in themselves, getting out of this small community and meeting others," Duff said.

Not long after Decoy became known for folk dancing, the Duffs, who also have a daughter, Carol (Mrs. James Maynard), of Lexington, started receiving requests from groups who wanted to visit their school. The first group to come was the American Friends Service Committee from Philadelphia in 1964. They stayed eight weeks and helped put a new floor in the school, build the basement and construct the bridge across Middle Fork to the school.

That was just the beginning. Ever since, Decoy has been host to summer work camps. People from all over the country and 16 foreign countries have lent a hand—from putting a new roof on the building to teaching summer school. Next summer the Appalachian folklore class from the University of Buffalo will live and study at Decoy. In March a group from Williams College will come.

Perhaps the biggest contribution, both in money and labor, made by the work camps is Decoy's new community center. It's a large, modern, yet rustic building where the people of the community gather for dances and meetings. Work camp groups can live there. The Duffs are now living in a small apartment area in the building which was designed by an architecture student from the University of Kentucky.

While dancing brought recognition to Decoy and continues to do so, the children's art work will also receive wide attention. Drawings by Decoy students will be on exhibit in New York's Metropolitan Museum this January, in a contest and exhibit sponsored by Save the Children's Foundation, work by Decoy students was selected to represent children's art of Appalachia.

Neither Mr. nor Mrs. Duff has formal art training, yet the walls of the three school-rooms are decorated with colorful, expressive drawings by the children.

And Mrs. Duff works with the girls, especially during the summers, teaching them to weave. They use the three looms in the community center and make beautiful skirts, some of which are used as dancing costumes, and rugs.

Since Mr. Duff is no longer teaching at the school, Mrs. Mary Combs, Mrs. Duff's first cousin, began teaching grades 5 through 8 at Decoy this year. Last year she taught eight children up on Laurel Fork at Elmrock. Now her husband drives her and the children from Elmrock down to Decoy every day.

And then he makes two more trips into the mountains, picking up other school children and driving them to Decoy. Until two years ago, all the children walked to school. For some the walk was several miles.

Mrs. Duff is a bit worried about the school during the winter months ahead. The road between Decoy and Elmrock isn't finished yet. She's afraid Mrs. Combs won't be able to make it to Decoy on bad days. They'll need another teacher.

Mrs. Duff herself intends to retire within the next year or two. She wants to move to Hindman where her husband and son are working.

Other teachers will come to the three-room, brown, wooden schoolhouse. But the

people who live around Middle Fork of Quick-sand Creek won't forget Lionel and Frankie Duff.

HAROLD WILSON'S PROPOSAL FOR PEACE IN ULSTER

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Harold Wilson, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, has suggested what appears to be the only solution to the civil tumult in Northern Ireland—unification of all Ireland under a single constitutional government.

It is hardly a unique proposal. Indeed, it has been made many times before by spokesmen of virtually every political stripe. But Mr. Wilson, after a trip throughout Ireland, is now convinced that this solution is the last dim hope for ending the bloodshed. He proposed that a convention of delegates from Eire, Ulster, and Westminster begin framing plans now for a United Ireland—plans that would take effect 15 years hence under a new constitution.

Mr. Wilson's speech was greeted soberly in Parliament. Even England's Tories, traditional foes of a united Ireland, did not protest.

Mr. Speaker, Alfred Friendly, distinguished correspondent for the Washington Post and now based in London, discuss Mr. Wilson's proposal and its implications in his column of November 27, 1971. Mr. Friendly has written perceptively and objectively on several occasions on the agonizing atmosphere of Northern Ireland. I include his article in the RECORD:

UNITED IRELAND A SOLUTION

(By Alfred Friendly)

LONDON.—Winston Churchill was more than usually grumpy. It was not so much that an ungrateful electorate had voted him out of office two years before, but that his doctors had forbidden him cigars. He was complaining to a luncheon guest:

"This island is beset by a tribe of neurotic philosophers"—he meant the Labor government whose ministers he termed, invariably and with bitter contempt, "those socialists"—"who wake up each day thinking what there is that is England's to give away and each day by regretting what they have done."

Churchill missed the point, a point more easily appreciated today, with almost 25 years of hindsight. Britain did not "give away" India, and later almost every other possession, as a charitable gesture, but because it could not hold them any longer. Whatever they might have been in the beginning, in the end not even the white colonies were "England's" to be given away.

It was just that once Britain could no longer support a massive, locally invincible world-wide military force, they could not be kept.

The point was clear enough to see this week with Rhodesia. Britain has concurred in its independence not because Ian Smith came to Britain's terms but because Britain came to terms with its own capabilities. Rhodesia could be held, as "England's" only by military force, if it ever came to the crunch. Britain has no clout for such a crunch, and the end was inevitable.

All of which is prelude to the speculation

that probably also Ulster is not any more "England's" either to give away as a gift or to hold on to. The reason is not exactly a lack of bare military strength, but the futility of expending that military strength forever to keep a sort of peace in an area where one side is determined to fight on and on, sometimes passively, sometimes actively, until its goal is won.

However ridiculously anachronistic today, when transportation and communications render foolish the old ideas about where borders must be, there remains an overpowering nationalist mystique about islands. It holds that they must in their entirety have a single government. There is no good reason for this but it is so (Hispaniola being an exception). Try telling his Beatitude Archbishop Makarios to give a chunk of Cyprus to the Turks, or Generalissimo Chiang Kai Shek to split Formosa between the Chinese and Taiwanese.

There is no good reason why a million Protestants, largely of Scottish descent and British loyalty, should become part of the Republic of Ireland because 3 million Catholics there, plus the half-million in Ulster of different tribal ancestry, want the six counties of the North united with the 26 of the South.

Yet, as the Ulster crisis wears on, it is beginning to look as if that is the only possible final outcome. A measure of just how far that not very equitable conclusion has come to be recognized was former Prime Minister Harold Wilson's speech to Parliament Thursday, on his return from an intensive inquiry in both the North and South of Ireland.

His proposal, startling yet sober, ingenious yet careful, was for a commission of representatives from the Parliaments of Ulster, Eire and Westminster to draw up plans for a unification of the North with the South to take place 15 years hence, under a new constitution.

There was no outraged scream from the Conservative side of the house, no waving of the bloody shirt, when Wilson concluded. On the contrary, even the Tories, beginning with the minister of state for defense, seemed to take the proposition not only seriously but also approvingly.

The prime minister of Eire saw "problems" (meaning Wilson's proposal that the unified country should then return to the Commonwealth and pledge loyalty to the Queen), and the prime minister of Ulster declared, whether ritually or substantively, that there could be no unification "as far as the political eye can see."

Yet the consensus here is that Wilson may have made the most fruitful and statesman-like proposal since he lost office 18 months ago. His speech may be the takeoff point of a policy that will end a decade or two from now with Britain "giving away" another province.

For it looks, more and more, that a united Ireland may be the only solution for permanent peace in bloody Ulster. It will be unfair, but so many peace settlements are and have been. It will be a victory of emotional, passionate, romantic nationalism over the principle of rational and equitable sharing of democratic power. It will be a validation of the unreasonable notion that even for those who don't like harp music, there can be no partitions in Tara's halls.

HEROIN: THE FRENCH CONNECTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, revelation has followed revelation on the degree of

French governmental complicity in the heroin traffic that begins in Turkey, moves to France and ends up in the United States.

Roger Barberot, a former French ambassador, has admitted that French counterespionage agents have been smuggling narcotics into our country, narcotics that find their way into the bloodstream of our young people and our servicemen.

Herbert J. Stern, the U.S. attorney in Newark, has charged the French Government with an unwillingness to prosecute Paul Fournier, also known as Paul Ferrer, of the French secret service—SDECE. Fournier was named as a key man in the dope ring linked to the unsuccessful attempt to smuggle \$12 million worth of pure heroin into this country in April. Confessed heroin smuggler Roger De Louette has stated that he was given the name of a French consular officer to contact in case he ran into any difficulties while trafficking in heroin.

Mr. Speaker, we have not heard the last of this matter. The people of the United States are tired of protocol taking precedence over the health and well-being of our citizens. They are sick of reading how Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs agents are being silenced for speaking the truth.

We in Congress, with the support of the American people, must tell France that we have had enough flimflammy and deception. We demand action.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material:

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 17, 1971]

ADMITS DOPE PLOT AND TELLS OF HIS FRENCH CONNECTION

(By Alex Michelini)

Swearing repeatedly that he was confessing "without force, threats or promises," former French intelligence agent Roger DeLouette pleaded guilty in Newark yesterday to charges of conspiring with a high-ranking French Government counterspy to smuggle \$12 million worth of pure heroin into the United States.

In the process, the tall, dark-haired defendant branded a member of the French Consulate in New York City as his alleged "contact" in the plot and implied that French police who questioned him here following his arrest scolded him for spilling the secrets of the alleged dope conspiracy.

And in a series of letters to French authorities revealed in court for the first time, U.S. Attorney Herbert J. Stern hinted that the French government was attempting to cover up the conspiracy by throwing legal roadblocks into the way of a French investigation of the case.

APPEARS IN COURT

Accompanied by an attractive, blonde French interpreter in Newark Federal Court, DeLouette 48, a college-educated former agent for the Service of Extended Documentation and Counter Espionage, the French equivalent of the Central Intelligence Agency, swore that he plotted with his former spy boss, Col. Paul Fournier, a supervisor of the counter-espionage agency, to smuggle the heroin into Port Elizabeth, N. J., last April 5.

"Do you understand that you have been charged in count one with conspiring with Paul Fournier and others to import and bring into the U.S. 96 pounds of heroin?" Judge Frederick B. Lacey asked.

"Oui," Delouette replied softly.

"And are you, in fact, guilty of this charge?"

Again, Delouette said, "Oui."

DENIES GUN THREATS

DeLouette, a father of six, and a former agriculture engineer, answered, "no" when asked if his plea resulted from any force, threats, or promises of freedom. And he replied "no," when Lacey asked, "Has there been an understanding with you or an understanding as to the sentence that I or some other judge might impose?"

He stood with his hands folded in front of him as Lacey told him he could receive a term of five to 20 years in prison and a \$20,000 fine on the guilty plea to the one count of the three count indictment. The defendant said repeatedly he understood the consequences.

At one point, Lacey read off the questions put to De Louette during the first of two lie detector tests last Sept. 21 in which De Louette talked about his "New York contact."

"Did Fournier give you a contact in the French Consulate in New York?" one question asked.

"Yes," he replied, the report of a lie test said.

ASKED ABOUT BOGUS MONEY

Another question asked, "Were you directed by Fournier to receive \$17,000 in counterfeit U.S. currency," and again, the report said De Louette replied, "yes."

De Louette's attorney said he would move at some future date for the dismissal of the two remaining counts of the indictment against De Louette. In the meantime, Lacey deferred sentencing of De Louette pending a mandatory probation report, and sent him back to the Somerset County Jail in Somerville. Bail of \$500,000 was continued.

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 17, 1971]

DOPE SMUGGLING ROLE DENIED BY PARIS AGENT

(By Bernard Valery)

PARIS, November 16.—Col. Paul Fournier, the French secret service agent indicted by a New Jersey grand jury on heroin-smuggling charges, was questioned for five hours by a judge here today. He denied later that he had anything to do with the affair.

Fournier, a stocky, crewcut man of about 50, was spotted at the door of investigating magistrate Gabriel Roussel.

"I don't know what you are talking about," he told reporters. No details of the long hearing were released.

But several hours later, he told a newsman: "I have nothing to do with this affair. ... This affair would be very serious if I were indicted by the French and not the American justice."

The grand jury charged yesterday that Fournier solicited Roger de Louette, a former subordinate, to smuggle \$12 million worth of heroin into the United States. De Louette was arrested in April and implicated Fournier.

Most of the French press claims not to believe that Fournier is guilty. Most have accepted the official version that De Louette was employed for a short time by Fournier before being fired. When he was caught with heroin, the version goes, De Louette implicated Fournier out of spite.

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 17, 1971]

STATE DEPARTMENT "SATISFIED" WITH FRENCH HELP

(By Frank Jackman)

WASHINGTON, November 16 (News Bureau).—The State Department said today that the United States was "satisfied" with the cooperation of French authorities in efforts to smash illegal drug traffic. Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.), however, blasted the French for doing little to crack down on heroin manufacturing and trafficking.

State Department spokesman Charles Bray was questioned about U.S. attitudes toward the French antinarcotics effort in light of the indictment by a federal grand jury in

Newark, N.J., yesterday of a high-ranking French intelligence officer and one of his former agents. The two were accused of conspiring to smuggle \$12 million worth of heroin into the U.S.

Bray said that the "close and continuing cooperation between ... the two governments has been of great value to both." He said that U.S. Attorney Herbert Stern of Newark, went to Paris at one point during the investigation and received "invaluable assistance" from French officials.

But Rangel, in a letter sent to all members of the House, said that France "has a very long way to go before it can pat itself on the back for its fight against illicit trafficking in narcotics."

CALL IT PROPAGANDA

Rangel, a member of the House Crime Committee, claimed that the French Embassy here was conducting a propaganda campaign to try to convince the American people that France is successfully fighting the processing and smuggling of heroin.

"It is imperative that the American people not be lulled into a false sense of security," he said. "France is definitely not exerting itself to prevent the merchandising of heroin and its illicit transportation into the United States."

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 19, 1971]

HE MISSED FRENCH CONNECTION

(By Alex Michelini)

Confessed heroin smuggler Roger De Louette said yesterday through his attorney that the name of a contact in the New York French consulate was given to him by high-ranking French counterspy Paul Fournier, an alleged kingpin of the dope ring, to use "if I ran into any problems."

But De Louette who conferred with his lawyer, Donald Robinson, in his New Jersey jail cell, said he never met nor got in touch with the contact because he was arrested before he could make a move.

CLAIMS DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

According to Robinson, De Louette said he was not told what role, if any, the consulate official actually played in the alleged conspiracy, only that he was to contact him if he got into trouble.

The consulate official, who twice refused to appear before a federal grand jury in Newark investigating the case, agreed to answer written questions submitted by U.S. Attorney Herbert J. Stern. The official had refused to answer the grand jury subpoenas on the grounds of diplomatic immunity.

The written answers were turned over to Stern's office late yesterday.

The first mention of a consulate figure in the case came last Tuesday when De Louette pleaded guilty to charges of plotting to smuggle \$12 million worth of pure heroin into Port Elizabeth, N.J., along with Fournier, a supervisor for the French Service of Extended Documentation and Counter Espionage.

TOOK LIE DETECTOR TEST

At the time, a report on a lie detector test administered to De Louette, which he passed, showed that he answered "yes" to a question about whether Fournier had given him a contact in the New York French consulate.

De Louette, a former intelligence agent working under Fournier, is being held in \$500,000 bail in the Somerset County jail in Somerville.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 20, 1971]

EX-FRENCH AIDE BACKS DOPE CASE

(By Morton Mintz)

A former French ambassador said yesterday that American charges that French counter-espionage agents smuggled narcotics into the United States were justified.

Roger Barberot, former French ambassa-

dor to Uruguay, made the charge in an interview on Radio Luxembourg that was reported by Reuter, the British-based news agency.

Barberot spoke four days after a federal grand jury in Newark, N.J., indicted Col. Paul Fournier, an official of the French counter-espionage agency known as SDECE, and Roger X. L. DeLouette, his former subordinate and accuser, for conspiring to smuggle heroin valued at \$12 million into this country.

Without dealing specifically with Fournier, whose true name was given by Barberot as Paul Ferrer, the former diplomat said, "I am convinced—you will be told officially later—that the operation was organized by a number of SDECE agents in Paris."

Barberot is now director of an agricultural development office in Paris in which, he said, DeLouette worked from 1968 until he was dismissed in 1970.

"I think that he was recruited by the SDECE in 1970," Barberot said.

On Tuesday, pleading guilty in District Court in Newark, DeLouette said Fournier solicited him in the same year for the heroin smuggling conspiracy, which was frustrated last April by a customs inspector at Port Elizabeth, N.J. She found the heroin—96 pounds of the pure form—concealed in a Volkswagen camper.

DeLouette, arrested when he came to pick up the VW, told Judge Frederick B. Lacey—and had said earlier in polygraph tests which his own attorney and U.S. Attorney Herbert J. Stern said he passed—that Fournier masterminded the operation.

Fournier, on Thursday, challenged Stern to prove him guilty; Stern responded that, if innocent, he should be willing to come to the United States to stand trial.

Stern has protested that Paris authorities have shown much less interest in prosecuting Fournier, than in extraditing and prosecuting DeLouette, who now faces a mandatory prison sentence of five to 20 years here.

The prosecutor has said, however, that he may seek to have Fournier extradited if he will not stand trial here, or if the French do not prosecute him.

In the interview with Radio Luxembourg, Barberot suggested that DeLouette's arrest resulted from a "major purge" in the SDECE, which wanted "to do away with a murky past."

He also said that Fournier is a former sergeant in the French Air Force.

Reuter said the Investigating Magistrate Gabriel Roussel in Paris ordered seizure of the interview tape.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 21, 1971]

HEROIN SMUGGLER'S STORY—PROBING THE ANATOMY OF A "FRENCH CONNECTION"

(By Morton Mintz)

Last Dec. 15, according to the U.S. government, Col. Paul Fournier, a supervisory agent in the French counterpart of the CIA, recruited Roger X. L. DeLouette, 48, who holds the Croix de Guerre for his service in World War II, for an unusual mission: to smuggle heroin into the United States.

DeLouette, who had been dismissed some months earlier by another French government agency believed to be an espionage front, the Bureau for Agricultural Development, and who is the father of four sons and two daughters, agreed.

Here is the sequence of events that followed, according to U.S. government sources and DeLouette:

Fournier, whose agency is known as SDECE (Service de Documentation Extérieure et de Contre-Espionage), and who has an office in Paris in Les Invalides, arranged for DeLouette to meet someone the government calls "John Doe."

Meeting, as instructed, the next day at the Paris Cafe in Paris, DeLouette made an agreement to smuggle 96 pounds of pure heroin, with an estimated "street corner" value of \$12 million, into the United States. For his services, "John Doe" told him, he would get \$1,200 per kilogram, or \$50,000.

At the same meeting, the unidentified man instructed DeLouette to obtain a visa for entry into the United States, to buy a Volkswagen camper, in which the heroin would be hidden, and to arrange for shipping the camper to this country.

A secondary preliminary meeting, also set up by Fournier, was held at the King Cafe in Paris in mid-February. This time, "John Doe" gave DeLouette the equivalent of \$5,500 in French currency for the purchase of the VW and other expenses associated with his mission.

DeLouette bought the camper from the Garage Michel-Ange, V.W., in Paris on Feb. 25. To avoid the French sales tax, he paid for it with a check for 14,079 Swiss francs drawn on the Credit Suisse in Geneva, where he has account No. 195-715.

The next day, DeLouette went to Geneva to deposit enough to cover it.

On March 15, Fournier got in touch once more with DeLouette. He told him to drive the VW to Pontchartrain, about 25 miles from Paris, and there, the next day, meet another unidentified man—"Robert Roe" to the U.S. government—who would be driving a green Simca and who would give him the 96 pounds of heroin.

DeLouette did this, and he and "Robert Roe" hid the narcotic in wall panels and under the floorboards of the VW.

The day after, DeLouette drove the VW to LeHavre, where he consigned the camper to Pacific Intermountain Express for shipment to Port Elizabeth, N.J. On March 18, he told Fournier the details of the shipment, including the date of arrival in this country and the name of the hotel in New York City in which he planned to stay, the Park-Sheraton.

On April 3, Fournier told DeLouette to fly to New York. He did so the following day, on TWA Flight 803, and went to the Sheraton.

At Port Elizabeth, meanwhile, a Bureau of Customs inspector, Lynn Pelletier, 21, who had been on the job only a couple of months, was spot-checking imported vehicles. She discovered the heroin in the VW.

When DeLouette went to Port Elizabeth on April 5 to claim the VW, he was arrested.

By then a major investigation was underway—by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the Justice Department, the Bureau of Customs and the U.S. attorney in Newark, Herbert J. Stern.

Almost at once, DeLouette was questioned by American authorities together with a French policeman, Commissaire Daniel Hartwig.

DeLouette's final instruction from Fournier, which was aborted by the arrest, had been to drive the VW to the Park-Sheraton and await an unidentified contact, who would take the heroin and pay him the \$50,000 delivery fee.

In Paris on April 6, the day after the arrest, the Central Office for the Suppression of Illicit Drug Trafficking entrusted an official inquiry to Investigating Magistrate Gabriel Roussel.

A week later, in a letter to prosecutor Stern, Roussel said that under French law he could not proceed against Fournier without a statement from DeLouette.

Later Stern obtained permission from District Judge Lawrence Whipple to appoint an official of the Bureau of Narcotics to ask the questions of DeLouette that Roussel wanted asked—and to ask them in the presence of a French narcotics policeman, Claude Shaminadas, who is assigned to the French consulate in New York.

DeLouette's court-appointed attorney, Donald A. Robinson of Newark, balked. He

wanted assurances that DeLouette's answers (and testimony he gave in the meantime to the grand jury) would not be used against him in France.

Without such protection from self-incrimination, which in the United States is guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, he would not let DeLouette answer Roussel's questions.

To resolve the dilemma, Stern said, Honore Gevaudan, assistant director of the Police Judiciare in Paris, suggested that Stern request Roussel to immunize DeLouette from prosecution in France.

Stern made the request in a letter in which he said that immunizing DeLouette would enable the French "to proceed against the 'high-ups' in a criminal organization which is operating between our two countries."

Roussel has never told Stern whether he will grant immunity. As late as Friday, however, French government spokesmen were insisting that Roussel lacked power to immunize DeLouette. The prosecutor's office disputes this, not only because the idea had a French source, Gevaudan, but also because of special provisions in a French-American agreement on fighting narcotics trafficking.

Another effort to mesh the legal systems of the two countries was made in Washington on Sept. 14, at a meeting attended by Stern and assistant; Donald W. Merkelbach; Bureau of Narcotics officials; Gevaudan and Michel Nocquet, also of the Police Judiciare, and Shaminadas, the consulate narcotics policeman.

Recounting the meeting in letters to Roussel and Max Fernet of the French Criminal Police in Paris, Stern said the French participants made it clear they believe DeLouette was lying about Fournier.

Accordingly, Stern said he proposed a lie detector test, with the understanding that if DeLouette should refuse to take it or should fail, he would prosecute him and recommend the maximum sentence for conspiring to import narcotics, 20 years.

On the other hand, Stern said in the letters, the French agreed that if DeLouette took the test and passed, they would "proceed with an appropriate prosecution" of Fournier.

Privately, Shaminadas bet Stern a meal in a French restaurant that DeLouette wouldn't take the test—but he did, on Sept. 21, with the Justice Department administering it. "The results of the test were positive indicating that DeLouette was telling the truth," Stern told Fernet.

One of the questions was, "Did Fournier give you a contact in the French consulate in New York?" DeLouette's answer was yes. The person he named—not Shaminadas—is a middle-level official. Stern has submitted written questions to this official that are supposed to be answered Monday.

Later, on Oct. 4, DeLouette took a second polygraph test to answer questions submitted by Shaminadas, who was present. The machine indicated that DeLouette was untruthful only when he denied he had told a certain friend of the heroin smuggling.

Nine days later, Stern sent Fernet, the police official in Paris, a copy of the polygraph examination, which, he said, "indicates to me beyond any doubt that Mr. DeLouette is telling the truth concerning the involvement of Col. Fournier." Stern has never had a reply from Fernet.

The same day, although French police had interviewed DeLouette as far back as April 5, Magistrate Roussel wrote Stern to ask for additional information in order to "identify" DeLouette.

Stern, who by then had turned over all of the evidence in his possession to the French, sent along photos and fingerprints.

But, obviously seeing stalling tactics in all of this, the prosecutor told Roussel—in

a letter hand-delivered in Paris on Nov. 5—that his "primary emphasis" seems to be on arresting and extraditing and prosecuting Fournier. And, he said, if Roussel did not act, the grand jury would.

Last Monday, the grand jury indicted Fournier and DeLouette. The next morning DeLouette pleaded guilty.

For two hours, Judge Frederick B. Lacey reviewed with DeLouette every detail of the conspiracy charge, as given earlier in this article.

Judge Lacey ended by saying he was satisfied that the guilty plea was factually based, uncoerced and made in awareness that it carried a mandatory sentence of at least five years. DeLouette, unable to put up \$500,000 bond, is in custody awaiting sentencing.

In France, official sources issued a series of denunciations of DeLouette and Stern and defenses—echoed by the American embassy—of the vigor with which the two countries fight the narcotics traffic.

There was no sign at all of a possible prosecution of Fournier, who, Stern told police official Max Fernet, had been cleared by a four-day "investigation."

Instead, in a statement authorized by Defense Minister Michel Debre, Fournier challenged Stern to prove him guilty. Stern replied that Fournier, if innocent, should be willing to come here to stand trial.

In the midst of all of this, it became known that the European chief for the Bureau of Narcotics, John Cusack, who had publicly hinted in August that official complicity underlies France's role as the source of the vast majority of heroin reaching the United States, was being transferred to the United States. The bureau said this was a normal rotation.

On Friday, Roger Barberot, head of the Bureau for Agricultural Development, where DeLouette once worked, said in an interview, on Radio Luxembourg in Paris, that agents of Fournier's SDECE had organized illegal traffic in narcotics, currencies and jewels. The true name of Fournier, a former master sergeant in the French Air Force, was Paul Ferrer, he said. Magistrate Roussel ordered the tape of the interview seized.

[From the New York Sunday News, Nov. 21, 1971]

DEBRE: HEROIN STORY SEEMS A PIPE DREAM

PARIS, November 20.—Defense Minister Michel Debre said today that Roger de Louette, who is facing sentencing in Newark, N.J., on drug-smuggling charges, made "grave accusations" against a French secret service agent in order to get his sentence reduced.

Debre, who oversees the secret service agency, said the charges that the agent, Col. Paul Fournier, conspired with deLouette in the smuggling operation came from a man with an imagination like a "serialized novel."

Without naming de Louette, Debre said in a statement to the government radio network, "The occasion of which people currently speak was provided by the arrest of a former and occasional employe of the service, who seems to have sunk in recent months into deplorable operations.

"To diminish the sentence which awaits him, the accused made grave accusations. His imagination quickly constructed a serialized novel. The guilty one will be judged and his accomplices brought to justice."

De Louette, who admitted trying to smuggle 96 pounds of heroin, worth \$12 million street value, into the U.S. at Port Elizabeth, N.J., earlier this year, told New Jersey authorities that Fournier had masterminded the plan. Fournier was in New York at the time of de Louette's arrest last April.

De Louette pleaded guilty to the charges last Tuesday. He faces a prison term of five to 20 years. Fournier, who is now in Paris, has denied any part in the conspiracy.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 22, 1971]

FRENCH ASK DRUG CASE STATEMENT

PARIS, November 21.—The judge investigating the French side of a French-American heroin smuggling scandal involving members of the French secret service reportedly wrote to U.S. attorney Herbert Stern today offering to exchange statements by the accused men.

Authoritative French sources said judge Gabriel Roussel told Stern that he would send him the declarations of Col. Paul Fournier, alias Paul Ferrer, of the French Secret Service (SDECE) in exchange for those made to American authorities by alleged former agent Roger DeLouette, arrested last April and indicted last Tuesday by a Newark, N.J. grand jury on heroin smuggling charges.

Both Stern and DeLouette's lawyer have refused to let French police question De Louette unless he were granted immunity from prosecution.

The grand jury also indicted Fournier, in his absence, on the smuggling charges after DeLouette had told U.S. police that Fournier had masterminded the operation, involving heroin worth \$12 million.

Judge Roussel questioned Fournier for five hours last Tuesday, and the secret service official maintained afterward that DeLouette's charges were false.

Defense Minister Michel Debre, whose ministry has jurisdiction over the SDECE, said Saturday that the government supported the service.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 23, 1971]

EX-AGENT ATTACKS FRENCH SPYING UNIT

(By James Goldsborough)

PARIS, Nov. 22.—The French counter-espionage service (SDECE), already under fire for its possible involvement in a \$12 million Franco-American drug scandal, was attacked today by one of its former ranking officials.

Col. Pierre Beaumont, who was recently dismissed as head of the service's investigations section, asserted that the intelligence organization was infested with clans conniving against one another.

"So long as this situation exists," Beaumont told a news conference, "the service will be worthless."

Today's charge coincided with the publication in the newspaper France-Soir of an interview with Herbert J. Stern, U.S. attorney in New Jersey, who urged French authorities to cooperate in the current drug investigation.

Stern reaffirmed his contention that certain SDECE officials were behind the attempt by a former French intelligence agent to smuggle 96 pounds of heroin into the United States last April. The former agent, Roger DeLouette, is currently held in a New Jersey jail.

Col. Roger Barberot, former French ambassador to Uruguay, last week charged the intelligence organization with complicity in the drug case. He also accused Beaumont of "high treason."

Beaumont, who was fired along with several other French intelligence officials on suspicion of being double agents, said today he plans to sue Barberot for 1 million francs.

Both Beaumont and Barberot, however, agreed that the service's troubles stem from a massive housecleaning of the agency carried out under its new chief, Alexander de Marenches, who was handpicked for the job by President Georges Pompidou.

Charges by former officials as well as the drug scandal are getting increased public attention here. The intelligence organization has denied any connection with the drug case.

But Stern said in his interview today he had proof that Col. Paul Fournier, who took over Beaumont's job, was connected with

the drug smuggling case. Stern said Fournier's real name is Paul Ferrer and said he would ask for his extradition.

Stern suggested that other SDECE agents may be involved but that DeLouette has refused to cooperate with the investigation in an effort to protect them.

Barberot speculated that the drug scandal was engineered by disgruntled French intelligence officers who "clumsily" planted heroin in a Volkswagen camper in the belief that DeLouette would be caught.

PARIS PRESSED TO ACT ON ALLEGED DRUG PLOT

A federal prosecutor yesterday pressed Paris authorities to proceed against Col. Paul Fournier, the French counter-espionage official accused by a former subordinate of masterminding a conspiracy to smuggle \$12 million worth of heroin into the United States in a Volkswagen camper.

In a letter to Investigating Magistrate Gabriel Roussel in Paris, U.S. Attorney Herbert J. Stern in Newark, N.J., said that he was forwarding the transcript of the extraordinary arraignment proceedings in which a guilty plea was entered by Roger X. L. DeLouette, Fournier's accuser and former agent in the counter-espionage service known as SDECE.

At the two-hour proceedings, Judge Frederick B. Lacey questioned DeLouette for almost two hours to establish to his satisfaction that, among other things, DeLouette's charges against Fournier were valid.

The arraignment was last Tuesday, a day after a grand jury indicted DeLouette and Fournier.

As of the close of business Friday, when Stern mailed the letter to Roussel, no French official had come to the courthouse to get a copy of the transcript. The transcript included details of a polygraph (lie detector) test the Justice Department gave DeLouette Sept. 21 and documentary evidence supplied by Stern's top aide, Jonathan L. Goldstein.

DeLouette, who is held in \$500,000 bond, is awaiting sentencing. He faces a mandatory prison term of 5 to 10 years.

Stern sent the magistrate, who has been in charge of the case in Paris since April, another key document: the statement DeLouette made to a French policeman, Commissaire Daniel Hartwig, after a Customs inspector spotted the heroin in the VW, leading to DeLouette's arrest at Port Elizabeth, N.J., April 5.

The transcript and the arrest record together "surely set forth sufficient details to proceed forthwith with the prosecution of Col. Fournier," Stern told Roussel.

JAILED AGENT'S WIFE QUESTIONED BY JUDGE

PARIS, November 22.—Christian DeLouette, wife of a former French secret service agent indicted in the United States on charges of drug trafficking, was questioned for more than an hour today by a French judge.

But no details were disclosed of the 80-minute interrogation by Judge Gabriel Roussel who is handling the French end of investigations about American accusations that a French espionage services chief led a multi-million dollar conspiracy to smuggle heroin into the United States.

Roger DeLouette, 48, was arrested in Newark, N.J. in April after a woman customs officer found 96 pounds of heroin in a car on a ship at Port Elizabeth, N.J. Mrs. DeLouette made no comment today. She has been separated from her husband for five years but met him regularly when he visited France, court sources said.

The sources said Roussel was also expected to question DeLouette's former mistress, 22-year-old Marie-Jose Robert, arrested earlier this year after police found \$17,400 in counterfeit currency in her Paris home.

BLUE RIDGE FLUSHPOT

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know that I have spoken many times on the impending threat to the economic and environmental well-being of thousands of my constituents—the threat posed by the scheduled construction of the massive Blue Ridge power project.

I have cited articles from the Winston-Salem Journal, the New York Times and other newspapers dealing with this critical situation; I have played a part in insuring the independent participation of the Environmental Protection Agency in this case; I have filed a formal statement of my own views in this matter with the Federal Power Commission.

Today I am urging my colleagues to pay particular attention to an editorial on this subject which appeared in the November 15 issue of the Greensboro, N.C., Daily News. My colleagues would be well advised to heed the warning proposed in the last two paragraphs of that editorial, which state:

"The Department of Interior appears to be saying that for the time being at least pollution dilution shall be a substitute for adequate treatment at the source, whether it is industrial or municipal or whatever. Environmentalists, however, insist that much of the technology for at-the-scene treatment is now available and the technology to treat the most resistant pollutants will be available before the Blue Ridge project is completed.

We are unqualified to judge the dispute over the availability of the necessary treatment processes. But if the FPC gives Blue Ridge the go-ahead for the expanded project it will be setting a precedent with implications that polluters can easily grasp. The long-range effect will be a slowdown of pollution abatement in the United States."

This is a timely and reasonable warning, and one which I hope my colleagues will give serious and immediate consideration.

At this time, I include the full text of the editorial in the Record:

BLUE RIDGE FLUSHPOT

The Federal Power Commission concluded hearings on the Appalachian Power Company's proposed Blue Ridge power project November 11. The agency's decision, when it comes, should provide some clues as to how serious the federal government is about controlling water pollution.

More immediately, the decision could affect the lives of several thousand people in northwestern North Carolina, not to mention the ecology of the region. The project would dispossess 5,000 in Alleghany and Ashe counties and in Grayson County, Virginia.

It would also flood the best valley land in those counties—about 40,000 acres altogether. At periods of maximum draw-down, the shoreline would fluctuate widely. Opponents of the project claim that would expose such vast expanses of unsightly, foul-smelling mudflats as to make the lake unfit for boating and fishing and would drive tourists away. (The people supporting the project have emphasized its potential as a tourist attraction.)

At issue here is whether the government should control pollution at the source or allow industrial polluters to use relatively

clean waterways to flush dirty water hundreds of miles downstream to be diluted in huge reservoirs. Appalachian Power is asking for licenses to build two reservoirs on the New River. But the reservoir on the North Carolina-Virginia border would be the main flushpot for the chemical industry complex at Charleston, W. Va., 250 miles upstream.

In the beginning, the power company's proposal was a modest one that might have benefitted the three counties economically. The original plan, submitted in 1965, involved flooding only 19,000 acres and no storage for flushing pollution. There was no demand or need for the power locally and it was to be fed into the company's distant grid system which ties American Electric Power Company of New York. But residents of the three counties concerned did not oppose the original plan.

Former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, a Democrat, pressured the company into changing that plan. He argued it was necessary to double the size of the project and impound more water for flushing purposes. Mr. Udall has since recanted; he testified the other day that he was "misguided" and that "pollution dilution is crazy any way you look at it." But Interior under the Nixon administration still backs the flushpot idea on the ground that technology to clean up Charleston's industrial pollution at the source is not available and won't be "in the foreseeable future."

The power company, likewise, has changed its position and now favors the additional water storage. And the FPC's presiding examiner, William C. Levy, has approved a license for the enlarged project.

But there is opposition to the plan. Various state and national conservation groups, the North Carolina Farm Bureau, the Appalachian Regional Commission and the governments of the three counties concerned are against it. Mr. Udall himself is now opposed and so are the attorney generals of Virginia and West Virginia. Governor Robert Scott and Attorney General Robert Morgan are not opposing it for reasons best known to themselves.

Opponents of the project are basing their legal fight on a provision of the federal Water Pollution Control Act which says that while water quality storage may be considered in planning, any project requiring a federal license, "such storage and water releases shall not be provided as a substitute for adequate treatment or other methods of controlling waste and the source."

The Department of Interior appears to be saying that for the time being at least pollution dilution shall be a substitute for adequate treatment at the source, whether it is industrial or municipal or whatever. Environmentalists, however, insist, that much of the technology for at-the-source treatment is now available and the technology to treat the most resistant pollutants will be available before the Blue Ridge project is completed.

We are unqualified to judge the dispute over the availability of the necessary treatment processes. But if the FPC gives Blue Ridge the go-ahead for the expanded project it will be setting a precedent with implications that polluters can easily grasp. The long-range effect will be a slowdown of pollution abatement in the United States.

NOODLE PRIEST

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have as my good friend

for many years Msgr. John Romaniello. Until recently this remarkable man ministered to the needs of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong by feeding them high-protein noodles.

Now working for the Catholic Relief Service in New York, the famed and beloved "noodle priest" has recently become involved in the work of a black-run farm cooperative in the delta country of Mississippi. Having sent the project a noodle machine from Asia to help it provide high-quality nutrition for the area's children, he traveled to Mississippi this month to assist in setting up the machine for production.

A recent article in the Boston Sunday Globe focuses attention on this dedicated servant of God and on the OEO project in Mississippi. With much pride and respect for Father John, I commend the article to my colleagues:

TROUBLED FARM CO-OP PINS FUTURE ON NOODLE MACHINE
(By Herbert Black)

MOUND BAYOU, MISS.—A noodle machine that traveled from Hong Kong to Boston to here became a symbol of hope this weekend for a farm cooperative, run by black people, which is faced with losing Federal support.

The noodle machine was sent from Asia by Hong Kong's famed "noodle priest," Msgr. John Romaniello who fed high-protein noodles to thousands of refugees from China for 14 years.

Fr. Romaniello bustled into Mound Bayou last week to put the noodle machine back into operation and he stirred up more interest and activity than is usually experienced in a year.

The monsignor served as a catalyst to draw together people from the Far East, New York, Boston, Washington and elsewhere to locate a noodle machine in this tiny, dusty town in the Mississippi Delta.

The story begins with the Delta Health Center, established here by Tufts University School of Medicine five years ago. The doctors soon found they were prescribing food as medicine for black children of the area.

This led to establishment of a farm cooperative for blacks, run by blacks and supported by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The Ford Foundation helped provide land for growing vegetables. Tufts sponsored the cooperative and served as grant agent. The foundation holds title to 305 or 345 acres the farm uses.

Fr. Romaniello's work in Hong Kong was coming to an end when he learned of the farm cooperative from a friend, Davis Taylor, publisher of The Boston Globe. Taylor suggested protein-fortified noodles might help solve nutritional problems in the United States and recommended Mound Bayou as a place to start.

Fr. Romaniello, who works for the Catholic Relief Service in New York, sent a reconditioned noodle-making machine to Boston. It was shipped 18 months ago to Mound Bayou.

Even though the machine measures only six feet by two feet, considerable space is needed to store flour and other ingredients and to dry the noodles.

With the help of OEO a \$20,000 noodle plant building was built of brick and metal. The machine was set up in the building last week and a test run was successful.

Now the OEO is phasing out the cooperative's Federal funds as of Dec. 31, after three years of helping to get it going.

Eric Taylor, director of the North Bolivar County Farm Cooperative, doesn't see how the program can continue without Federal support. He says capital is needed for another year or two until the co-op can become self-sustaining.

The noodle machine has become a symbol of hope for continuing the farm program. Fr. Romaniello's presence in the Delta has stirred up a lot of interest in the farm project.

There is hope the machine, while it won't make money for the project, might stimulate aid from outside.

Already, for example, F. Robert Melina, special projects director of the Lauhoff Grain Co. of Danville, Ill., has promised to donate the high-protein concentrate CSM for at least six months of noodle production. CSM is a mixture of cornmeal, soybeans, nonfat dry milk powder, vitamins and minerals to be added to the noodle flour.

Melina also is asking the Millers National Federation and other flour-producers sources for donations of flour.

Others are volunteering, too. Hubert A. Davis, business manager of Tufts Medical School, is trying to find funds for use after the OEO grant runs out. He has run the business side of the co-op under the grant.

G. Brenton Creelman, a Boston accountant who has been auditor for the program, came to Mound Bayou for the dedication of the noodle machine and to see what he could do to help.

Fr. Romaniello is asking his superiors at the Catholic Relief Services to let him make periodic visits to help keep the machine going. He already raised \$2100 from Boston donors to buy flour.

Miss Patricia Bennett, a consultant for OEO, said she would report on the machine and the enthusiasm it has generated to Washington officials.

Despite all these offers, the 647 Mound Bayou families who belong to the co-op feel they are being abandoned.

They don't understand how the government can let them develop a farm helping to feed 3,235 people and then cut off the funds. The OEO explanation is that its Emergency Fund and Medical Program is ending nationally.

Fr. Ramaniello, who got free flour and CSM to feed refugees from China, has tried to get these supplies from the Federal government for Mound Bayou. He is concerned that the government doesn't appear to allot food for a project in this country.

Because the high-protein noodles would first be provided primarily to children, there is some hope that a project might be funded to study their effects on the health of children who ordinarily lack protein in their diet.

Protein deficiency is a serious problem in the Delta, despite the rich soil. Most of the land is devoted to cotton. The farm co-op's fresh vegetables are an effort to overcome this deficiency.

The noodle machine, it was emphasized by all connected with it, won't compete with local stores.

At least in the beginning, the noodles would be distributed to needy families with many children. Fr. Romaniello believes protein deficiency is related to slow mental development in small children.

CHOU EN-LAI HAS ADMITTED DEMOLIBERATE SCHEME FOR OPIUM TRAFFIC AMONG U.S. TROOPS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of October 24 London's Sunday Telegraph reported that according to the biography of Egyptian President Nasser by Mohammed Heikel, Chou En-lai in his conversation with Nasser in 1965 told Egypt's late President that:

The Chinese Communist regime planted high-grade opium in Vietnam to demoralize American soldiers with drugs.

And that:

The effect which this demoralization is going to have on the U.S. will be far greater than anyone realizes.

From what actually transpired in Vietnam in subsequent years, it would appear this despicable scheme was employed as the Communists had planned, though not as successfully as they had hoped.

The article, "How Chou Fights America With Drugs," as it appeared in the Sunday Telegraph, will be included as a part of my remarks.

This serves to confirm the modus operandi of the infamous Peking regime which was recently admitted and embraced by the United Nations—an organization that is supposed to be fighting international drug traffic.

This serves to remind us of a warning issued by Gen. Ho Ying-chin, president of the UN Association of the Republic of China, in which he said that according to data collected by the Weekly Review of London, the peasants on the Chinese mainland have been ordered to plant poppies on a massive scale with the total acreage reaching 5,830,000 hectares.

It was found there are 30 "special products processing factories" in the mainland of China engaged in the processing of narcotics for dumping overseas, and that in 1970 alone the Peking regime exported \$800 million worth of narcotics, including opium, morphine, and heroin.

It is thus made clear that the Peking regime is at the root of most of the troubles in Asia and the whole world by the deliberate massive production of and traffic in narcotics. It constitutes a weapon in their arsenal of diabolical schemes to demoralize any people who may become casualties in their disgraceful drug war. They thus establish themselves as a world leader in an enterprise to promote human debauchery and depravity.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the revealing article which appeared in the Sunday Telegraph. It follows:

HOW CHOU FIGHTS AMERICA WITH DRUGS—A LEAK TO HARRIMAN

One of the remarkable things Chou said that night when talking about the demoralization of the American soldiers was that "some of them are trying opium, and we are helping them. We are planting the best kinds of opium especially for the American soldiers in Vietnam."

President Nasser looked at him in some disquiet, but Chou went on: "Do you remember when the West imposed opium on us? They fought us with opium. And we are going to fight them with their own weapons. We are going to use their own methods against them. We want them to have a big army in Vietnam which will be hostage to us and we want to demoralize them. The effect which this demoralization is going to have on the United States will be far greater than anyone realizes."

Nasser felt that possibly Chou was exaggerating a little. But Chou had his plan absolutely clear in his mind. There was no doubt that he intended to do exactly as he said.

When Johnson called his bombers off North Vietnam at the end of 1965, he sent

a number of emissaries round the world telling the leaders of other countries what he hoped to gain by the pause. Averell Harriman came to Egypt on this mission and saw Nasser on January 4, 1966.

The bombing pause had been accompanied by a great propaganda campaign from the Americans and so, when Harriman arrived, Nasser expected to hear something important. But the meeting lasted for two hours with nothing positive emerging from it. Harriman had come with nothing new. He had no suggestions. And there were silences during the talks which lasted for several minutes at a time.

Eventually Nasser said to Harriman: "Do you really think you are going to defeat them? If you increase your troops in Vietnam, you are only going to play into your enemy's hands. Strangely enough, I've heard something from Chou En-lai, and you are carrying out the Chinese plan precisely." And he went on to tell Harriman what Chou had told him about wanting more and more American soldiers to be sent to Vietnam. But he did not tell Harriman about Chou's plan to fight the American Army with opium.

TRADE CRISIS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Union resolution has now been favorably reported by the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. Hopefully, in the near future it will be considered by the full committee and passed.

The bill is timely, indeed. The world monetary and trade crisis is still critical. The United States has just reported the worst balance-of-payments deficit in its history. Trade barriers with Common Market nations have suddenly sprung up. Nations with which we have a net balance of trade surplus complain that the 10-percent surcharge is unfair. Canada, a nation for which we profess the greatest friendship, suffers under worse economic conditions than our own—conditions which have been greatly aggravated by the surcharge.

The North Atlantic Alliance is being subjected to new divisive pressures. A Senate committee has again called for a cutback of U.S. troops in Europe, and the move was only narrowly beaten on the floor. Many think that a reduction in troop strength is inevitable.

It is time for the United States to assume the leadership role which its size, economic, and military power give it. It can do so if the Congress will pass the Atlantic Union resolution.

The following are recent editorial comments which outline the immense international problems we face and point the way to their solution:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 28, 1971]

A WORLD-WIDE DEPRESSION

That's a scare headline, of course, one that does not apply to the conditions of the moment. Unless nations begin pursuing wiser economic policies, however, before long the words may be only too appropriate.

Economic nationalism has become the order of the day. Underdeveloped countries, desperately in need of foreign capital and

technology, frighten it away by seizing foreign assets with little or no compensation. "Chile for the Chileans" makes a ringing slogan, but it's a poor way to build up a poor country.

The problems of the poorer lands are aggravated by a similar chauvinism in the industrial nations, countries that ought to know better. In a revival of old mercantilist notions, exports are eagerly sought but imports are something to hold down as much as possible.

If the underdeveloped nations are ever to develop—and thus to provide expanding markets for the industrial countries—they have to begin somewhere, and a logical way to start is with labor-intensive industries such as textiles. But these industries need markets, too, and increasingly they find the markets of richer countries more or less closed to them.

Nearly all countries, rich and poor alike, appear to think they can purchase lasting prosperity with expansive monetary and fiscal policies. In the backward lands the result has often been nearly ruinous inflation. The sophisticated industrial nations think they can control the price pressures with "incomes" policies, but the results in the past have differed only in degree from those in underdeveloped nations.

Inflation helps to lead organized labor everywhere to press for ever-higher wages, even though in the process the unions are often pricing their members' products out of the market. The upshot of all of this is the present period of economic weakness and uncertainty, conditions that are by no means unique to the U.S.

As Neil Ulman reported in this newspaper recently, unemployment is creeping upward almost everywhere in Europe. On a seasonally adjusted basis, joblessness in Britain is the highest in 30 years. Swedish unemployment, on a similar basis, is the highest since the nation began keeping such statistics in 1955.

In few countries does anyone seem to see that a prime cause of present problems is excessive governmental meddling in the economy. Most countries, in fact, appear to think that the way out is for the government to meddle quite a lot more.

The U.S., for its part, is trying to check inflation by freezing prices and wages; next month the freeze will begin to thaw in a manner that is anything but settled. With a 10% import surcharge, America is also trying to coerce other countries into opening their markets wider to U.S. goods; so far, the more noteworthy results have been Japanese agreement to "voluntary" quotas on textile sales to the U.S.—and threats by other countries of retaliation against American goods.

U.S. officials firmly deny that they're trying to build a sort of "fortress America," but actually nearly every nation seems to be trying to build a little fortress of its own. Many countries evidently accept the idea that, in the future, there will be fewer economic gains to share and they want to make sure of theirs while they can.

"The world economy is entering a stage of lessened growth in which, within a few months, problems of activity and unemployment will raise universal concern," Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, the French minister of economy and finance, said recently. In some areas the concern is already here.

There is no easy solution. It should be apparent, though, that the post-World War II world prospered through growing cooperation, not through growing chauvinism. It should be obvious too that inflationary finance buys only inflation, not perpetual prosperity. Sound growth must be based on relatively stable prices and the freest possible markets, in labor as well as in business.

If every nation insists on trying to enrich itself at the expense of its neighbors, the result will be that world-wide depression. In

the interdependent world we inhabit now, that's even truer than it was in Adam Smith's day.

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Sept. 10, 1971]

URGES NEW TRY FOR ATLANTIC UNION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—One of the causes of today's problems is that while physical scientists are living in the future, political scientists are living in the past.

The physical scientists are readying vast changes but the political scientists—and the politicians—are doing little to prepare for the changes in government needed to cope with what is coming.

What we are experiencing is the lethargy of political thinking and the dynamism of breathtaking scientific inventiveness.

Herman Kahn and Anthony Wiener in their book, "The Year 2000," cite a hundred staggering technical innovations, most of which will be with us in the next 30 years. The spinoff from these will lead to hundreds of other innovations.

Alvin Toffler in what may be recognized as the most important book in the 1970s, "Future Shock," notes that "in every conceivable field and some that are almost inconceivable, we face an inundation of innovation."

But in the field of governing ourselves to meet this onrushing future, we face a dearth of innovation.

The need is to fashion instruments of government equal to the size of the problems we must deal with.

We haven't done so.

Crucial problems sweep over national boundaries. They are global in magnitude and can only be handled on a global basis.

There is need to establish new and stable worldwide trading relations.

Mounting pollution is worldwide and can be handled successfully only on a worldwide basis.

There is need to create a better international monetary system as today's floating currencies reveal.

War is cruel and stupid but peace is in constant peril.

All of this is simply to say that no nation, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union nor any other great power, can keep the peace by itself, can right its monetary system and its trading relations with the rest of the world or rescue its own environment from suffocating degradation.

The physical scientists alone cannot lead the way into the future. Political inventiveness must soon catch up with technical inventiveness or we are in serious trouble.

What can be done? The prospect of getting some kind of world government is slim because the nations are so divided ideologically.

But why not start? A tangible, practical first step would be for the United States to convoke a NATO-wide convention to explore ways to transform the alliance into an eventual federal union. This action is supported by 116 members of the House from 30 states. When President Nixon was a senator he advocated it in these words:

"The Atlantic union resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change going on in the world around us. I urge its adoption."

Clarence Streit, its originator, and its other advocates like Sens. Hubert Humphrey and Barry Goldwater, Eugene McCarthy and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, former President Eisenhower and Sen. Robert Kennedy were not ahead of their time; it is those who have too long resisted it who are behind the times.

President Nixon has already taken two bold initiatives in economics and diplomacy. Why not another?

A THIRD REVERSAL THAT WOULD SAVE LIBERTY, PEACE, AND NIXON FROM PERILS IN HIS FIRST TWO

(By Clarence K. Streit)

The July House hearing on the Atlantic Union resolution began with a strong reminder of the powerful plea for its approval that Richard Nixon made at the 1966 hearing. The hearing ended with no break in the silence President Nixon has maintained on this subject since his election. The only clue to its meaning indicated, however, that this was the kind of silence that proverbially expresses consent.

The Silencer Silenced. Ever since the resolution entered Congress in 1949 (with Senator Nixon among its early cosponsors), the State Department has expressed opposition to exploration of the federal way to unite Atlantica. Its influence silenced even such favorably inclined Presidents as Truman and Eisenhower. This year for the first time the Department declined the routine Congressional invitation to express its views before and at the hearing. Only President Nixon could have thus silenced the Department's bureaucracy, experienced State watchers believe. The bill's backers took the passive help to be part of the "cautious nature" the media attributed to the President.

"Mr. Cautious" Becomes "Mr. Audacious." Only a few hours after the hearing ended July 15, they, and the media, and all the world, got the shock of the year: The laconic Nixon announcement that he would visit Peking. Just one month later, on August 15, "Mr. Cautious" received a second image-shattering blow: The President announced that the U.S. had ceased to uphold the gold commitment which made the dollar the key currency for world trade and foreign Central Bank reserves, and was adding 10 per cent to all import duties and also freezing wages and prices for 90 days. Both moves were abrupt reversals of longstanding Nixon as well as U.S. policies.

A good press for any Nixon move is rare in the U.S., but he had one on both these moves. So remarkably good a press, indeed, that it should encourage him to think that his best way to overcome his many foes in the media and elsewhere is to be bold, and bold once more, and bold again.

The 3d Bold Move Nixon Needs to Make. Despite their good points, I fear the two astounders will end by bringing worse dangers than those he saw required drastic policy changes. I earnestly hope that while he still rides the wave's crest, he will make a third bold move—the one that can save us all, and him, from the reefs he is heading for. That move would be to throw his helm toward the Atlantic federal channel through those reefs. I find it hard to believe that so old an Atlantic hand has forgotten the federal way to safety.

The Hidden Reefs. What are these reefs, hidden to so many now? My August editorial gave the two dangers I saw in the Peking visit. Neither was in its aim (which I have long favored). Both lay in Russia's interpretation of it, and response: the likelihood that Moscow would see it as the classic "leapfrog" move in diplomacy's balance-of-power game, and respond (1) by renewing the Mideast nuclear confrontation threat that led the President to visit the Sixth Fleet only a year ago, and/or (2) by the riskless course of speeding its efforts to drive the dollar off gold, and so doom Atlantica to dissension, depression.

Events showed Russia needed to do nothing to gain the latter aim; the dollar proved even nearer the brink than I warned, at the House hearing, U.S. policies had brought it. Moscow now needs only exploit the loss we have caused our allies and all the non-Red world, and the glum view—reflected on our cover by normally poker-faced diplomats—they take of this. Possibly the prospects this

offers may lead Russia to defer the Mideast challenge; even if only a time-gainer, as I fear, this could be a godsend . . . if used for the third bold Nixon coup.

The greatest dangers in the second Nixon surprise are international. My testimony at the hearing tells why depression follows when the key world currency leaves gold; the Geneva report on page 2 tells of the one that came when the pound did this in 1931. But neither makes clear what proved to be the worst reef—the one that nearly wrecked Freedom then.

What Price Trade—Gained by Freedom's Loss? To me, the worst reef ahead, now that the U.S. has taken the 1931 way to "better" foreign trade, is not the economic disaster I fear will again follow, but its consequences. In 1931 the major loser was Germany; exports sank, unemployment soared. Result: It voted out the free republic it began in 1919. For 12 years it resisted Hitler nobly; when Wall Street crashed he had only 12 deputies; 10 months after Britain left gold, the voters gave him 230. Six months more of depression, and they reverted to autocracy—the worst in their long history. True Britain won in the resulting war, but the price was more than blood, sweat, tears: Loss of long pre-eminence in finance, trade, industry, empire, sea power—with Russia replacing it as superpower. It has paid cruelly for ephemeral gains in trade.

Young Democracy is Now Hit Hardest Again—and Doubly. London's tragic blunder in 1931 was to let hope of trade gains blind it to the longterm dangers when the main loser is a people of outstanding industrial and war potentials, little rooted in freedom, deeply habituated to autocracy.

The U.S. has now hurt most two such nations—Germany and Japan. This reversed a policy paying big dividends, which encouraged West Germany to try democratic federation again; it did even more to give Japan its first free government. The former has survived nearly twice longer than the Republic that died in 1933—but it is only 23; the latter is but 24. Yet both nations have thus risen, phoenix-like, from ruin. Both have passed Britain industrially—a feat indicating how fast each could be a nuclear power. Both show how much more people can do by free government and free enterprise than by Marxism and dictatorship—and each show window strategically faces Communist Russia, Japan's also faces Red China. Is it not folly to run any risk of causing such loss in Germany and Japan that they revert to dictatorship, Red variety?

The Atlantic Union Liberty-and-Life Saver. If you doubt that it could save us from such danger, read "Why Atlantic Union would Prevent another Crash." George Washington feared that even the ties binding Americans west of the mountains to the seaboard states could not keep that area of vast potential from breaking away, or falling in hostile hands. It must be bound to the 13 by "hoops of iron," he said—and led in doing this by replacing alliance with federation. May Nixonian Washington turn soon from repeating 1931 to repeating 1787.

HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

The American Heritage has printed a most interesting interview with the Hon-

orable James A. Farley in its August issue, and I include it here for the benefit of my colleagues. Mr. Farley is a blue-ribbon Democrat, and a blue-ribbon American, and his thoughts and views are of interest to all of us.

BEFORE THE COLORS FADE—THE TRUE-BLUE DEMOCRAT

(By Virginia Van Der Veer Hamilton)

(Note.—Once upon a time—some eighty-three years ago—a likable lad named James Aloysius Farley was born in the village of Grassy Point, New York, on the west bank of the lower Hudson River, to "poor but honest" parents, Irish to the core. When he was nine, his father was killed in an accident. "Jimmy" promised his mother he would help her run the grocery store and saloon, go faithfully to Mass, and neither smoke nor drink. He has kept every one of those promises. When he grew to manhood—six feet two inches—he wed Elizabeth Finnegan, whom he had known all his life, and lived happily with her until her death in 1955. He also commenced another lifelong and still warm affair, common to young Irishmen of his generation—this one with politics, inside the hospitable embrace of the Democratic Party. And it was this that brought him to a place in life where he spoke as a friend to Presidents, prime ministers, and popes, and even heard his own name placed in nomination for the Presidency.

On the opposite bank of the Hudson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a scion of the Knickerbocker aristocracy, grew up in a mansion, in an aura of ease and privilege. He and Jim Farley made each other's acquaintance in Democratic politics. Twice Farley helped elect Roosevelt governor. When F.D.R. became President in 1932, he said that Louis McHenry Howe, his faithful adviser, and Jim Farley were the men most responsible for his victory.

During Roosevelt's first two terms, "Big Jim" was chairman of the Democratic National Committee and of the New York State Democratic Committee, Postmaster General, and number-one glad-hander for the New Deal. Raymond Moley, an adviser to the President, said Farley possessed "inexhaustible geniality." It was reputed that Farley could call by their first names fifty thousand faithful Democrats all over the country. When he and the President were alone, Farley called F.D.R. "Boss and Roosevelt called Farley "Shamus," which is Irish for James.

After his famous split with Roosevelt over the third term, Farley resigned as "three-job Jim." He became chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation. As a soft-drink supersalesman for three decades, he has averaged each year some 120 banquets, one hundred luncheons, and visits to thirty countries. He is still hale and vigorous. Since his wife's death he has lived alone. His three children telephone nearly every day, and his four grandchildren in college call every Sunday ("Collect!"). Usually Farley takes one or two of his ten grandchildren on his trips abroad. Unless it's raining, he walks to his Madison Avenue office every weekday and Saturday morning. Football and baseball are his big sports enthusiasms, but he also enjoys harness racing and occasionally a boxing match. During the baseball season, Farley, who used to play first base for the Grassy Point Alphas, can be found in his box at Yankee Stadium almost every Saturday and Sunday and many evenings.

Farley spends a couple of hours every Friday afternoon in the Biltmore Turkish baths, perspiring and relaxing. This helps him keep tabs on his weight. If the scales go too high, he eases up on two of his favorite dishes, ice cream and rice pudding. Every Sunday morning, rain or shine, Jim Farley passes the collection plate at nine o'clock Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral. He regrets

that he seldom sees a familiar face there, because the congregation is mostly from out of town.

It is an active life. James A. Farley does not, like some old warriors, live entirely among his memories. He is still a worker, still an involved Democrat. But he relishes the recollected days of his political peak. In answer to an interviewer's questions, he recalls the thunder and the shouting of New Deal days, in fluent, soft-spoken sentences, stippled with a wealth of detail drawn from a memory that was once legendary, and is still remarkable.

How did you come to know Franklin D. Roosevelt?

I first met Franklin Roosevelt in 1920, when he ran for Vice President with Governor [James M.] Cox. There was a reception for them at the National Democratic Club of New York, which was on Fifth Avenue where Saks [a New York department store] is now. I had been married only a short while, and I brought Mrs. Farley. It was a long reception, and, in a facetious way, Bess said that if she'd known she had to go through things like that, she wondered if she would have married me. "Well," I said, "in the days ahead, you may run into many like this."

I went to Mr. Roosevelt's office—he was attorney for an insurance company—many times to seek his services as a speaker. I remember I asked him to speak at Flag Day services of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks when I was active in the Haverstraw, New York, Lodge No. 877.

I'll never forget once I met Mr. Roosevelt at the Biltmore Hotel. Every time I go to the Biltmore that scene flashes before my mind's eyes. The hotel has about sixteen steps, and I stood at the top and watched Mr. Roosevelt bound up those steps, two at a time. That's the last time I saw him before he was stricken [with polio].

Did you think that his becoming crippled would be a handicap to him politically?

No, I thought it would be a help to him. I thought it would evoke sympathy. I think it did. In fact I'm sure it did. Only on one or two occasions did I ever hear him refer to his infirmity. We were playing poker one Saturday night at the White House. As the game broke up, he looked at a fellow named Stephen Gibbons, who was an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of the U. S. Customs and who had been stricken with paralysis, and walked with a cane. Mr. Roosevelt said: "I'll tell you, Steve, there's one thing about you and me. We'll never have to worry about getting blood-pressure running up stairs!"

He hated to go into a building if there was danger of getting out in case of fire. He might say to me: "Will there be any difficulty getting in the building?" I remember one time he spoke in Yorkville, and they brought Roosevelt in a side entrance, through windows, rather than the front door because he'd have difficulty getting on the stage.

When did you think of him seriously as a Presidential possibility?

I didn't produce Mr. Roosevelt, although I was given a lot of credit for his nomination and election. He was the logical candidate. Governor [Alfred E.] Smith had persuaded him to run for governor of New York in 1928, although Mr. Roosevelt didn't want to run and his wife didn't want him to run. But he was persuaded on the theory that, if he won, it would help Governor Smith carry New York [in the Presidential campaign]. Well, Governor Smith lost the state by over one hundred thousand, and Mr. Roosevelt carried the state by approximately twenty-five thousand, if I remember the figures correctly.

Being elected governor in a year when there was a Republican landslide made Mr. Roosevelt appear a miraculous candidate. When he was re-elected in '30, he carried the state by approximately 725,000. Next day after that

election, I prepared a statement in which I said, whether Mr. Roosevelt wanted to or not, in my judgment he would become the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1932. Of course I had consulted with his secretary, Louis Howe. I called Mr. Roosevelt up and read him the statement, and in substance he said: "Whatever you want to do, Jim, is all right with me."

After the first of the year I had a tabulation made showing how New York governors in past years had run. I listed the counties from 1912 on, and showed in heavy type the upstate counties Mr. Roosevelt had carried that no other Democratic candidate for governor in the history of New York had ever carried. That was sent out to all Democratic governors, senators, members of Congress, members of the Democratic National Committee, country chairmen, and members of state committees—about seven thousand people all over the United States—with my card attached: "James A. Farley, Chairman, New York State Democratic Committee." Well, that really started a flood of correspondence. It's amazing the number of people who said they were for him and were glad they had that information.

The last Democratic convention in which two-thirds vote was required for nomination was in 1932. Can you explain how and why that rule was abolished?

Well, Mr. Roosevelt was in favor of doing away with it. I did more to bring that about [in 1936] that anybody else. And [in 1932] Mr. Garner told Sam Rayburn when he went to Chicago that if, as, and when Mr. Roosevelt had the majority of the votes, he was entitled to be nominated. He didn't want to see a duplication of the Baltimore convention [of 1912] or the Madison Square Garden convention in '24 [when a deadlocked convention took 104 weary ballots to name John W. Davis].

It's been said that the change began a reduction of southern influence in American life that accounts for some regional bitterness. Do you agree?

Well, they have their influence in the Senate and in the House. They may not have had it with a nomination for President or Vice President, but there's no section of the country had more influence in the Congress and especially in the Senate than in the South, because those men get re-elected, and get on the committees, and they become chairmen. A lot of the complaint now is that the South holds too many chairmanships, and they're not, the southern states, are not supporting the Democratic nominees for President.

Let me say that I travelled all over the United States during the years I served as national chairman, and never once did I see the slightest sign of intolerance or discourtesy. So I have great affection for people in all sections of the country. No place was more generous in support of me than the South. I had a fine relationship with southern leaders and southern people. As a matter of fact, in the polls of those days, outside of Mr. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull I ran better in the South than any other man.

A big change in 1932 was the swing in the votes of Negroes to the Democrats, after a long era of Republicanism among them. Did you try to win over that vote?

No, no, no. I think they felt that Mr. Roosevelt would be more helpful in helping their position, in helping their way of life, than the Republicans would be.

It has been claimed that Hoover asked Roosevelt for help in the period when Hoover was a lame-duck President, but that Roosevelt refused, because he didn't want to take any steps until he had full responsibility. Is that true, and did you so advise him?

I've forgotten. I doubt very much whether I advised him one way or another. That was a policy matter of his own, which of course he discussed with friends in and out of the incoming administration. I don't think he wanted to participate and be helpful, as you

indicate, until he had to assume responsibility, and I don't think he wanted any prior act of his that would embarrass him in any way when he finally took over. You see he was—this has appeared in print and it isn't private—he was very much annoyed with Mr. Hoover when he called on him to pay his respects, which is the usual thing, a day or two before the transition, and when Mr. Roosevelt got there Ogden Mills [Hoover's Secretary of the Treasury] was there, and I think [Undersecretary Arthur A.] Ballantine was, too. And I know Mr. Roosevelt resented it very much. Now he and Mr. Mills were close personal, social, society friends—they lived close to one another—but they were as far apart as the poles, politically speaking. Right or wrong, I think he resented that the President had Mr. Mills there and he was going to try to get him involved, get him interested, get him to participate in some of the programs that Mr. Hoover wanted to carry out. That caused the break. And frankly all it was supposed to be was a social call. They should have asked previously if he had any objection to the presence of Mr. Mills. Now, if they had done that it might have eradicated the problem that developed.

I think Herbert Hoover was one of the most dedicated Americans I ever knew. I worked with him on the Hoover Commission. There isn't any doubt of his regard and affection for his country. Now I might disagree about his policies, but you can't take away from Mr. Hoover his dedication to his country. He ran at a bad time and inherited a bad situation, and he wouldn't do anything to end Prohibition or use the rrc [Reconstruction Finance Corporation] the way Mr. Roosevelt later did.

I asked him one time after I got to know him fairly well, when he first thought that he would be defeated in '32. He said that he had read my prediction [of Roosevelt's victory] and thought I was crazy. He couldn't believe that he was going to be defeated.

I used to see Mr. Hoover often at the Waldorf. He'd send for me to talk politics. My wife, Lord have mercy on her, she's dead fifteen years now, but during her lifetime he'd invite the two of us to dinner. He said ten was too many for a dinner party; six or eight could all engage in one conversation.

I'll never forget one time when I was being talked for governor of New York. Mr. Hoover said: "If you'd run, I'd come out and support you. I don't know if it would do you any good, but I'd be glad to do it." I thought this was one of the finest tributes ever paid me.

After he took office, Roosevelt quickly brought in a number of academic and intellectual leaders to advise him—the so-called brain trust. Could you say how you, as a working politician, got along with them?

I've always said that Professor Moley's advice and wise counsel was most helpful to the President—the President-elect and after he was elected. And I was sorry when they broke because I felt that Mr. Roosevelt in losing Moley—he lost a very fine associate, who was very loyal of course, but above anything else, he was frank. He was not in any sense a yes man. I had a lot of respect for Professor Moley and for the services he rendered to the President. [Rexford G.] Tugwell and I never hit it off too well. Now I could talk to Moley and I was very friendly with [Adolf A.] Berle, very friendly with Berle. But with Tugwell I was more or less at cross purposes. It wasn't personal. We just couldn't reconcile our points of view. I guess that's the way to put it. I was a political animal, you know, and everything I was doing was what I felt was in the best interests of Mr. Roosevelt and his administration and, incidentally, the Democratic Party. The rest of them I had no difficulty with at all.

Do you think that creating the brain trust was a good idea?

I think any President has the right to have around him, in the first place, men who are intelligent and in whom he has confidence. But I think it's important that he have men on both sides of the question. I think he is entitled to have both sides rather than just one side. Mr. Roosevelt saw a lot of people, and he got their views whether they agreed with him or he agreed with them. He got the views on both sides.

How were you able to predict F.D.R.'s 1936 landslide so accurately?

I made that prediction based entirely on my conversations with state chairmen, national committeemen, newspapermen, from Maine, for instance, and different parts of the country. I was on pretty good terms with all of the newspapermen regardless of the papers they wrote for; I told them the truth as I saw it. And I got letters and all kinds of information. Mr. Roosevelt didn't want me to go that far. As I recall it, we had a pool, and I don't know whether he was in the pool, but I think he said 346 electoral votes, or something, I don't know whether I'm right on the figure. But I'll never forget, when I decided I was going to predict, that I called up the Democrats in the state of Maine and told them about it and also called up Frank Duffy, who was the Democratic leader in Vermont, about what I was going to predict. But Frank always called me James, talked like all Vermonters, very stiff. He said, "James, I wish you wouldn't do that. We have a chance to elect a Democratic governor and if you predict Vermont is going Republican it will hurt us." And I said "Frank, it's my job to make a prediction on what I think is going to happen nationally, and I don't think it's going to hurt your state at all insofar as the election of a governor is concerned if the same trend is going along in your state—I've just got to make the prediction that I'm going to." He was very much annoyed with me, but I made it nevertheless.

There's a story that you sent personal notes of thanks to thousands of party workers afterward, and signed them in green ink. Why green?

The editor of my home town newspaper used to use green ink, so I started to use it when I was a boy, and I still do except that I sign obituary and official letters in black ink. Once in a while a regular letter will get signed in black ink, and the person will write back to know if I've given up green ink. But I had a funny experience—it wasn't funny, it was tragic—when I was in the Post Office. I used to sign all the commissions in green ink. The President's signature was a facsimile, but the Postmaster General's was an actual signature. Well, that green ink faded in the sunlight, so I asked the inspectors, as they made the rounds of post offices, to pick up commissions where my signature had faded. They picked up over ten thousand, and I had to retrace every signature! From that time on, I signed all the commissions in black ink.

It's generally conceded that Roosevelt made two political mistakes in 1937 and 1938. One was the attempt to enlarge the membership of the Supreme Court; the other, intervention in the 1938 primaries to "purge" anti-New Deal Democrats. Did you advise him against these steps?

Well, frankly, I didn't know anything about the Court fight, the Court bill, until I read it in the New York World Telegram. He had a press conference that morning where he brought in the legislative leaders and the chairmen of the Judiciary committees of both the House and the Senate—[Senator] Joe T. Robinson [of Arkansas], the Republican leaders, the House and Senate Democratic and Republican leaders, and the chairmen, I think, of the committees to which that bill would go for consideration and for hearings before it went up to the House. And it wasn't until I picked up the World Telegram that

I saw about it. And the next day when I went down the street, I dropped in and I said, "Why the hell did you do that without telling me?" He just called them that morning you know, and anybody that wasn't there [didn't get asked]. You see, he made it very secretive. Now if I'd been in Washington, I'd have been there. But they knew I was in New York and they didn't call me.

Well, he had a mind of his own. Of course, I urged him not to participate in the purge at all. And I didn't participate, as the records show. I took a rather strong stand, you know. Here I was his Postmaster General and the state and national chairman and I refused to participate in the purge.

You broke with him when he went after a third term. In fact, you had your name put in nomination in the 1940 convention and received seventy-two votes. Did you try to discourage the third term beforehand? And how do you feel, looking back?

I still think I was right. I didn't think any man should have done that because it was against our tradition. I argued with Mr. Roosevelt about his health. I said: "You've been four years governor and eight years President, and it's bound to have weakened you physically. There's no way of knowing what's going to happen in the days ahead, and you ought not to do it."

Do you think he could have won the third term if the war in Europe had not been going on?

I don't know. I'm never quite sure on that. He took an awful chance on the third term, but, of course, [Wendell] Willkie just wasn't the fellow to beat him. I don't know who could have beaten him. Willkie wasn't accepted by the country, and he happened to be the nominee. They deluged the Republican convention in Philadelphia, you remember, with million of wires. That really was a deluge. The third term, of course, brought on the fourth term, and by the fourth term Mr. Roosevelt was a very sick man.

As a loyal party man, of course, you had moved to make his nomination unanimous at the convention. Did you actively support him at any time in the campaign itself?

I didn't see Mr. Roosevelt during the campaign, but it was customary for me to ride with him to Madison Square Garden for the big political meeting we always had a few nights before election. I had ridden with him and Mrs. Roosevelt in '32 and again in '36. I was up in Rockland County one Sunday in '40 when there was a telephone call from the White House. Steve Early, the President's press secretary, said that the President wanted to know if I'd meet him at Mott Haven railroad yards [in the Bronx] and ride to the Garden with him and Mrs. Roosevelt and appear on the platform. I said of course I would, and I went up there and we rode down in the car together. Mr. Roosevelt was a superstitious fellow.

I was in the Democratic state committee office [Farley had resigned as Democratic National Committee chairman but remained chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee] from early morning till late at night because I didn't want New York State to go Republican and they'd say Farley was to blame. On the Sunday before election I sent a wire to every member of the Democratic county committees in New York State, about eleven thousand more or less, urging them to get every voter to the polls. Democrat, independent, or Republican, who they felt would support President Roosevelt, because I wanted him to carry New York. And he did. So everybody in the United States knew where I stood.

How do you rate Roosevelt as a President now?

I think Mr. Roosevelt is bound to go down in the history of this country, when they get away from hatred and bitterness, among the first six American Presidents. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and I would think

Jackson and Truman. I'm a devotee of Jackson because he was such a Democrat.

Mr. Roosevelt's entitled to that because he saved the capitalistic system of this country. God knows we might have had a civil war if he hadn't moved as quickly as he did. People were threatening law and order. Out in Iowa they were burning corn and threatening judges who were honoring mortgage foreclosures. People just rebelled.

In the first hundred days the Congress put through many pieces of legislation, PWA [Public Works Administration], AAA [Agricultural Adjustment Administration], CCC [Civilian Conservation Corps]. The CCC took boys off the streets and put them in gainful employment in camps, and part of their pay had to go home to their families. It was great training for them. They were off welfare, well fed, disciplined, in proper housing.

The HOLC [Home Owners Loan Corporation] that President Roosevelt passed saved the banks, the insurance companies, and loan associations. They were proceeding to foreclose mortgages on thousands and thousands of homes in the United States. The HOLC stepped in and took over those mortgages and guaranteed them, you know, and when that organization went out of business after it had served its purpose, it turned a profit back to the government.

Mr. Roosevelt was never given credit for that. The Republican leaders and the bankers, whose businesses he saved, and the businessmen, whose businesses he saved, they were his biggest critics.

It's an outrage that Mr. Roosevelt's been dead twenty-five years now and he hasn't any monument in Washington. Of course George Washington was dead a long time before they did anything for him, and Lincoln, too. Jefferson didn't get his until Mr. Roosevelt was in office. I worked on that. It wasn't easy to get an appropriation even for Jefferson, with people needing money for more important things. But I'll never forget that Mr. Roosevelt said to me: "Jim, if we don't get this through now, we'll never get it for Jefferson." He was just insistent about it.

What was the secret of his political success?

Well, he was an extremely charming man, very easy to know. He was born and raised in the country, so Mr. Roosevelt was really a country fellow, if I may use the term. He was friendly with all the folks around Hyde Park where he grew up, and they called him Frank or Franklin. So it wasn't difficult for him to meet people around the country the same way. He was down to earth, a neighborly sort of fellow. When he was in Warm Springs, they all looked on him as a citizen of Georgia. When he'd greet them, he'd make them feel very much at home, that by God they were an old friend of his. He could do it without any difficulty. Now some people are born with that. It's like a smile. Mr. Roosevelt could smile readily.

I think he could win today. He was probably the greatest campaigner of his day and generation, you know. And on TV he would have been marvellous. On radio . . . his fire-side chats, you know. He wasn't, I would say, a good extemporaneous speaker, but he read beautifully, and the intonation of his voice and everything else went over. Made him, I think, one of the outstanding campaigners of all time. He wasn't an orator in the way Stevenson was, and he didn't have the type of oratory that Smith had or any of the other men of his time, but he read a speech well and got it over, and he did it with a great deal of sincerity, and it got across.

You say "sincerity," but a great many people charged him with being insincere and deceitful. What about that?

I can truthfully say that Mr. Roosevelt—a lot of people accuse him of lying or being careless with the truth—that he never lied to me except about the third term. In my situation, and may I say this very modestly,

there wasn't any reason why he should have lied to me. I was doing everything I could for him and the party and the country, and whatever strength I had I got from my association with him. I wouldn't be doing anything publicly that would be contrary to his wishes. So there was little reason why we wouldn't always agree. Whatever little differences we had would be resolved his way or the way I suggested.

How do you feel about him as a human being now?

All I can say is this: the entire time I spent with Mr. Roosevelt, from the time I first met him in '20 down through the years, it was always a delightful relationship and a fine experience. I have, of course, regretted the fact that my disagreement with him on the third term broke a friendship that had existed for all those years, and I saw him only three or four times after I retired, and I felt very badly about that.

Did he ever forgive you?

I don't think so. I don't think so.

Are you still a good Democrat?

I have a deep sense of loyalty to the Democratic Party. I started in politics in a small town with a population of about three thousand at the time. The town was 75 or 80 per cent Protestant, and at least 65 or 70 per cent Republican. I was an Irish Catholic, but I was elected to office eight times on the Democratic ticket. [Farley was elected town clerk of Stony Point, New York, four times, a supervisor twice. He won election to the state assembly once, and lost once, but carried the town both times.] So I have a sense of appreciation.

There is talk of the need for one or more new national parties. Do you think the two-party system will be with us for a while yet?

I hope it's always with us.

Do you have any plans for retirement?

No notion of it.

Looking back on it all—the people you've met, the offices you've held, the fights you've fought—do you have any comment?

It's been an interesting life.

AUTOMOBILE SAFETY

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, since 1966, Congress has taken an active role in investigating the prospects for improved automobile safety. The need for this type of investigation is well established. The automobile has become an important part of our everyday life. Last year our citizens drove 1,100 billion miles. We have come to depend on the automobile as one of our basic transportation units; however, with more automobiles in use the problem of passenger safety has become acute. American drivers were involved in 47,000 fatal accidents and 2 million disabling accidents. These statistics cost the Nation over \$13 billion, without counting the lost man-hours and the untold amount of pain and suffering which always goes along with such occurrences.

It is for this reason that it is especially gratifying to see one of our leading auto manufacturers providing the real public service of offering meaningful auto safety experiments at no cost to the taxpayer. General Motors Corp. is building an experimental safety vehicle to U.S. Department of Transportation specifica-

tions for the contract cost of \$1. The experimental safety vehicle will help to test some safety concepts which could eventually be included in our passenger sedans. Two of these vehicles will be delivered to the Department of Transportation next October.

Before the ESV models are delivered to the Federal Government they will be crash tested a dozen times. The goal of General Motors engineers is to meet or exceed all Department of Transportation safety standards. Ernest V. Starkman, vice president in charge of environmental activities, described the role of the ESV as a "test bed for new safety concepts."

To introduce the program to the public, William B. Larson, director of the project, presented a film of a high-speed barrier crash test with the ESV. The film revealed that the test vehicle withstood the impact of a 50-mile-per-hour barrier crash test to a remarkable degree.

The experimental safety vehicle will be a five passenger, four-door family sedan with a 125-inch wheelbase, 219-inch overall length. The powertrain consists of a 362-cubic-inch displacement V-8 engine, three-speed torque converter, a drive shaft with two universal joints, and a coil spring rear suspension.

The goal for the ESV in occupant protection is for a 30/50 standard. This would mean that an occupant could be expected to survive as a passenger riding without safety belts at 30 miles per hour. In a 50-mile-per-hour barrier crash, the air cushion approach is used, so that the unbelted passenger is protected.

I am hopeful that these test vehicles will provide the basic information concepts which can be used in designing a safer vehicle for the American motorist and I applaud the efforts of General Motors Corp. to provide this real public service.

VITAL CANCER CRUSADE MUST BECOME REALITY THIS YEAR

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, November 30, a House-Senate conference committee is scheduled to begin deliberations on legislation which could well lead to an historic breakthrough in finding the causes and a cure for cancer.

Practically all of us have been touched in some way by the terror of this disease which ranks as the Nation's No. 2 killer.

Little is known of its origin and the sinister way it strikes casts a grim shadow on everyone. Thus no legislation in recent times has more support in both Houses than that to be considered by the House-Senate conference committee.

A major stumbling block however appears to be the role of the National Cancer Institute in this battle against cancer.

Under the Senate proposal adopted by a vote of 79 to 1, a separate cancer

agency would be created. The House version approved 350 to 5, expands NCI but keeps it within the National Institutes of Health.

My distinguished and able colleague from western New York, Congressman JAMES F. HASTINGS, who, as a member of the House Commerce Subcommittee on Public Health, helped write the House bill, has rightly said:

There is no argument about the need for a speeded-up, all-out offensive against cancer but rather it is a question of which route to take to guarantee the best chance of success.

An editorial in the Jamestown, N.Y., Post-Journal of November 20, strongly underscores this point and I would sincerely urge the conference committee to strive diligently to work out their differences permitting the bill to be presented to the President before the end of this year so, as the editorial so succinctly states:

This vital crusade, the strongest effort yet by the Federal Government to combat a single disease, becomes a reality.

The editorial follows:

HOUSE CANCER DEBATE TO HAVE VITAL IMPACT

A debate has been raging in Washington over how best to organize a government program to conquer cancer. The Administration, Congress, doctors and cancer research specialists agree on the need to find a cure for the disease but disagree on how to organize and administer a national cancer research program. The money for the new cancer program, \$100 million, cleared Congress last May and is ready and waiting for the debate to be resolved.

Rep. James F. Hastings, who with Rep. Paul Rogers (D-Florida) helped write the House Commerce Committee bill expected to go to the floor of the House for debate last month is confident it will pass without major amendments with the final provisions of a national cancer bill to be decided by a House and Senate conference committee.

Mr. Hastings was one of the six original co-sponsors and was instrumental in bringing a Congressional hearing to Roswell Park's Memorial Institute in Buffalo. This hearing resulted in the bill's considerable emphasis on training cancer researchers, creating 15 new cancer centers, similar to Roswell, throughout the United States, and increased funding for the operation of these and existing centers.

Mr. Hastings has announced that more than \$1.6 billion would be unleashed during the next three years to speed up the search for a cure and the causes of cancer under terms of the bill approved by the House Commerce Committee.

A senate measure adopted earlier this year established a separate cancer attack agency. The difference has provoked a controversy within the medical and scientific community with the American Cancer Society and the White House favoring the Senate bill.

"However," Rep. Hastings said, "it should be pointed out that not a single scientific organization supports the concept of a separate cancer institute."

More than 11 such organizations, including the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association and the American Society of Biological Chemists oppose an independent cancer agency, he said.

"In addition," he declared, "the American Medical Colleges Association, representing 103 medical schools and 401 teaching hospitals, has testified before both Houses against a separate cancer institute."

Rep. Hastings said the House bill gives cancer "top priority in funding and establishes

the best machinery for carrying out an effective and accelerated attack on cancer."

Besides the \$1.6 billion, the legislation also contains authorization for \$90 million during the next three years for programs to provide for early detection of breast and cervical cancer.

It is to be hoped that differences are settled and that this vital crusade, the strongest effort yet by the federal government to combat a single disease, becomes an immediate reality.

THE FIRST TEAM FROM THE FIRST STATE

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, the House schedule permitting, tomorrow evening it will be my pleasure to be present at the 1971 annual banquet of the Newark Touchdown Club. This banquet is an outstanding affair each and every year, but this year is something special for everyone in Delaware. The University of Delaware's football team has been voted the No. 1 small college football team in the United States by both the Associated Press and the United Press International. The first State has the first team.

There has not really been a drought in football honors for our great State university over the recent years. Indeed, to many they have become almost routine. In 1968 the Blue Hens won the Lambert Cup, symbol of small college football supremacy in the east. In 1969 they again won the Lambert Cup; and again in 1970. Needless to say, with the No. 1 small college football team in the country in 1971, they won the Lambert Cup unanimously.

In 1968, Delaware participated in the First Annual Boardwalk Bowl for the small college championship of the east. They won. In 1969 and 1970, Delaware was again in the Boardwalk Bowl and again they won. And Delaware is going to the Boardwalk Bowl again this year. What other football team in the country—small college or major college—has compiled a record of that stature? Few, if any. In one popular poll which ranks all football teams together, regardless of size or status as small college or major college, Delaware was the No. 2 team in the east—all colleges and universities included. They were ranked ahead of such perennial powers in the east as Syracuse, West Virginia, Boston College, Villanova, and Army.

But I think that the most important aspect of the success of the University of Delaware's football program is that it has been accomplished without surrendering to many of the evils associated with bigtime football. The University of Delaware does not give scholarships for football, only grants-in-aid based upon the need of the applicant. On the 1971 Blue Hen football team, there are nine starters not receiving any aid. Football is only a part of the University of Delaware—a small part, not its lifeblood.

The history of Delaware football is more than outstanding records. It is a

story of outstanding people. Of recent memory are Bill Murray, who coached until 1950 when he left to become one of the outstanding coaches in the Nation at Duke University; Dave Nelson, who stepped in to take the reins in 1950, became chairman of the NCAA Rules Committee, and led Delaware to a national championship in 1963; and Harold "Tubby" Raymond, who has compiled an awesome record since 1966. And the players, too. Jimmy Flynn, Mickey Heineken, and Ted Kempinski have returned to the university after outstanding careers as players to become assistant coaches. Mark Hurmm, the captain of an outstanding Blue Hen team in the late 1950's, is now a doctor in the Newark area. Dr. Robert Money maker, a vital backfield cog in the late 1950's, is now a Ph. D. research chemist in Delaware. Jim Garvin is an attorney. John Wallace is an attorney. John Boresson, from the early 1950's, is now vice president of Clairrol. The list goes on and on. Community leaders, civil leaders, and leaders in government—all began on the gridiron playing for the University of Delaware.

Nineteen hundred and seventy-one is no exception to the record of success of the Blue Hen football team. With a record of 9-1, the Hens averaged 42.2 points a game. Their great defense allowed only 9.8 points a game. Records were shattered in numbers of categories: rushing, scoring, offense, and defense. Individual standouts were everywhere. Gardy Kahoe shattered the single season rushing record. Sam Neff broke some of the last remaining passing records of the legendary Don Miller, Delaware's Little All-America quarterback of the mid-1950's. And Capt. Ralph Borgess who not only anchored the center of the defensive line, but perhaps more than anyone else provided the team with the leadership and the courage it takes to be No. 1.

Captain Borgess knew that this team was No. 1 from spring practice to Bucknell, and he never let the players forget what it takes to stay on top. And if there were any doubts among the spectators at large that Delaware was destined to be No. 1, they vanished on the first series of plays against Delaware's old nemesis, major college power Villanova. Anyone who saw John Bush at 5 feet 10 inches, 180 pounds, line up against Villanova's All-American flanker, "a man who just can't be covered one on one" and knock him down time after time, knew that this team had what it takes to be No. 1.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Tubby Raymond, Capt. Ralph Borgess, the Delaware coaching staff, the players, and the entire student body for a job well done in 1971. The "First State" now has the first team.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. GLADYS BRYSON

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on October 22, one of the outstanding

missionaries of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Mrs. Gladys Bryson, passed away in San Francisco. Mrs. Bryson, who was a native of Gibson County, Tenn., was a personal friend of mine and had been for many years the object of my admiration. She and her husband, Dr. Davis Bryson, once spent a year in my home community of Yorkville, Tenn., while he was pastor of my home church.

Last week, the Milan Mirror ran Mrs. Bryson's obituary which I include at this point in the RECORD:

FORMER MILAN CITIZEN, MISSIONARY DIES IN SAN FRANCISCO

Funeral services were held Sunday, October 24 for Mrs. Gladys Bryson, a missionary in San Francisco and abroad for 40 years. She died October 22 at the age of 62. Mrs. Bryson was born in Milan and studied at Bethel College and Southern Methodist University in Dallas.

She then went to Colombia where she did much pioneering missionary work. She concentrated on helping international students.

Ill health forced her to leave her work in Colombia after 15 years and she moved to San Francisco. For the last 25 years she worked with the Cumberland Presbyterian Chinese Church and also taught in the adult education program since 1956, and again working extensively with international students.

Mrs. Bryson is survived by her husband, Dr. David O. Bryson of San Francisco; son James of Sunnyvale and two grandchildren.

Funeral services were held at Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Dr. Fred Bryson, her nephew, a dean at Southern Methodist University and Dr. Carl Ramsey officiated.

The family has requested that memorial contributions be sent to the Bryson Scholarship Fund, P.O. Box 4149, Memphis, Tenn. 38104.

The news of the death of Gladys Bryson brought into focus the realization of the broad dimension of a life splendid in every area of work, in the activities of Christian living dedicated to the service of her church and her Lord. The spirit of good will and service had been evident in the early years of her life. A native of Milan, the daughter of the late Lonnie M. Holt and Myrtle Hassell Holt, Gladys Holt had received her elementary and high school education in the Milan City Schools. She was an active honor student in the graduating class of 1927. She entered Bethel College the following year and graduated again with recognition in 1931. She was married to David Bryson, a ministerial student of Midlothian, Texas in 1929.

Following graduation, the Byrsons accepted work at Rose City Church, Little Rock, Ark. Having continued their education in graduate work at Southern Methodist University, they volunteered for a foreign missionary assignment from the Board of Foreign Missions of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. They were then sent to Coll, Colombia, South America, where they worked in building and expanding the church in the entire area for fifteen years. For a year following their return to the states, Davis Bryson served as pastor of the Yorkville Cumberland Presbyterian Church and Gladys was a teacher in the Yorkville Elementary School.

The need for trained missionary personnel in the San Francisco area was apparent and the Byrsons were called by the Board of National (Home) Missions, for this challenge to work with international and especially oriental students. As pastor and education director the Byrsons had been the leaders in the entire area. For twenty-five years the Chinese Cumberland Presbyterian Church had been fortunate in the growth and spiritual inspiration given to all members and friends of the church because their dedication was founded on the lasting values of Christian living and sacrificial love. The

twenty-five years of this service was emblazoned on the hearts of the people with who they labored. Because of a serious heart condition of Davis Bryson the resignation of the Byrsons from the Cumberland Chinese Cumberland Presbyterian Church was given special attention at the 1971 General Assembly at Jackson, Tenn., when the Assembly, through the Board of Missions presented to Davis and Gladys Bryson, a memorial plaque engraved with a notation of very special honor for the forty years of dedicated service to the church and to their great missionary cause. The life and contribution for building better lives in places of sorrow and want, in places of the greatest need have been given with sacrifice and love by Gladys Holt Bryson. This evaluation can be made only by the omnipotent power of the Master of all men for the eternal ages.

The survivors of Gladys Holt Bryson in this vicinity are one brother, Ralph Holt, and two sisters Mrs. Mildred Alexander, Humboldt, and Miss Edith Holt, Milan.

THE POCKET VETO

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during a brief congressional recess last Christmas, President Nixon elected to "pocket veto" two bills which had been passed by the 91st Congress. One of these was the family doctor bill—a measure I had introduced in the House—to focus Federal resources on the critical need for family physicians in the Nation's health care delivery system.

Although the bill had encountered the dissenting votes of only three Members of Congress en route to the White House, it died by the President's pocket veto and Congress was deprived of an opportunity to override the Chief Executive's decision.

The President's use of the pocket veto in this instance, during a period when Congress stood adjourned for a brief holiday period, has produced considerable debate in the interim about the Constitutional foundation for his action.

Writing in the October issue of the American Bar Association Journal, Attorney Benny L. Kass of the Washington law firm of Boasberg, Granat & Kass, has explored "The Pocket Veto: An Elusive Bone of Contention." Many of my colleagues will recall Mr. Kass as a former member of the legal staffs of two congressional committees.

I include his article in the RECORD and I invite the attention of my colleagues on the subject—an issue rooted in the separation of legislative and executive powers and still unresolved today:

THE POCKET VETO: AN ELUSIVE BONE OF CONTENTION

Every student of the Constitution knows that when a bill passes both houses of Congress, the President of the United States has but ten days to act upon it. He may sign the bill, in which case it becomes law. He may veto the bill and return it to the house in which it originated, giving Congress an opportunity to override the veto by a two-thirds vote of both houses. Or he may do nothing, in which case Paragraph 2, Section VII, Article I, of the Constitution provides:

... If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sunday excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law.

When this last event happens, it is commonly called a "pocket veto", and in recent months a considerable controversy has been stirred up between Congress and President Nixon as to whether two bills suffered a pocket veto.

President Nixon received two bills from Congress on December 14, 1970. One was the Family Practice of Medicine Act, which had passed the Senate by a 64-1 vote and the House by 346 to 2, and which authorized the appropriation of \$225 million over three years to help train family-practice physicians. The other was a private bill granting the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission jurisdiction to consider a dispute.

Both bills were sent to the President on December 14; thus the ten-day period expired on December 25. But the Senate, in which the bills had originated, recessed for the Christmas holiday from the close of business Tuesday, December 22, until the following Monday, December 28. Since the Senate was not in session on December 25, President Nixon announced that the bills had been pocket vetoed. No formal veto message was sent to Congress.

A legislative confrontation came quickly. When Congress reconvened, Senator Edward Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, accused the President of introducing "an arbitrary element into the legislative process—an element never contemplated when the pocket veto provision was written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers". According to Senator Kennedy: "The promiscuous use of the pocket veto in this situation was obviously designed to avoid an embarrassing vote in Congress on a veto that would surely have been overridden. The President's action raises the possibility of similar arbitrary vetoes every time Congress takes a brief recess."

But the Justice Department, in defense of the President's action, responded that the use of the pocket veto not only conformed to the two judicial precedents in the area but also "to the consistent practice of other Presidents during the last quarter century". Assistant Attorney General William H. Rehnquist wrote to Senator Kennedy that, "while I believe that the President was on very firm legal ground in taking the action he did, there is no doubt that the use of the pocket veto power has been a bone of contention between the President and the Congress throughout the years".

Indeed, it is a bone of contention, going back a long way in history. By 1928, for example, the first definitive survey into the use of the pocket veto cited more than 400 bills and resolutions that were neither signed nor returned by Presidents. And in recent years, almost every President has used the pocket veto as a means of stopping unwanted legislation.

IS AN "ADJOURNMENT" AS SIMPLE AS IT SOUNDS?

In the words of the Constitution, a bill held by the President for more than ten days becomes law "unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law". Sounds simple, but what is an "adjournment"? Clearly when Congress adjourns *sine die*, at the end of a Congress, the President has the constitutional right to exercise the pocket veto. In effect, he has no choice, for there is no Congress in session to which he may return his veto message.

There are, however, many other periods when one or both houses are in adjournment. In *The Pocket Veto Case*, 279 U.S. 655 (1929), the Supreme Court held that the word "ad-

journalment" was not limited to a final adjournment. The Court, through Justice Sanford, concluded:

We think that under the constitutional provision the determinative question in reference to an "adjournment" is not whether it is final adjournment of Congress or an interim adjournment, such as an adjournment of the first session, but whether it is one that "prevents" the President from returning the bill to the House in which it originated within the time allowed. It is clear, and, as we understand, is not questioned, that since the President may return a bill at any time within the allotted period, he is prevented from returning it, within the meaning of the constitutional provision, if by reason of the adjournment it is impossible for him to return it to the House in which it originated on the last day of that period.

The Court ruled that an interim adjournment of Congress at the end of a session prevented the return of a bill by President Coolidge, and it upheld his pocket veto. It is significant to note that while the Court drew no distinction between the types of adjournments—whether at the end of a Congress *sine die*, at the end of a session or within a session—the issue at hand was, in fact, adjournment at the end of a session.

An interesting collateral issue was then raised as to whether the bill must be returned to the house itself while it is in session or whether it may be returned to the house, although not in session, by delivering it to an officer or agent of the house. The Court decided "that the 'House' to which the bill is to be returned, is the House in session". According to Justice Sanford:

... Aside from the fact that Congress has never enacted any statute authorizing any officer or agent of either House to receive for it bills returned by the President during its adjournment, and that there is no rule to that effect in either House, the delivery of the bill to such officer or agent, even if authorized by Congress itself, would not comply with the constitutional mandate.

Nine years later the Court again had occasion to consider the pocket veto question. In *Wright v. United States*, 302 U.S. 583 (1938), a majority of the Court held that when only the Senate had adjourned, and the adjournment was for a period of three days, "Congress", as the term is used in the constitutional provision, had not adjourned. Therefore, a pocket veto was not available to the President.

In the *Wright* case, a bill that had originated in the Senate was vetoed by President Roosevelt and returned with his objections to the Senate during a three-day adjournment of that body. The House of Representatives was in session. The bill with the President's message was received by the Secretary of the Senate and submitted by him to the Senate when it reconvened two days later. The issue was whether the veto was effective since the President's objections had not been received within the ten-day period by the originating house while in session. In a majority opinion written by Chief Justice Hughes, the Court held that as the Senate alone had adjourned, the constitutional provision did not apply, and the veto was effective.

Wright considerably limited the opinion and dictum of the *Pocket Veto Case*. In the latter case the Court said (in a statement that does not appear to have been necessary to its holding) that even though one or both houses of Congress were to authorize an agent to receive messages from the President, "the delivery of the bill to such officer or agent . . . would not comply with the constitutional mandate". The Court in the *Pocket Veto Case* was concerned with the impropriety of delivering a bill during a period of adjournment to:

Some individual officer or agent not authorized to make any legislative record of

its delivery, who should hold it in his own hands for days, weeks or perhaps months. . . . In short, it was plainly the object of the constitutional provision that there should be a timely return of the bill, which should not only be a matter of official record definitely shown by the journal of the House itself . . . but should enable Congress to proceed immediately with its reconsideration. . . .

The Court in *Wright* responded to these concerns. Chief Justice Hughes wrote: "However real these dangers may be when Congress has adjourned and the members of its Houses have dispersed at the end of a session—the situation with which the Court was dealing [in *Pocket Veto*]—they appear to be illusory when there is a mere temporary recess."

While it is true that the recess time in the *Wright* case was for only three days, it is hard to imagine the Court ruling differently for temporary or interim adjournments when only a few more days are involved. Indeed, in his letter to Senator Kennedy, even Mr. Rehnquist recognized this when he wrote: "There is undoubtedly a legal 'gray area' with respect to the question reserved in the *Wright* case—whether a pocket veto is appropriate during an adjournment for more than three days by one house of Congress. Advice from this office in the past has been to the effect that in this situation, without controlling judicial decision to guide him, the President ought to disapprove a bill by the normal veto message and return, rather than by the pocket veto" (emphasis added).

WHY WAS THE POCKET VETO USED FOR THESE BILLS?

Returning, then, to the two bills which were the subject of President Nixon's pocket veto, there is a real question why the President apparently ignored advice to disapprove the bills by the normal veto message. Fred B. Rooney, Democrat of Pennsylvania, the principal House sponsor of the Family Practice of Medicine Act, believes that the President, faced with a 346-2 vote in the House and a 64-1 vote in the Senate, took advantage of the pocket veto "because he knew if he did send a veto message back to the Congress, the Congress would override his veto unanimously".

During a roundtable discussion at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator Kennedy asked Mr. Rehnquist why the President took the "rather extraordinary procedure of the pocket veto" instead of returning the bill with a veto message. Mr. Rehnquist responded that by the time the President determined to veto the measures, Congress had adjourned: "I felt at this point he had no choice after Congress had adjourned. If it is an adjournment which under the constitutional language prevents the return of the bill, if he wishes to veto it, he must pocket-veto it."

No matter what the legal merits of the question are, the fact remains that President Nixon's pocket veto thus far has been effective. But Congressman Rooney, Senator Kennedy and Senator Sam Ervin, Democrat of North Carolina, have indicated their intention to test the constitutionality and legality of the vetoes, and recently there have been a number of developments.

HOW CAN THE POCKET VETO BE TESTED?

One method of bringing the issue to court is for Congress to treat the Family Practice of Medicine Act as a valid public law and appropriate funds for its implementation. If the Nixon Administration were unwilling to spend the appropriated monies, then a legal action could be brought to test the validity of the purported pocket veto.

Following this approach, on May 11 Congressman Rooney introduced an amendment to an appropriation bill that would have appropriated \$25 million to implement the

provisions of the act. Responding to a point of order that there can be no appropriation for something that is not authorized, Speaker of the House Carl Albert ruled the amendment invalid, stating:

The Chair is not oblivious to the fact that certain questions have been raised about the legal propriety of this veto. However, the Chair cannot rule on this constitutional question. The Chair may only refer to the statutes at large or the United States Code to find the authorization required to support this appropriation. Since no such statute can be cited, the Chair must sustain the point of order.

And the Senate similarly refused to make the appropriation.

Another method of testing the pocket vetoes might be to proceed on the private claim. One of the vetoed bills would have conferred jurisdiction on the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to pass upon a \$215,200 claim of the estate of Miloye Sokitch, a refugee from Yugoslavia. After the Germans had occupied Yugoslavia in World War II, they handed over a manganese mine owned by the Sokitch family to the Italians, and the family's loss of ore from the mine is the basis of their claim.

In April of this year the Sokitch family filed their claim with the commission, alleging jurisdiction on the basis that the private bill is now law. If the commission rejects that view and holds the pocket veto authority validly used, this may open the door for an ultimate Supreme Court ruling. Although commission rulings on claims usually are final and not subject to court review (22 U.S.C. § 1623(h)), because of the constitutional issue involved, a federal district court might be willing to accept the case for review.

CONGRESS MOVES TO DEFINE "ADJOURNMENT"

Only time and a possible judicial decision will determine the ultimate legality of the Family Practice of Medicine Act and the private claim statute. Many members of Congress believe, however, that Congress should act to prevent what they regard as the possibility of future abuse of the pocket veto power by defining what "adjournment" means. For example, Congress probably will have recessed at least seven times during 1971, and presumably the President would be able to exercise the pocket veto during at least some of these recesses.

Senator Ervin, along with Representatives Emanuel Celler, Democrat of New York, and William M. McCulloch, Republican of Ohio, have introduced bills that would define the scope of the pocket veto (S. 1642 and H.R. 6225). Specifically, the word "adjournment" in the Constitution would be defined as an adjournment *sine die* by either the Senate or the House of Representatives. The bills also would make it clear that if the respective house were not in session when a President wants to return a bill, then presentation to an officer designated and authorized by that house to receive bills under those circumstances would constitute a valid return of the bill. Both bills have been referred to the respective committees on the judiciary, where they are under active consideration.

In June of 1833, James Madison wrote Henry Clay on the President's duty to return bills to Congress, stating:

It is obvious that the Constitution meant to allow the President an adequate time to consider the bills . . . presented to him, and to make his objections to them; and on the other hand that Congress should have time to consider and overrule the objections. A disregard on either side of what it owes to the other, must be an abuse, for which it would be responsible under the forms of the Constitution.

The legislative bone of contention has been hauled out again. Perhaps this time, Congress—and the courts—will have an opportunity to bury it completely.

CONTRASTING COURT DECISIONS STRESS NEED FOR NEW LABOR POLICY

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize the pressing need for a Federal prohibition on involuntary unionism by relating the contrasting results of two recent court cases involving workers who incurred the wrath of dictatorial union officials.

The employee plaintiffs in these cases were an Idaho busdriver, Wilson Lockridge, and a veteran Western Electric Co. employee, Dale Richardson of Nebraska.

Each of these men was fired from his job as a consequence of conflicts with union officials. In September, a Federal district court jury in Omaha awarded Richardson damages totaling \$342,000. Last month Lockridge irretrievably lost an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, whose members acknowledged that existing labor laws sanction the unfair treatment to which he was subjected.

In his work as a busdriver, Lockridge was exposed to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act which sanction compulsory "union shop" clauses in collective bargaining agreements. His employer and the certified union negotiated such a contract, and he was obligated to pay union dues in order to retain his job.

At the outset Lockridge authorized his employer to deduct monthly dues from his wages and transmit them to the union treasurer. Subsequently, he revoked that authorization and elected to remit the dues himself. His revocation of the dues checkoff authorization displeased officials of this local union, and they made their displeasure known to him.

Ultimately, the union officials alleged that Lockridge was in arrears in his dues payments, and they demanded his removal from the company's payroll. His employer complied with that demand, thereby triggering court proceedings which were to extend over a period of 12 years.

This litigation reached a dead end when the Nation's highest court ruled against Lockridge. Last month it denied his petition for a rehearing. The Court held there is no remedy in the acts of Congress for workers who find themselves in Lockridge's circumstances.

Dale Richardson, the Western Electric Co. worker in Nebraska, was for 9 years a voluntary member of the AFL-CIO affiliate known as the Communications Workers of America. He held the highest grade for which an hourly-rated employee was eligible, and he was second in seniority among 164 shop and warehouse employees in the Western Electric facility in Omaha.

In early 1965, Richardson became concerned about the possible misuse of union funds. After being stymied in his efforts to see the pertinent financial records, he

protested by resigning from the union in January 1966. He was aware that the Nebraska right to work law promised him the right to withdraw from the union without jeopardizing his employment.

His resignation triggered a vicious campaign of abuse, discrimination, and harassment by union hotheads—a campaign which company officials did not suppress. Several months after his withdrawal from the union, Western Electric acceded to the demands of union officials for Richardson's discharge. Company officials later acknowledged that his work record was without blemish previous to his resignation from the union.

Richardson filed suit for damages against both the union and his former employer, charging a flagrant violation of his freedom to join or not to join a union as protected by Nebraska's right to work law. A Federal district court jury heard the evidence and awarded the plaintiff \$20,000. The presiding judge promptly reduced the award to \$1,500, and his decision was then appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. The latter court upheld Richardson's appeal and said in its opinion:

An employee wrongfully discharged under a collective bargaining agreement, as exists here, suffers more than just the loss of a job itself. His damage must be appraised in terms of not only his wages, but the loss of seniority and the benefits which flow from it; he has thus lost his reasonable expectancy to his continued employment . . . When an employee's expectancy of employment is challenged by invidious discrimination of the company or the union arising from his non-union membership, the law should not react niggardly as to realization of his whole damage . . .

The court of appeals also described in some detail the "malicious treatment" to which Richardson was subject. The following is an excerpt from the court's decision:

The evidence is that plaintiff was subject to malicious treatment for over six months before his discharge . . . While at work Richardson was constantly pelted by a rain of nuts, bolts, and screws thrown at him by other employees. Other methods of harassment included constant pushing and shoving, challenges to fight and threats of violence, burning Richardson with a lighted cigarette down his back, calling his wife vulgar names and attributing to her unnatural sex acts, deflating his automobile tires, placing a beer bottle behind his tires, squeezing a tube of grease in his tool drawer, and padlocking his locker. Not long after he resigned from the union, the tires of his car were slashed while it was parked at his home . . . Union officials took part in many of the intended harassments . . . During the nearly seven months of his non-union employment, union men involved Richardson in three separate fights. In May an employee by the name of Reber . . . called Richardson's wife a whore, then asked him to sign a statement that he (Richardson) had challenged Reber to fight. Richardson struck Reber three times. Both were suspended by the company, Richardson for three weeks, Reber for two weeks . . . On September 1, a union member named Korytowski tried to provoke Richardson in the parking lot. He kicked Richardson, who returned the blow and called the offender a bastard. Later that day the company discharged Richardson . . .

In accordance with the higher court's ruling, the Richardson case was retried

in September before a second Federal district court jury in Omaha. That jury awarded the plaintiff \$250,000 from the union for mental anguish and \$92,000 in compensatory damages. It assessed the defendant union for 70 percent of the smaller sum and the company the remaining 30 percent.

It is clear, of course, that Richardson was successful in his fight because the Nebraska Legislature exercised its authority to outlaw compulsory unionism. It might be said that Lockridge was unsuccessful, because of the Idaho Legislature's failure to exercise that same authority. However, we cannot obscure the fact that Lockridge was victimized by a weapon placed in the hands of his employer and his union by the Congress.

If it had not been for legislation enacted here, Lockridge could not have been placed under the obligation to pay union dues. Therefore, the Congress—and not the Idaho Legislature—is primarily responsible for the injustice he suffered.

Some of us in the Congress may prefer to absolve ourselves of guilt by saying we affirmed the authority of the States to legislate against compulsory unionism by incorporating section 14(b) in the National Labor Relations Act. But, in effect, we said to the States: We'll allow you to ameliorate any problems arising from our authorizing the forced unionization of workers. That is akin to blaming the homeowner for his failure to prevent the destruction of his property by a Government-licensed arsonist.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we remove the weapon of compulsory unionism from the hands of employers and union officials. We can attain that objective by enacting into law the national right to work bill that I introduced November 17.

**UKRAINE—THE LARGEST CAPTIVE
NON-RUSSIAN NATION IN THE
U.S.S.R. AND EASTERN EUROPE**

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is not generally known and sufficiently appreciated that the largest captive non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe is Ukraine.

With a population of over 45 million, Ukraine is one of the most resourceful nations in Europe, and if it were not under the domination of Russian Moscow, it would surely again become "the granary of Europe" in an advanced economic framework of industry and agriculture. Also, the country's geographic location, extending from the Carpathian mountains toward the Caucasus and above the Black Sea, is a most strategic one as concern developments in Europe, Asia and the Middle East.

Because we shall hear more and more about this largest captive nation in Europe, I submit for our popular edification the illuminating section on "Ucrainica In American and Foreign

Periodicals" in the world-respected journal of East European and Asian Affairs, The Ukrainian Quarterly. The section, prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, regularly shows the growing interest in this captive nation and, above all, the prominent myths and misconceptions that many in the West still cling to when analyzing or commenting upon the Soviet Union, Russia or Ukraine. It is high time these myths were dissipated, and a Select House Committee on the Captive Nations would be the most effective way of doing it. The Ukrainian Quarterly, Vol. XXVII No. 3, autumn 1971:

**UCRAINICA IN AMERICAN AND FOREIGN
PERIODICALS**

"U.S. Facing the Inevitable on U.N. China Seat," an article by Crosby S. Noyes. *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., May 14, 1971.

Many arguments pro and con have been advanced on the so-called China issue in the United Nations. But about the most ridiculous one in favor of seating Red China is the analogy drawn with the presence of the puppet representatives of Ukraine and Byelorussia in the U.N. There has recently been a whole rash of articles and commentaries putting forward this false analogical argument.

This article cites the suggestion made by Harvard's China expert John Fairbank to recognize Taiwan as an "autonomous province" of mainland China. It then goes on to say "It even might eventually provide a basis for Nationalist representation in the UN on the same ground that Byelorussia and the Ukraine are represented along with the Soviet Union."

It is indeed startling how thinking processes seem to be detoured when the non-Russian nations in the USSR become involved in world issues. There is obviously no parallel between the two distinct non-Russian nations in relation to the Russian within the multinational state of the USSR and that between the Republic of China and mainland China. Plainly, on all counts the former are distinct and separate national entities. Both Taiwan and mainland China are integral and inseparable parts of the Chinese nation. To draw an analogy between the two different categories is like mixing pickles and ice cream. But the nonsense continues to be repeated ad nauseam.

"Soviet Union Accused of Genocide," a report. *Freedom's Facts*, The All-American Conference to Combat Communism, Washington, D.C., February 1971.

Two lectures in honor of the late Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki are commented on in this report. Both lectures were delivered at St. Josaphat's Ukrainian Catholic Seminary in Washington, D.C. The first lecture by Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn, head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in this country, dealt with Soviet Russia genocide of both the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches in the USSR. The second, given by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, dwelled on the strategic importance of Ukraine in the world struggle.

Sweeping in its coverage, the Senyshyn lecture registered twenty-one charges of genocide and crimes against imperialist Moscow. These included the destruction of churches, the dispatch of hoodlums into churches to disrupt services, the incarceration of clergy and a host of other barbarous activities. The Archbishop stressed the genocide of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

The Dobriansky lecture at the Ukrainian Catholic Studies Foundation pointed out the strategic importance of Ukraine in any consideration of world affairs. He stated his prime point in these words: "From every viewpoint—political, economic, geographic—

Ukraine is so high in strategic importance that one can formulate it into the equation, U.S.S.R. minus Ukraine equals zero." The equation was elaborated at length.

"The Vindication of Barry Goldwater," remarks by Hon. Philip M. Crane. *Congressional Record*, Washington, D.C., June 28, 1971.

The so-called disclosures made in the Pentagon Papers and the role of the *New York Times* are dealt with in the remarks of Congressman Crane regarding an introduced article by Allan C. Brownfeld. As both conclude, "Only Barry Goldwater emerges from these Pentagon papers as an honest man. It is indeed ironic to see the newspapers which once sought to destroy him now admit that in a cynical age he was a man who told the truth."

In the course of the columnist's analysis striking reference is made to the man-made famine in Ukraine. "For many years," Brownfeld writes, "Walter Duranty was the *Times* correspondent in Moscow. He was there during Stalin's purge trials, during the famine in the Ukraine. Yet, he reported none of these things accurately to *Times* readers. Instead, he became an apologist for Stalin."

With the memorable year 1964 at issue here, many can recall similar newspaper distortions of truth concerning the erection of the Shevchenko statue in the nation's capital. *The Washington Post* led in this and similarly played up to Moscow and the puppet Ukrainian representation in the U.S. In this case, it was mauled.

"No U.S. Trip for Ukraine Cardinal," a report. *New York Post*, New York, May 28, 1971.

Appearing also in other papers as an AP release, this report covers the cancellation of an intended visit by Josef Cardinal Slipyj to Canada and the United States. According to the account, "A Vatican press office spokesman said . . . that the visit was canceled in the wake of threatened agitation at the consecration of two auxiliary bishops in Philadelphia." The disturbances that actually did ensue, reached desecratory proportions.

The Ukrainian prelate's secretary, Msgr. Ivan Choma, is quoted as having said with reference to the canceled trip, "He was a prisoner in the Soviet Union and seems to end up being one in the Vatican, too." If this quote is correct, the analogy cannot but raise many an eyebrow.

"And a Wishful Reality," a commentary. *News From Ukraine*, Kiev, Ukrainian S.S.R., April 1971.

This is a curiously written commentary on the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and also its president, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University. The disturbed commentary is studded with emotional adjectives and, as for empirical facts, its hallmark is dearth. Its views of UCCA bear no relation to reality. Primarily, the commentator doesn't seem to understand that UCCA is an American organization of Ukrainian background and not some sort of government-in-exile or a parliament in the diaspora.

What appears to sting the writer is Dr. Dobriansky's involvements in Asia. As he puts it, "But nevertheless in Saigon, Mr. Dobriansky defends all human ideals and virtues! And how he defends them!" Of course the writer knows the broad, integrated discussions that go on not only in Saigon but also Taipei, Tokyo and Seoul. Plainly, if Peking can take a keen interest in Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, why can't these? It has been known for years that Kiev, as well as Moscow, has been keenly interested in these Asian sojourns, and for good reason. Current developments, such as the President's trip to Peking, indicate it in part.

"Ukraine Leader Urges Soviet to Get Rid of Hippies," a report. *The New York Times*, New York, June 30, 1971.

"Khippism" seems to trouble Pyotr Y. Shelest, the Ukrainian Communist leader and a Politburo member. It was the same Shelest who three years ago was troubled by events in Czecho-Slovakia and strongly urged Moscow's invasion of the neighboring Red state. Now he would have action taken against the latest Western scourge—"khippies."

Apparently this is the first time a public official in the USSR used the term "hippies" in the open. According to Shelest, "Under the influence of bourgeois propaganda and morals, part of the youth for this or that reason has slipped from under our influence." His admonition?—"All Communists and all public opinion must join in the fight against them."

The trend in the USSR is for growing hippy looks in the major cities. Youth there seems to keep abreast of developments in the West. Ironically enough, television and movies in the USSR concentrate on anti-war movements in the West, showing thereby the current look of youthful participants. The youth there simply imitate, ostensibly as comrades-in-arms, practically as comrades-in-looks.

"Who Is the Imperialist?," a tabulation. *AFL-CIO Free Trade Union News*, Washington, D.C., June 1971.

In the book review section of this journal an incisive analysis is made of the booklet released by the AFL-CIO on *Who Is the Imperialist?* The basic deficiencies of the work are described in detail. The tabulation reproduced here shows the new independent nations since World War II, one that appeared in a number of sources several years ago but is up-dated here. The one on "the Soviet and Communist Chinese Record as of 1970" begins only as of 1939 and thus incurs a grave omission of the numerous non-Russian nations in the USSR.

The Captive Nations List that has official sanction in Public Law 88-90, based on the Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passed in July 1959, is a far more accurate account of Soviet Russian imperialism. Also the annual National Captive Nations Committee's list "Who's Next?" is complete and generally accepted. Though the AFL-CIO list and the comparative table on new nations are informative and of value as far as they go, the Soviet Russian record it presents is most misleading. Some of the problems involved in this were fought publicly in the 50's when some attempted to conceal Soviet Russian imperialism but talked glibly about Red Chinese imperialism. Half of the USSR itself is imperialized by Moscow.

"The Dilemma of Russification," an article by John P. Roche. Syndicated column, June 1971.

In treating of the Jewish problem in the USSR, Professor Roche contends the Muscovite bureaucracy is in a dilemma because, as he puts it, "in demographic terms, Russia is running short of Russians." According to him, projections show that in ten or twenty years the Russians, who now ostensibly constitute 53.4% of the total population, will be a minority. By the next century "the Slavs (Russians, Ukrainians, and smaller ethnic groups) will be outnumbered."

What then is the dilemma? Simply, Russify or not Russify. The writer concludes that "the regime obviously hopes to behead Soviet Jewry, to leave it an inchoate mass of leaderless individuals who will passively succumb to Russification. This applies to other non-Russian groups, for otherwise the Russians will be "a minority in 'their' country."

Parts of this interesting article indicate the writer's relative lack of familiarity with the USSR. Although he concentrates soundly on Russification, his conception of "Soviet national minorities," the Ukrainians as simply one of the "individual ethnic groups" and so forth leaves much to be desired. It may surprise the professor that by a re-defining process the trumped-up statistics fur-

nished by Moscow support the minority status of the Russians now.

"John Theodorovich, Ukrainian Prelate," an obituary. *The Washington Post*, Washington, D.C., May 5, 1971.

Admired by his own Orthodox, Catholics and others, the Most Reverend Metropolitan John Theodorovich, head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the U.S.A., passed away at the age of 83. His career was an eventful one, and its highlights are well portrayed in this account. His cathedral church was St. Volodymyr's in Philadelphia.

Ordained into the priesthood in 1912, Metropolitan John "served as chaplain with the army of the Ukrainian National Republic in the war against Russia in 1919-20." In 1921, he was elevated to the episcopal office of archbishop of Vinnitsa, Ukraine. As the account describes it, he was persecuted by Moscow for his anti-communist activities and "later was released through the intercession of Jews he had defended against pogroms." He came to the U.S. in 1924, and in 1950 became metropolitan.

"A New Detente Shaping Up in Asia?," an article by David Lawrence. *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., August 16, 1971.

This columnist believes that the Nixon gesture toward Peking is a response to the latter's deep fear of Japan's power. This power can be easily translated into militarism and the domination of South Korea and Taiwan. As pointed out by the columnist, the Japanese ambassador in Washington has denounced as nonsense any idea that Japan has "ambitions of aggression" toward Korea and Taiwan.

A deeper analysis of the situation in the Far East would show that the threat is not Japan but the Soviet Union. When dealing with the latter and the question of how to accommodate Taiwan in the U.N., the writer uncritically mentions the so-called Byelorussian/Ukrainian analogy. He writes, "One argument is that the Soviet Union, for example, has two of its 'provinces' in the international organization." As shown earlier, this argument is without foundation and any that employ it reveal their own misconception of the USSR.

"Brezhnev Lauds 'Brezhnev Doctrine' and Husak," an article by James Feron. *New York Times News Service*, Prague, Czecho-Slovakia, May 27, 1971.

The final nail was driven into the Czecho-Slovakian coffin of captivity with the appearance of Leonid I. Brezhnev at the fourteenth Czech Party Congress in May. In effect reaffirming what has come to be known as the Brezhnev Doctrine, he received a standing ovation by the puppet audience when he declared, "Nobody will ever be successful in breaking our friendship and fraternity."

Stated in true terms, Brezhnev simply reminded the Czechs and others that Russian imperialism won't tolerate any drift toward independent will by satellite communists or others. He brazenly justified the invasion of Czecho-Slovakia and in Aesopian language held it to be "the duty of Socialist states to intervene to protect their system against revisionism." It's significant that the Red Chinese, themselves threatened by the Brezhnev Doctrine, accuse Moscow of revisionism. In this medley of intraempire conflict the seeds of freedom's opportunity are sown with great promise.

"Ukrainian Find Yields Clues to Nomad Ways," a release. *United Press International*, Moscow, USSR, May 30, 1971.

A burial mound has been discovered by Ukrainian archeologists near the Ukrainian city of Dnipropetrovsk. The site contained two bodies that reveal new information about nomads who roamed Ukraine before the birth of Christ, spilling blood but encouraging culture. The bodies, a queen and a small boy, are believed to be members of a royal family.

The report states that an "alabaster-lined sarcophagus contained the gold bedecked remains of the queen and the body of a small boy, apparently an heir to the throne." This was a part of Scythian civilization in the fourth century B.C. Ritual silver vessels for wine and a gold bracelet were placed near the boy, and the child's attire was also richly embroidered with gold disks. It is known that the Scythians were barbarous, but apparently they also had a taste for fine art.

"National and Religious Dissent Worries Soviet Leadership," a commentary. *Religion In Communist Dominated Areas*, The National Council of Churches, New York, April 1971.

This semi-monthly publication of the National Council of Churches contains much worthwhile material on religious conditions in the Red Empire. The comments, too, on reproduced pieces are refreshing and incisive. For example, as RCDA comments, "Repeated attacks in the Soviet press against 'Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism,' 'excessive and unjustified glorification of the national peculiarities, traditions and customs of the native population,' and their 'religious masking' by the Uniate clergy indicate that Soviet leadership is worried about the growing and religious dissent in the Ukraine and throughout the USSR."

An extract from *Man and World*, published in Kiev, and with the title "In Single Harness—Clericalism and Ukrainian Bourgeois Nationalism" vilifies past and present clerics who have hitched religious beliefs to nationalist aspirations. For instance, it's stated, "this alliance manifested its anti-people nature especially glaringly in the struggle of the nationalists and the clergy against Soviet order, which they conducted under the false slogans of 'an independent, united Ukraine. . .'"

Religious beliefs and forces are indomitable and thus are a constant threat to totalitarian Soviet Russian imperialism. In time, properly channeled, they will overcome the latter. Their unity in the Free World as well as behind the Iron Curtain is therefore a necessary prerequisite for this inevitable outcome.

"A Look Inside Russia," a personal report from a White House aide. *U.S. News and World Report*, Washington, D.C., August 2, 1971.

This interview of Thomas Pauken, who is deputy director of the White House Fellows, is really based on a diary Pauken kept during his recent visit to Moscow and "the two biggest cities of the Ukraine—Kharkov and Kiev." Some fifteen fellows or one-year White House interns went on the trip.

Among the many interesting items recorded is this impression: "In Kharkov, I was struck by the contrast with Moscow. The majority of people in Kharkov are ethnic Ukrainian and very different in personality and style from the ethnic Russians who predominate in Moscow. In Moscow, the face of the average Russian was virtually expressionless, and the drabness of life hung like a cloud over everything. In Kharkov, the people are outgoing, more colorful in their dress, and appeared to have great zest for life."

It's evident that our fellow has no appreciation of the multinational nature of the USSR. The term ethnic Ukrainian makes sense for a Ukrainian residing in Moscow, and ethnic Russian for one living in Kiev. However, his general impressions are substantially correct. Before leaving the USSR, Pauken met with two young Ukrainians who were fluent in English. "They hoped some day to go to America themselves," he writes.

"What Has Been Done by the U.S. To Contain Russian Imperialism," an article by Austin J. App. *ABN Correspondence*, Munich, Federal Republic of Germany, March-April 1971.

Striking a positive note on America's successful containment of communism, the writer argues that the whole concept of na-

tional self-determination and freedom is American. "It was America that proposed to usher in the new era of self-determination of peoples." He cites in detail the costs sustained by the U.S. in upholding this since World War I.

THE LACK OF ADEQUATE LEGISLATIVE MACHINERY TO REPRESENT THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN THE CASE OF NATIONWIDE STRIKES

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, significant observations are being made concerning the lack of adequate legislative machinery to properly represent the public interest in labor-management disputes having national impact.

Responsibility of the Congress is to appropriately represent the public interest rather than the specific personal interests of either labor or management. The New York Times published the following editorial in its November 27 issue:

REOPENING THE DOCKS

President Nixon's move for national emergency injunctions to reopen the strikebound ports on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts represents the collapse of an Administration attempt to revive the atrophied processes of collective bargaining on the waterfront.

Ever since passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, a court order to end strikes has been an almost automatic accompaniment of the expiration of agreements between the International Longshoremen's Association and the dock employers. And, with only slightly less regularity, the strike resumed as soon as the eighty-day cooling-off period ran out.

In hope or abolishing this charade, the White House let the current strike run for nearly two months before deciding that its impact on the economy necessitated injunctive action. Even then the Administration stayed out of court until an all-out effort to conclude a negotiated settlement had failed—for reasons that remain a mystery. Earlier this week an agreement seemed near, under which some of the worst abuses of the guaranteed annual wage in the pattern-setting port of New York would have been moderated in exchange for basic wage increases far in excess of the Pay Board's anti-inflation guidelines. An overnight evaporation in union receptivity to the whole arrangement made it unnecessary for the country to judge how much, if any, real benefits such a pact would have brought.

Now fascinating reversal has taken place in the normal line-up of employers and union on the President's invocation of Taft-Hartley, once the most hated of all laws in labor's lexicon. The industry, which always in the past has welcomed such a move, is trying hard to block a permanent injunction by insisting on fragmented treatment of each port. It is also seeking to knock out the standard requirement in all prior injunctions that the workers return to their jobs under terms of the old contract. That requirement would mean reinstating the enormously expensive guaranteed wage without any of the safeguards the industry says it needs.

The union, in contrast, is putting up only the most nominal objections to an injunction that would cover all ports. Its real concern is that the wage guarantee go back into full effect in New York in line with invariable

past practice, a practice Federal Judge Bonsal sustained in the ten-day temporary back-to-work mandate he issued here yesterday.

This weird miscarriage of the Administration's original design indicates anew the need for fundamental overhaul of the nation's statutory curbs on crisis strikes. On the West Coast, where a similar Taft-Hartley injunction is already in effect, two-thirds of the cooling-off period has gone by and no glimmering of a settlement is reported. Some form of binding arbitration is needed to bring final resolution of such disputes, in which the public eventually and inevitably becomes the prime victim.

"AMERICA, THE BEAUTIFUL, OF THEE WE SING"

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have read and heard hundreds of Thanksgiving prayers in my life, but the most beautiful one I ever read is the one written by Rabbi Haim Kemelman, of East Brunswick, N.J., called, "America, the Beautiful, of Thee We Sing."

It is full of gratitude, faith, and inspiration because its gifted author has these rare qualities deep in his heart and soul. While many others disparage and condemn America, Rabbi Kemelman is proud to praise and honor our country because he loves it and because he believes in its promise.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for many blessings in this land of freedom, and one of them is that Rabbi Kemelman is one of my constituents and that he is my friend.

The text of his beautiful and moving Thanksgiving prayer, which was published in the Sunday Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., on Sunday, November 21, 1971, follows:

AMERICA, THE BEAUTIFUL, OF THEE WE SING

When some say, "Why?" we sing, "Why not?"
When some cry havoc, we sing and work,
When some see stumbling stones, we see
stepping stones;

When some curse the darkness, we blaze the
path.

America the beautiful for Thee we pray.

We pray that God give us men: strong men,
brave men,
honest men—men who yield not conscience
to power
and wisdom to wealth; men who dare to do
the right
even in face of adversity and evil.

America the beautiful for Thee we are grate-
ful.

We are grateful that thy heritage has given
us men—
men who are noble and true, men who are
just, men who
inspire loyalty and truth to the end that the
just

shall be strong and the strong shall be just.
America the beautiful of thee we sing, for
these we are
grateful and in behalf of thee we pray.
Amen.

—Thanksgiving Prayer, by Rabbi Haim
Kemelman.

IMPENDING GIVEAWAY OF PANAMA CANAL MUST BE PREVENTED BY THE CONGRESS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress from Louisiana, I have watched with deep concern the current treaty negotiations between the United States and Panama. One of the admitted objectives of our negotiators is to cede U.S. sovereignty over the U.S. owned Canal Zone territory to Panama, a small, weak country, notorious for its political instability.

This may explain the administration's denial of recent statements or implications attributed to Assistant Secretary of State Charles A. Meyer that the U.S. Government would take no action to intervene in order to protect the Panama Canal should the Soviet Union decide to invade and conquer Panama.

One highly redeeming feature of the present situation is that the sovereign people of our country are far ahead of their Government in Washington in evaluating the true significance of the canal problem in spite of the failure of most of the mass news media to make objective reports on it. This development is explained by the able leadership over many years of my distinguished and most scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) and resulting pamphleteering in various parts of the Nation.

A recent example of this effort is an ably prepared pamphlet on "The Impending Giveaway of the Panama Canal," by Dr. William S. McBirnie, Glendale, Calif. In this, he stresses that the main canal question is a power struggle between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. and not one between the United States of America and Panama and that it is a contest that the United States dare not lose. Its loss would give Soviet power control of the round-the-world canal route, Suez and Panama, and bring closer the day of encirclement of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most glorious chapters in American history is the successful construction and subsequent operation in both peace and war of the Panama Canal, which has yielded great benefits to the Republic of Panama. Yet the position of its revolutionary government is that our Nation's entire course in dealing with the canal question has been one of oppression and infamy and that Panama has suffered greatly thereby.

As to such contentions there could be no greater falsehood. Unfortunately, these mendacious Panamanian pronouncements are never denied or answered by the highest officials of our Government with the resulting impairment of our country's image in world opinion.

Russian agents are already in the Panamanian Revolutionary Government and

at the University of Panama. Certainly they are making their adverse influence manifest in the formulation of Panamanian policies, all without the slightest opposition by our responsible officials.

The weakest spot in recent national administrations over a period of years has been their policy in dealing with the Panama Canal. The people of our country are dead set against the surrender of any of our treaty-based sovereignty at Panama, either over the zone or the canal. Our citizens have contributed too much in the way of treasure and sacrifice to have all that they have done in this connection thrown down the drain in complete disregard of our Federal Constitution—article IV, section 3, clause 2.

Mr. Speaker, on November 29, 1971, there were started before the House Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries under the chairmanship of my distinguished and able colleague from New York (Mr. MURPHY) the first comprehensive congressional hearings on the interoceanic canal problem since 1906. This inquiry should go far in clearing away the fog of confusion that has for so long obscured the canal subject in the public mind and in laying the basis for an Isthmian policy based upon realities and not shabby sentimentalism of appeasers, demagogues, and weaklings.

There are two steps that should be taken: First, the reaffirmation by House resolutions now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of our undiluted sovereignty over the Canal Zone; and second, the enactment of pending legislation for the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal.

Because of the timeliness of Dr. McBirnie's recent pamphlet, I quote it as part of my remarks along with the texts of a related letter and of House Resolution 540 and H.R. 1518 that I cosponsored and introduced, respectively:

THE IMPENDING GIVEAWAY OF THE
PANAMA CANAL

(By W. S. McBirnie)

THE PANAMA CANAL

Treaty basis of the U.S. canal rights

There are three treaties, one with Great Britain, one with Panama and one with Colombia which constitute the legal basis for U.S. Sovereignty over the Panama Canal. The first of these with Great Britain, known as the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901, recognizes the exclusive right of the U.S. to construct and deepen the canal.

The second of these treaties, known as the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, and ratified in 1904, granted to the United States "in perpetuity":

"The use occupation and control of the canal zone for the construction of the Panama Canal, and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection, as if the United States were "the sovereign of the territory" and to the "entire exclusion of the exercise of the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority". Quoted in *The Isthmian Canal Policy Questions*, Rep. Daniel Flood, D. Penn., House Document 474, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 136."

The United States, in turn, guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Panama which had just seceded from Colombia, and whose very existence depended upon the protection of the United States.

By the terms of the third treaty, the Thom-

son-Urrutia Treaty, proclaimed March 30, 1922, Colombia recognized the title to the Panama Canal as "now vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America". Special rights and privileges were guaranteed to Colombia, and the United States paid Colombia 25 million dollars. (*Ibid*)

The negotiations of these three treaties were the work of some of the ablest men of their time. They knew, from their own observations, that Panama was a land of endemic revolution and political instability. These treaties were meant to solve permanently the problem of sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Bunau-Varilla, Panama's minister to the United States, and one of the authors of the treaty, stated, "After mature thought . . . I decided to grant concession of sovereignty en bloc." The Canal Zone was not sold, ceded nor leased but granted to the United States in perpetuity for the operation of the Panama Canal. The treaty also granted the control of the Canal Zone, an area five miles wide on each side of the canal itself.

The sanitation problems were enormous, but the treaty of 1903 gave the United States the right to enforce sanitary measures throughout the entire canal area. Army doctors and scientists conquered yellow fever and malaria which for years had caused great loss of life in Panama. The story of their heroism and achievement has been recounted in many books. The building of the Canal was one of the great engineering feats of the world. It was opened to traffic on August 15, 1914.

The importance of the canal

The Panama Canal is one of the greatest transportation facilities in the world, and has been characterized as the backbone of ocean commerce, especially in the Americas. Cargo tonnage on the Panama Canal in fiscal 1969 amounted to 108,793,069 tons which was an increase over 1968. Toll collections in 1969 were \$95,914,608 which was almost 2 million dollars more than in 1968. Within the last several years improvements on the Canal have totaled some 68 million dollars. (*World Almanac*, 1971, p. 110)

All of the nations in this hemisphere have a vital interest in a well run canal, open to the commerce of all nations. The canal occupies a strategic place in the defense of the western hemisphere, and has been extremely useful in moving military cargo bound for Vietnam.

The canal has growing importance to our [defense] effort because of the diminishing supplies of raw materials in this country . . . Our aluminum industry is dependent on bauxite coming from Guiana and Venezuela. (*Between the Lines*, Edith Kermit Roosevelt, published in *The Wanderer*, August 24, 1967.)

The United States has fully discharged its obligation to maintain a free and open waterway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Tolls have remained at a reasonable level and ship transit is accomplished expeditiously.

The Canal occupies a highly strategic place in the defense of the western hemisphere. Representative Daniel Flood of Pennsylvania, and probably the best informed man in the Congress on all the ramifications of the Panama question, has stated:

"The Panama Canal is a military key of the first order in world strategy and the chief feature required for the protection of all Latin America. Yet an attempt is being made on our part, motivated by shabby sentimentalism and complete disregard of the consequences involved, to give away this great economic and military agency." (*CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, vol. 113, part 10, p. 13111.)

The canal is a control point of indispensable use in barring deep Soviet penetration of Latin America. With Russia in control of Cuba, and able to use that island as a naval and military base, the United States' sov-

ereignty over the canal becomes vitally important.

The canal: A key Communist target

Wresting ownership and control of the Panama Canal from the United States has been a communist goal that dates back to critical days of the Russian revolution in November, 1917. John Reed, a notorious American communist reporter who covered the Russian revolution in a highly sympathetic manner, discussed the internationalization of the canal with the leaders of the Russian revolution. Lenin realized the importance of the canal, and was determined to force the United States to give up unilateral control of the waterway. (John Reed, *Ten Days That Shook the World*, p. 235) The strategic nature of the canal will continue to make it a prime target for Soviet subversion.

The Soviet Union has been increasing its naval power at an unprecedented rate as a prelude to securing control of the world's waterways. Following the seizure of the Suez Canal by Egypt, Russia began to dominate the Mediterranean Sea, and her ships are prowling the Indian Ocean unchallenged. The communists desire to make the Caribbean Sea a Russian lake, and it is well on its way to becoming just that. Cuba, as has been pointed out, is already a Russian bastion and Panama and the canal are the next logical steps leading to communist domination of Central and South America.

Many experts in naval strategy, including men in Europe as well as the United States, believe that Russian naval planning has placed a high priority on the objective of depriving the United States of the ownership of the Panama Canal. Russian strategic planning related to the Panama Canal, according to the experts, should give the United States great cause for alarm. Russia has constantly supported the efforts of Panama to gain control of the canal. In the late summer of 1970, R. Doria Souza, General Secretary of the People's Party (communist) of Panama, visited Moscow. As a result of his visit, the Russian government strongly supported Panama's military dictator, General Omar Torrijos, in his demands upon the United States for control of the canal. Souza stated that the principal task of the communists in Panama is "to strengthen the unity of all anti-imperialist forces and together counter the machinations of Yankee imperialism". (*CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, May 5, 1971, pp. 13641-13643.)

Piecemeal surrender

For twenty five years the United States has been surrendering the rights given to it by the treaty of 1903, but the Panamanians have not been satisfied. The surrender has merely served to increase their appetites for more concessions.

After prolonged, secret negotiations extending over a period of two years, the Eisenhower-Romon Treaty was proclaimed on August 26, 1955. This treaty increased the annual annuity to Panama and surrendered valuable Panama railroad property in the terminal cities of Panama and Colon. Another important provision was the abrogation of the right of the United States to enforce sanitary ordinances in Panama City and Colon. Since 1955, when sanitation enforcement was turned over to the officials of these two cities, the garbage collection has been totally inadequate. (Flood, op. cit., p. 203)

From 1959 on, there were increasing demands by the Panamanians that their flag be flown on the zone beside the American flag. President Eisenhower, fearing violence from unruly mobs, agreed that this should be done, thus providing "visual evidence that Panama does have titular sovereignty over the region". (*Interoceanic Canal Problems in the Americas*, Dr. Donald Dozer, quoted in

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, part 17, p. 22891.) The House of Representatives objected strongly to this policy by a vote of 381 to 12. The President completely disregarded this sentiment expressed by the House, and by executive order on September 17, 1960, ordered the Panamanian flag to be flown on the zone. Following this order the governor of the zone, Robert J. Fleming, in 1963 forbade the American flag to be flown over the U.S. court house or American schools on the zone. The bloody riots of January, 1964, followed an attempt of Balboa High School students to raise an American flag on campus. When peace was finally restored twenty one persons were dead, many injured and property damage was widespread.

Bowing to mob threats of further violence, President Johnson announced on September 25, 1965 that the United States and Panama would begin negotiations for the adoption of a new treaty. Three treaties were written, surrendering more control of the zone and the canal to Panama, but they failed of ratification by the U.S. Senate and also by Panama. The terms of these treaties were merely an appeasement of the radical elements in Panama. Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury, and chief negotiator for the American team had had no experience with the military matters that make the canal so vitally important to the United States. For the sake of appeasement, Mr. Anderson was willing to surrender the control of the canal to Panama.

The United States still seems determined to surrender the canal to Panama, which of course, means that Russia will rapidly gain control of this most vital waterway. At the time of the proposed treaties of 1967, public indignation at the huge give-away ran very high, but now, four years later, the Nixon administration is again negotiating a new treaty with Panama. One June 29, 1971 negotiations were begun, and the United States was represented by the same Robert B. Anderson, who helped negotiate the aborted proposed 1967 treaties. It becomes imperative that the Congress and the American people express their conviction that the United States must retain control of the Panama Canal. In this case time is of the essence, and the members of Congress, especially Rep. Daniel Flood, need the support from the people as they fight to retain control of the canal by the United States.

There is no need for U.S. negotiators to be in Panama for the Panama Canal should be regarded as non-negotiable. It is not a question of the United States vs. Panama in the present discussions, for Panama cannot maintain her independence without the protection of the United States. The whole canal question is a power struggle between Russia and the United States, a conflict which dare not be lost by the United States.

The treaties of 1967 would have removed the canal entirely from the control of the Congress and would have placed it in the hands of a nine-man governing board. The five Americans on the board were to be appointed by the President with no confirmation of either House necessary. These treaties called for the construction of a new sea level canal in Panama to cost approximately three (3) billion dollars. Expert testimony in the House of Representatives has stated that the improvement program provided for will make the present canal adequate to handle all traffic problems to the end of the century. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 15, 1971, p. 25493.)

The United States has lived up to all its treaty obligations. It has managed the canal with "show case" efficiency, bringing untold benefits to world commerce and to the people of Panama. On several occasions, as has been pointed out, the United States has liberalized its side of the bargain. Panama is now enriched by some 160 million dollars annually from the canal over and above the annual

annuity. In addition, Panama retains its independence "through United States protection."

Senator Thurmond put the whole Panama question in its proper perspective when he said:

"It is clear that the Panamanians are seeking to seize upon their geographic positions as a means of extorting enormous revenues, not only from the United States, but from every user of the canal." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 15, 1971, p. 25494.)

If the canal ever becomes totally owned and controlled by Panama, it will be a victim of Russian takeover, for Panama will be unable to resist the pressure of Russian advance. This is a fact, which the United States in its eagerness to placate Panama, must not overlook. If the United States does not retain its sovereignty over the canal, the world will be one step nearer Russian communist domination.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., November 15, 1971.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RARICK: This is a follow-up to Bill Timmons' reply to your letter of September 28 requesting clarification of a statement attributed to Assistant Secretary of State, Charles A. Meyer.

I have looked into the matter and have been informed that Mr. Meyer did have an interview with the press early last summer (apparently the basis of the Panamanian news article). Mr. Meyer did not state or imply that the United States Government would take no action to intervene in order to protect the Panama Canal should the Soviet Union decide to invade and conquer Panama. Apparently such a question was never asked. However, when asked about the possibility of US military intervention in Latin America, Mr. Meyer replied that he could foresee no situation that would require the unilateral use of US military force. I am assured that in no way or at no time did Assistant Secretary Meyer suggest that the United States had abandoned its sovereign right to take whatever measures it deems appropriate to protect its national security interests.

I hope this information is helpful to you. Sincerely,

RICHARD K. COOK,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

H. RES. 540

Whereas it is the policy of the House of Representatives and the desire of the people of the United States that the United States maintain its indispensable sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between the United States and Great Britain, the United States adopted the principles of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 as the rules for the operation, regulation, and management of said canal; and

Whereas by the terms of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 between the Republic of Panama and the United States, the Republic of Panama granted full sovereign rights, power, and authority in perpetuity to the United States over the Canal Zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority; and

Whereas under the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between Republic of Colombia and the United States, Republic of Colombia recognized that the title to the Panama Canal

and Panama Railroad is vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States and the United States granted important rights in the use of the Panama Canal and Railroad to Colombia; and

Whereas from 1904 through June 30, 1968, the United States has made an aggregate net investment in said canal, including defense, of over \$5,000,000,000; and

Whereas said investment or any part thereof could never be recovered in the event of Panamanian seizure, United States abandonment of the canal enterprise, or under any other circumstances; and

Whereas, under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the United States Constitution, the power to dispose of territory or other property of the United States is specifically vested in the Congress; and

Whereas 70 per centum of Panama Canal traffic either originates or terminates in United States ports; and

Whereas said canal is of vital strategic importance and imperative to the hemispheric defense and to the security of the United States as well as of Panama itself; and

Whereas, during the preceding administration, the United States conducted negotiations with the Republic of Panama which resulted in proposed treaties under the terms of which the United States would relinquish its control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal with the gift of both to Panama; and

Whereas the present revolutionary Government of Panama seeks to renew negotiations with the United States looking toward a similar treaty or treaties; and

Whereas the December 1, 1970, report by the Atlantic-Pacific Interocean Canal Study Commission revives the entire canal situation, including surrender of the Canal Zone to Panama and operation of the Panama Canal by an international organization not subject to laws of the United States.

Whereas the recommendations of said commission would place the United States in a position of heavy responsibility without requisite authority and invite a takeover by Soviet power of the isthmus as occurred in Cuba, other Latin American countries, and at the Suez Canal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of the United States should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over said Canal Zone and Panama Canal and that the United States Government should in no way forfeit, cede, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights, jurisdiction, territory, or property to any other sovereign nation or to any international organization, which rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction are indispensably necessary for the protection and security of the entire Western Hemisphere including the canal and Panama.

H.R. 1518

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of not less than one hundred and forty feet by not less than one thousand two hundred feet by not less than

forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the locks capacity at Gatun, raise the summit water level to its optimum height of approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at an estimated total cost not to exceed \$850,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone," "Secretary of the Army, and "Panama Canal Company," respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Governor of the Canal Zone may act and exercise his authority as President of the Panama Canal Company and may utilize the services and facilities of that company.

Sec. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows.

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with

chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

Sec. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

Sec. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

Sec. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations thereof in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of \$200 per diem.

Sec. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

Sec. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

Sec. 9. The Administrator of General Services or the President of the Panama Canal

Company, or both, shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

Sec. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

Sec. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

Sec. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

Sec. 13. Any provision of the Act of August 11, 1939 (54 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), or of any other statute, inconsistent with any provision of this Act is superseded, for the purposes of this Act, to the extent of such inconsistency.

CAPTAIN COOK RECREATION AREA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, 1971, Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska issued a proclamation designating a 2,000-acre land tract between Anchorage and Kenai as the Captain Cook Recreation Area.

As a result of the action taken by the Governor, the area may now receive aid from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The value of the land being \$851,000 automatically makes it eligible to receive an equal amount of Federal funds.

The proclamation reserves this land area for use as public recreation land and waters. The Governor's action is in keeping with Alaska's policy of providing the people of the State with ample recreation areas.

This new area includes the 400-acre Stormy Lake and will hopefully provide fishing, boating, beach activities, hiking, camping, cross-country skiing, and canoeing. It is Alaska's goal to continually develop its park and recreation sites.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Article VIII, Section 7 of the Constitution of Alaska and AS 41.20.140 empower the Governor of Alaska to designate the Captain Cook State Recreation Area by proclamation.

The proposal for the Captain Cook State Recreation Area has been reviewed by the appropriate government agencies.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, as Governor of Alaska, hereby designate as the Captain Cook State Recreation Area all the State-owned lands and waters and all those acquired in the future by the State of Alaska lying within Section 3; Section 9; NW 1/4, NE 1/4, SW 1/4 and W 1/2 of SE 1/4 Section 10; W 1/2 of W 1/2 Section 15; Section 16; Section 17; all tidelands abutting the above and all of Stormy Lake, all in Township 8N Range 10W Seward Meridian.

The areas included in the Captain Cook

State Recreation Area are reserved from all uses incompatible with their primary function as public recreation land and waters.

The areas included in the Captain Cook State Recreation Area are assigned to the Department of Natural Resources for control, development, and maintenance.

Dated this 2nd day of November, 1971.

NIXON AT THE AFL-CIO

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the President did speak before the AFL-CIO in Miami last week. I attach herewith an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, Monday, November 22, and two articles, one by Richard Wilson and one by David Lawrence on the President's speech. President Meany has since said he intended no slight and all of us hope this is true. When the President of the United States appears before any public gathering, he should have the respect due that office which he represents.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 22, 1971]

NIXON AT THE AFL-CIO

In a way, it was a small matter, the deliberate coolness of AFL-CIO officials toward President Nixon when he addressed them the other day. The calculated discourtesies were picayune—the failure to have the resident musicians play "Hail to the Chief," the refusal to announce the President's entrance or to permit live television coverage.

The Republic can survive such slights to the President and the office he holds. The men who draw their paychecks and/or expenses from union dues decided to treat Mr. Nixon like a political and economic adversary, which in some respects he is. The fact that he represents America in a larger sense may have been a dim presence in some unionists' consciousnesses. At least they didn't boo.

A long and loud Bronx cheer, the sound of which George Meany might remember, still is in order for organized labor's performance so far in Phase 2 of the President's price-wage stabilization program. Even granting the need of union leaders to appear as ferocious defenders of their constituents' rights and aspirations, Meany's abusive outburst against the President, administration officials and non-labor members of the Pay Board was superfluous. Big labor is doing well—perhaps too well—in the flexing of Phase 2's elastic wage boundaries. The AFL-CIO's vow of partial non-cooperation in Pay Board decisions just bears out the hypocrisy of Meany's earlier offers of willing participation in the stabilization effort. The board, in union leaders' eyes, is a huge collective bargaining table at which their role is to use every threat, including the ultimate strike, to get their way.

The effort to put strong downward pressure on the wage-price spiral must go on with or without the cooperation of AFL-CIO officials, as President Nixon emphasized in his off-the-cuff speech in Miami after throwing aside his "laundry-list" of labor-serving accomplishments. This message should get through to the tens of millions of working people who weren't conventioning in the warm South, or tittering or following instructions to act coolly when Mr. Nixon came by.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 22, 1971]

MEANY'S RUDENESS TO NIXON COULD HURT LABOR

(By Richard Wilson)

In every small and mean way that occurred to him, short of sticking out his tongue, George Meany treated the President of the United States with studied rudeness at the annual convention of the AFL-CIO.

The night before President Nixon spoke at the convention in Miami Meany sought to persuade the executive board not to sit on the platform while the President was there. He was overruled.

The 77-year-old labor leader made sure that the band usually in attendance vacated the hall so it would not have to play "Hail to the Chief" when the President entered.

Nixon was assigned in advance to sit in the second row of dignitaries on the platform. There was no announcement of his arrival. He was treated as an unwelcome interloper to be listened to in cold disrespect, as Meany had planned it.

Of course, the old man was afraid that the convention he dominates might slip from his grasp. He refused to approve live television coverage, which would have been OK with the White House.

When, after his speech, the President moved out to shake hands with some of the delegates, Meany bellowed: "Will the delegates and our guests please be seated!" When the President left, Meany topped off his insultingly rude attitude by announcing: "We'll now proceed with Act 2."

Meany is placing organized labor in an uncompromisingly bad position by his incredible pretense that Nixon is opening up relations with China and Russia as a "stunt," that his appeal for cooperation on economic controls was an "act" and that all Nixon does is a maneuver for re-election.

Meany's behavior is reminiscent of John L. Lewis in his declining days of breathing fire in the face of presidents of the United States, and it seems endemic among aging labor czars who are losing their grasp. Lewis, as head of the United Mine Workers, began to slip when delusions of grandeur elevated him above the presidency and projected him beyond the public interest.

"The public be damned," was the attitude of industrial barons of an earlier time, and it is ironic that the labor leaders of the present should be saying the same thing.

For that is what Meany is in effect saying. "The public be damned and phooey on the President. Labor will have its way." Therefore labor will not cooperate with the economic control machinery and will try to paralyze it so that if the President desires action he will be forced to remove the Pay Board's labor membership, including Meany. If Meany can't force Nixon to do that, he reserves for himself a decision on when to walk out.

Meany is moving on the path of destroying Nixon's major domestic policy, deriding his initiatives in foreign affairs and defeating him for reelection in 1972. John L. Lewis tried that in his time and it did not work, but it made Lewis look ludicrous and contributed to the general erosion of labor's public support, leading to the adoption of restrictive legislation.

The way is made harder today by a labor-oriented, Democrat-controlled Congress where the Senate Banking Committee has voted to make retroactive the payment of wage increases scheduled before the price freeze. This is Meany's immediate issue with Nixon but it is only the beginning. And if it is finally resolved in Meany's favor it can only result in further pressure tactics to prevent any significant hold-down on wages.

Meany's behavior is puzzling to White House staff members immediately concerned. They cannot understand what alternative he

has to effective economic control which will halt inflation. They believe, however, that he desires Nixon's replacement by a more manageable President and will do everything he can to that end from now on.

The President has accepted this challenge with his declaration in Miami that he knows what he can do, regardless of labor's opposition, and he will do it with the public's support.

Under these circumstances, there would seem little prospect of reconciling Meany. Organized labor will have to decide if it will follow the Meany leadership and risk the loss of public support which Nixon is confident he holds on this issue.

NIXON'S AFL-CIO SPEECH FORTHRIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

President Nixon produced one of the most significant and interesting pieces of news in a long time when he made an impromptu speech before the AFL-CIO convention at Miami Beach.

But the full text of it was not transmitted by radio or television. In fact, the labor leaders prohibited any TV cameras from being brought to the convention hall, and Nixon was given a seat in the second row on the platform and treated as a routine visitor.

The television broadcasters could probably persuade the President to read it to the American people during an evening hour. For the speech not only covers labor-management relations and the problems in Phase 2 of wage-price controls but also discusses the Vietnam War.

Nixon was not given a very cordial welcome. An editorial in the Miami Herald said: "Never in our memory has a President of the United States received such loutish treatment from a domestic audience, even in the roughhouse of an election campaign. The AFL-CIO delegates jeered and snickered at his remarks. The customary respect due the office, whatever the man, was abandoned for a kind of badgering which bespoke the arrogance of a great wealth and great power, both of which organized labor musters in the aggregates. For shame!"

"The rude fact, however, is that Mr. Nixon cannot 'go it alone' as he threatens in view of labor's intransigence. No voluntary program anywhere has succeeded without the cooperation of the interested parties. Labor turned its back on Canadian anti-inflation efforts, and they suffered."

Nixon showed no bitterness in his speech. He declared frankly he was going to talk about the differences between labor and the administration. But he remarked that, while some of the members of labor unions are against him, he knows from experience that, "when the chips are down, organized labor is for America, and that is why I am here before this convention today."

The President added that, whenever there has been an issue for the defense of America, organized labor has stood firmly behind the Commander-in-Chief for a strong defense. The President spoke approvingly of labor's support when the Cambodian incursion occurred and made a point of it as follows:

"I want all of you to know that in that critical decision you have been proved to be right. I said at the time that I ordered those strikes that it would reduce America's casualties. Before we went into Cambodia the number of Americans being killed each week in Vietnam sometimes reached 300, was averaging 200. This week the figures announced just yesterday: five. And over the past five to six weeks, less than 10. So we did what was right. You supported it, and I am most grateful for that support."

"Now, having spoken of the support that you have given in time of war, I am here today to ask for your support for another

cause. It is the cause of building a lasting peace, and it is the cause of a new prosperity."

The President emphasized that in recent years there has been full employment only in wartime, but the cost was 300 American dead every week. He declared that his effort is to get prosperity without inflation and to win a lasting peace in Vietnam. He added:

"Oh, not the easy way: Just get out and let the Communists take over the country. That would only plant the seeds for another war and more aggression, because it would encourage it in the future; but the right way, the honorable way in which the people of South Vietnam have a chance to determine what shall be the future, at some time in the future, without having that imposed upon them by the Communists from the North. Now, as a result of the success of our programs in Vietnam, we have had some aggravation of the problem of unemployment."

The President, in discussing his forthcoming trip to Peking, pointed out that China within 15 years could with its nuclear power make a significant threat to the peace of the world. He said he did not want to wait to do something about it. He declared that the President has an obligation to future generations and "has no choice but to talk about those differences."

He added: "That is why I am going. We are going to try."

Despite the President's forthright speech to labor, it was obvious that George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, was not too happy about the whole affair, and he pounded for order just as a number of delegates wanted to shake hands with Nixon as he walked out of the hall.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION GROWS

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the problem of illegal immigration grows more critical with each passing day.

No one knows exactly how many illegal aliens are in the United States. I have seen estimates ranging from 1 to 5 million.

But everyone in government directly concerned with the problem seems in agreement that our borders and ports of entry are veritable sieves through which tens of thousands of illegal aliens annually pour into our cities, where they either create new ghettos or go on welfare—when they are not taking jobs from needy citizens and driving them on welfare.

It is estimated that between 1 and 1.5 million illegal aliens are holding jobs that could be filled by unemployed Americans.

These people send back to their homelands between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion each year, a huge chunk of earnings which only magnifies the balance-of-payments crisis.

They not only take jobs that Americans could hold, they also take advantage of our overcrowded housing, hospitals, and schools.

This is an extremely serious situation. It would be bad enough in relatively normal times; but these times are far from normal where our economy and the welfare of our citizens are concerned.

CXVII—2728—Part 33

The pores in the sieve through which illegal aliens enter our country will only be closed when the risks outweigh the prospective monetary gains; when penalties against employers become a financial drain; when the men charged with protecting our borders have the manpower and laws to do the job; when the courts interpret the laws more strictly.

With millions of Americans unemployed and living in substandard housing, the flow of illegal aliens must be stopped—and stopped quickly.

DANGEROUS TOYS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as a concerned parent I would like to bring to your attention the following facts concerning dangerous children's toys:

The Food and Drug Administration has banned 144 toys from the market. Many of these toys have been redesigned and are again on the dealers' shelves, but there is insufficient manpower to check every dealer to see whether the banned toys have been removed. Therefore, I particularly urge gift givers to check the list closely and examine each toy closely to make sure that it is not on the banned list or, if it is, that the version in the store is the redesigned product.

Before purchasing each toy, carefully check to see whether it has sharp edges or glass or plastic which might shatter. Look for gears and springs that can catch onto clothing or little fingers. Check the thermal properties of the toys—it should not use any flammable materials or have surfaces which attain high temperatures. Try to assess its breakability; small broken off pieces can be easily swallowed.

Building blocks should be well finished and smooth. Metal toys should have rolled edges to protect against cuts. Arrows and darts should have rubber cups securely fastened. Guns which shoot projectiles are meant only for older children and should be used under supervision.

With electric toys, check to see how the service cords attach to the appliance. Examine the potential heat hazards on the surfaces. Some of the toy ovens now on the market have locks which keep them from opening until the temperature has gone down. Still, be wary of all thermal toys—they may not open until the temperature goes down, but a child can still get a severe burn from the surface temperatures. Some experts have advised that play appliances using electrical current might best be set aside. For younger children nonoperational toys sufficiently stimulate the imagination. And for older children, the real household appliance operated under the supervision of an adult serves a more educational function.

All of us must act together to protect our children. Therefore I would like to present the following reports which I believe will be helpful to all of us in our Christmas shopping.

First is a list of helpful hints in choosing safe toys. Second, is a list of injuries associated with hazardous toys. Third is a list of banned toys dated September 16, 1971, and fourth is a list of banned toys dated November 15, 1971. All have been supplied to me by the Product Safety Division of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have contacted the Food and Drug Administration and been informed that if anyone in the Boston area has questions about any toy, they should feel free to call or write Mr. Robert W. Kilpatrick, Product Safety Control, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 585 Commercial Street, Boston, Mass. 02109. Area Code 617: 223-3171.

The material referred to follows:

HELPFUL HINTS IN CHOOSING SAFE TOYS FOR CHILDREN

1. Choose a toy appropriate for the child's age and development (Many toys have age group labels on the package.)

2. Remember that younger brothers and sisters may have access to toys bought for older children.

3. Check fabric labels for "non-flammable", "flame-retardant" or "flame resistant" notices.

4. Check instructions. They should be easy to read and understand. Instruct the child in the proper use of any toy that might cause injury through misuse.

5. Avoid toys that produce excessive noise. (Even toy cap pistols fired too close to a child's ear can cause damage.)

6. Avoid shooting games, especially those involving darts and arrows, unless the games are played under parental supervision.

7. When choosing a toy for small children, make sure it:

Is too large to be swallowed;
Does not have detachable parts that can lodge in the windpipe, ears or nostrils;
Is not apt to break easily into small pieces or leave jagged edges;

Does not have sharp edges or points;
Has not been put together with easily exposed straight pins, sharp wires, nails, etc.;

Is not made of glass or brittle plastic;
Is not poisonous or toxic;

Does not have exposed flames or build up heat to dangerous levels;

Does not have flimsy electrical wiring; and
Does not have parts which can pinch fingers or catch hair, and for children under two (2) avoid long cords and thin plastic bag materials.

8. Choose carefully. Any toy if misused can be dangerous. There can be no substitute for parental interest and supervision.

INJURIES ASSOCIATED WITH TOYS, NATIONAL ELECTRONIC INJURY SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM, NEISS, JULY 1, 1971-SEPTEMBER 30, 1971

Products involved in injuries which were treated in hospital emergency room. (These toy injury figures have been extracted from N.E.I.S.S. data with 32 hospitals reporting. The figures do not represent or constitute a statistically valid sampling. Some of the 32 hospitals were not reporting for the entire 3-month period.)

Product Description:	Frequency
Skates, Roller.....	54
Toy Balls and Balloons.....	45
Toys Unspecified.....	44
Wagons.....	29
Tricycles.....	22
Skateboards.....	20
Toy Cars and Trucks and Non-Flying Airplanes, Boats.....	18
Fireworks and Caps.....	15
Toy Guns and other Toy Weapons with- out projectiles.....	10
Other Toys Unspecified, Carrying the Child, not Bicycles.....	10

Product Description—Con.	Frequency
Blocks, Pull Toys and Similar Items	9
Pogo Sticks and Stilts	7
Rocking Horses, Hobby Horses and similar Child Carrying Toys, not Wheeled Toy Guns and Other Toy Weapons with projectiles	7
Games, Other than Electric	6
Toy Tools	6
Flying Devices, not Gasoline or Rocket Powered	5
Other Toys, Powered, Carrying the Child, not Bicycles	5
Non-Mechanical Dolls and Toy Animals	4
Other Windup and Battery Operated Toys	4
Other Toy Home Equipment, including Stoves, Sinks, Sewing Machines and non-heating Ovens and Irons	4
Scoters	4
Chemistry Sets	3
Toy Musical Instruments and Whistles	3
Juvenile Sports Equipment	2
Rocketry Sets	1
Other Science Kits and Toys	1
Children Play Tents, Play Tunnels and other Enclosures	1
Toy Medical Equipment	1
Doll Carriages, Strollers, Cribs etc.	1
Costumes (Halloween, etc.)	1
Total	348

LIST OF BANNED TOYS, REASON FOR BANNING, AND DATE OF NOTIFICATION

SEPTEMBER 16, 1971

(NOTE.—Most of the toys on this list have been redesigned or their production ended since the date of notification.)

Champion Ring Darts—Lawn Darts: Haecker Industries, Philadelphia, Pa.; December 21, 1970; Inadequate Labeling.

King Model 1700—Lawn Dart: Change Athletic, 2615 Hunting Park, Philadelphia, Pa.; December 21, 1970; Inadequate Labeling.

Jarts—R. B. Jarts, Inc., Glen Falls, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Inadequate Labeling.

Javelin Darts—Lawn Darts: Hasbro Industries, Pawtucket, R.I.; December 21, 1970; Inadequate Labeling.

Lawn Darts—Lawn Dart: Regent Sports Co., 2500 Ranick Road, Hauppauge, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Inadequate Labeling.

Rocket Lawn Darts—Lawn Dart: Towne & Country Games, Ltd., Yonkers, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Inadequate Labeling.

Squeeze "Zoo-Zee": Stahlwood Manufacturing Co., 601 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

"Dizzy Doodle" Doll—Squeeze toy: Park Smith Corp.; New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

Rubber Squeeze toy football player: Leisure Group, 100 Tubb Avenue, West Point, Miss.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

Kooky Eyes—Squeaker toy: Azrak Hemway Corp., New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

Toy Rolling pin squeeze toy: Plaki Co., Youngstown, Ohio; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

Squeeze Toy Pig: J. L. Prescott Co., Arrow Molded Products Div., 493 Boulevard E., Paterson, N.J.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

Little Angel play ball: Childhood Interest, Roselle Park, N.J.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

"Toys for Fun" squeeze doll: J. L. Prescott Co., Paterson, N.J.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

Toy poodle rubber squeeze toy: J. L. Prescott Co., Paterson, N.J.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker Removes.

Blue Fox Model Youngster Archery Set: Bear Archery Company, Grayling, Mich.; December 21, 1970; Inadequate Labeling.

Fleetwood Archery Cub Archery Set; Fleet-

wood Archery, Superior, Mich.; December 21, 1970; Inadequate Labeling.

Jerry Pets Stuffed Poodle: Jerry Elsner Co., New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Sharp eyes.

Stuffed toy cat: Georg Jensen, Inc., 601 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Sharp eyes.

"Kooky-Eyes" Squeeze Doll: Uneeda Doll Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Removable eyes—possible ingestion.

Star Musical Rattle: Star Manufacturing Co., 100 Water Street, Leominster, Mass.; December 21, 1970; Sharp prongs.

Tumbler ball toy: Stahlwood Manufacturing Co., 601 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Small pieces.

"Honey Baby" Doll: P & M Doll Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Pins holding hair ribbons.

"Baby Beth" Doll: Allied Doll & Toy Corp., Brooklyn, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Straight pin holding hair ribbon.

Little Sophisticate Doll Model No. 79000: Uneeda Doll Corporation, Brooklyn, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Sharp hairpins and straight pin holding ribbon. [Exemption granted; collector's item]

"I Cry Mama" Doll: Goldberger Doll Co., Inc., 538 Johnson Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Sharp wires.

"Candy at Play" Doll: Fun World, Inc., 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Pin.

"Your Dream Bride" Doll No. 2080: Eugene Doll Co., Inc., 4012 2d Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Pin in head band.

"Mini-Bend-A-Family" Doll: Pensick & Gordon Co., 6501 Flotilla Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.; December 21, 1970; Sharp wires.

Toy Basket: Fun World, Inc., 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Plastic spike.

"Jiggly" Rattle: Bomar Company, Division of Kitty Products, Inc., 542 East Squantum Street, Squantum, Mass.; December 21, 1970; Sharp metal and protrusions when handle breaks.

"Magic Action Hammer": Childhood Interests, Roselle Park, N.J.; December 21, 1970; Sharp edges when broken.

Jackie Twisting-Waist Doll: Fun World, Inc., 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Sharp pin in hat and dress.

"Moody" Doll: Holiday Fair, Inc., 48 West 37th Street, New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Pins and long wire spike in neck.

Stuffed Head: Georg Jensen, Inc., 601 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Sharp eyes.

Stuffed Toy Dog or Doll: LaMar Toy Company (2 Toys), 148 39th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., December 21, 1970; Sharp eyes.

"New Born Baby" T. 80: Goldberger Doll Mfg. Co., 538 Johnson Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., December 21, 1970; Sharp wires in arms and legs.

Toy Telephone Rattle: Childhood Interests, Roselle Park, N.J., December 21, 1970; Small pieces.

Musical Merry-G-Round Canelon, F. W. Woolworth & Co., New York, N.Y.; December 21, 1970; Sharp spike.

"Squeaking" Toy Donkey: A. Ponnock, Inc., East State St. and River Road, Camden, N.J.; December 21, 1970; Squeaker removes.

Musical Hour Glass: Tico Toys, Pawtucket, R.I.; Before January 6, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Soft Baby Stuffed Dolls: Collette Toy Novelty Co., Inc., Long Island City N.Y.; May 26, 1971; Sharp wires.

Mascon Squeeze Toy Cheerleader: Leisure Group, Inc., West Point, Miss. Before January 22, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Bend-A-Family: Miner Industries, New York, N.Y. Before April 19, 1971; Laceration/puncture hazard.

Plastic Squeeze Toy No. 20892, No. 1030/70 (2 Toys): Tidy Ties Corp. Importer, Mon-

roe, La. About April 22, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Talkie Tiger: Sanitoy, Inc., New York, N.Y. April 1, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Protecto Squeeze Me Toy No. 838: Reliance Products Corp., Woonsocket, R.I. Before May 20, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Stuffed Donkey No. 1422: Herman Pecker & Co. (dealer), New York, N.Y. March 29, 1971; Sharp wire in ear.

Leatherette Grandpa Dog No. 386: Herman Pecker & Co., Inc., New York, N.Y. March 29, 1971; Sharp Wires of Glasses.

Stuffed Easter Bunny No. 3502: Easter Unlimited, New York, N.Y. April 21, 1971; Sharp wires.

Toy Squeeze Doll No. 64034, No. 64039, No. 63542 (3 Toys): Tidy Ties Corp., Monroe, La., April 28, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Baby Gift Set No. Y7452: Childhood Interests, Roselle Park, N.J. April 22, 1971; Squeaker removes, small objects, small parts.

Pata Cake Baby Rattler: W. W. Woolworth & Co., New York, N.Y., April 23, 1971; Sharp prongs.

Musical Rattle No. 37-T4037: New York Merchandise Co., Dallas, Tex., April 22, 1971; Sharp Prongs.

Squeeze Toy Giraffe No. 125: Sanitoy, Inc., New York, N.Y. May 4, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Musical Carousel No. 320: Plastic Toy & Novelty Corp., Brooklyn, N.Y., May 4, 1971; Sharp prongs.

Hedgehog Squeaker Teethers: F. A. O. Schwartz, New York, N.Y. June 18, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Squeeze Me Toy No. 835: Reliance Products Corp., Woonsocket, R.I. May 6, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Stuffed Dolls No. 127B: Collette Toy Novelty Co., Long Island City, N.Y., May 11, 1971; Sharp wires.

Squeaker Toys Nos. 6565, 6576, 6590 (3 Toys): Tidy Ties Corp., Monroe, La.; May 5, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Stuffed Toy Bunny No. 3450 (Mr. or Mrs. Cuddly Bunny): Eastern Unlimited, Inc., New York, N.Y.; June 7, 1971; Sharp wire in ears.

Rattle No. 521: Electro Plastics, Inc., Newark, N.J.; June 19, 1971; Small pieces and sharp edges

Rattle No. 538: Toy Plastic Hammer, Electro Plastics, Inc., Newark, N.J.; May 19, 1971; Small pieces.

Rattle No. 522: Happy Mates Happy Toys, Electro Plastics, Inc., Newark, N.J.; May 20, 1971; Sharp pieces.

Rattle No. 540: Happy Mates Action Rattle, Electro Plastics, Inc., Newark, N.J.; May 19, 1971; Small pieces and sharp edges.

Rattle No. 530: Happy Mates Rattle Balls, Electro Plastics, Inc., Newark, N.J.; May 19, 1971; Small pieces and sharp edges.

Toy Green Cat, Squeeze Toy No. 679, Happy Toy No. 661 (2 Toys): Electro Plastics, Inc. (dist.), Newark, N.J.; June 7, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Stuffed Dolls No. 131 c/1: Collette Toy & Novelty Co., Long Island City, N.Y.; May 26, 1971; Sharp wires.

Squeeze Toys No. 314: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y.; June 8, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Dolly Rattle No. 632: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y.; June 9, 1971; Small objects.

Whirlie Suction Toy No. 660: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y.; June 8, 1971; Sharp edges and small objects.

Toddler Set Containing Suction Cup, Flip'n' Roll No. 822: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y.; June 9, 1971; Small objects.

Horseshoe Rattle No. 200: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y.; June 8, 1971; Sharp edges and small objects.

Pretzel, Rocking Horse & Wishbone Toy No. 924: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y.; June 8, 1971; Squeaker Removes.

Squeaker Toy No. 63542 with Special Squeaker: Tidy Ties Corp., Monroe, La.; May 12, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Debbie Teen No. 1360 1/10: Thor Import, Inc., Dallas, Tex.; May 27, 1971; Sharp wires. Musical Bells No. 105: Binky Baby Products Co., New York, N.Y.; June 22, 1971; Small objects.

Stuffed Myrtle Turtle: Len Art Mfg. Co., Petaluma, Calif.; June 14, 1971; Sharp wire and "I Love You" sharp pin.

Toddy Toy (cat) No. 3/186: Star Mfg. Co., Leominster, Mass.; June 14, 1971; Small objects.

Shake Me Rattle No. 818: Reliance Products Corp., Woonsocket, R.I.; June 14, 1971; Sharp edges & small objects.

Klatter Balls No. 2915052: Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Binky Baby Products (importer), New York, N.Y.; June 22, 1971; Small objects.

Baby Toys No. 6257 and 6258 (2 Toys): Baby World Co., Inc., Great Neck, N.Y.; June 14, 1971; Sharp wire.

Reggie Rabbit (packaged with *Whitman's* Sampler): Imported by R. Dakin & Co., Inc., Brisbane, Calif.; May 14, 1971; Sharp wires. "Poly-Fluff Animals: Consolidated Productions, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.; June 21, 1971; Sharp nose.

Baby Rattler Nos. 831, 832, 833 and 834 (4 Toys): Childhood Interests, Inc., Roselle Park, N.J.; June 22, 1971; Small objects.

Hour Glass: Mego Corp., New York, N.Y.; July 7, 1971; Small objects and sharp edges. Stuffed Yellow Teddy Bear: Fun World, Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 13, 1971; Sharp wires in ear.

Musical Chime Rattle No. 587: Binky Baby Products, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Around July 13, 1971; Small objects.

Toy Rattle No. 289: Binky Baby Products Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 13, 1971; Small objects.

Rolling Fun Ball No. 377: Binky Baby Products Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., July 13, 1971; Small objects.

Teething Rattle No. 39/70: Binky Baby Products Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., July 13, 1971; Small objects.

Happy Hassock: Kasta Corporation, Bellevue, Iowa; July 13, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Toy Clown No. 265345: W. T. Grant Co., New York, N.Y.; July 13, 1971; Small objects.

Stuffed Bunny: Dollcraft Novelty Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 14, 1971; Laceration/puncture hazard.

Squeeze Toys No. 690: J. L. Prescott Co., Arrow Molded Products Division, Passaic, N.J.; July 13, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Squeeze Toys, boys and girls likeness: Dreamland Creations, Bronx, N.Y.; July 12, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Rooster Pull Toy with Rattle Eggs No. 205: Mego Corporation, New York, N.Y.; July 12, 1971; Small objects.

Miss Fashion Doll: Blatt Distributing Co., La Mirada, Calif.; July 14, 1971; Sharp wire.

Musical Nursery Bells No. 640: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 13, 1971; Small objects.

Squeeze Toys No. 131: Binky Baby Products, Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 12, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Klatter Balls No. 793: Binky Baby Products, Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 12, 1971; Small objects.

Jingle Bells No. 764: Sanitoy, Inc., Palisades Park, N.J.; July 13, 1971; Small objects.

Happy-Mates Rattle No. 522 (improved design): Electro Plastics, Inc., Newark, N.J.; July 12, 1971; Small pieces.

"Squeeze N' Hammer Rattle" No. 538 (improved design): Electro Plastics, Inc., Newark, N.J.; July 12, 1971; Small pieces.

Dog Squeeze Toy No. 780/1: Louis A. Boettinger Co., Inc., Hewlitt, N.Y.; July 28 1971; Squeaker removes.

Bear with Dark Glasses Squeeze Toy BV-5: Louis A. Boettinger Co., Inc., Hewlitt, N.Y.; July 28, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Cat and Duck Shape Squeeze Toy BV-8: Louis A. Boettinger Co., Inc., Hewlitt, New York; July 28, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Colorscope Rattle No. 561: Louis A. Boettinger Co., Hewlitt, N.Y.; July 27, 1971; Small objects.

Assorted Rattles No. 5619P: Baby World Co., Inc., Grafton, W. Va. or Great Neck, N.Y.; July 23, 1971; Small objects.

Telephone Shaped Rattle No. 6623: Baby World Co., Inc., Grafton, W. Va. or Great Neck, N.Y.; July 23, 1971; Small objects and sharp edges.

Assorted Squeeze Toys No. 6500: Baby World Co., Inc., Grafton, W. Va. or Great Neck, N.Y.; July 22, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Klatter Balls No. 238: Baby World Company, Grafton, W. Va. or Great Neck, N.Y.; July 23, 1971; Small objects.

Klatter Ring No. 5868: Baby World Company, Inc., Grafton, W. Va. or Great Neck, N.Y.; July 23, 1971; Small objects.

Plastic Doll Squeeze Toy No. 297: Binky Baby Products Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 22, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Duck Squeaker Toy No. 3-680: Star Mfg. Company, Inc., Leominster, Mass.; July 23, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Monkey Squeaker Toy No. 3-160: Star Manufacturing Company, Leominster, Mass.; July 23, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Tutti-Fruitee Squeeze Toys No. 140: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Company, Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 21, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Indian Drums No. 3715: Sally Distributors, 119 North Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minn.; July 26, 1971; Sharp nail and small objects.

Toy Stuffed Porpoise: S. Dakin & Company, San Francisco, Calif.; July 28, 1971; Sharp wires in flippers.

Rattle Balls No. 907: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; July 26, 1971; Small objects.

Cuddle Rabbit No. 9406: Knickerbocker Toy Co., Middlesex, N.J.; August 18, 1971; Sharp wire in ear.

Animal Squeeze Toys No. 275: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y.; August 8, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Pata Cake Baby Rattler (new design): F. W. Woolworth & Co., New York, N.Y.; August 18, 1971; Sharp wire & small object.

Party Favors: Carousel Party Favors, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; August 19, 1971; Noise-maker removes.

Klatter Balls No. 4530: Formulette Company, Inc., Long Island City, N.Y.; August 18, 1971; Small objects.

Jumbo Fun Ball No. 440: Formulette Company, Inc., Long Island City, N.Y.; August 18, 1971; Small objects.

Whiskers Toy Squeeze Lion: Ashland Rubber Products Corp., Ashland, Ohio; August 23, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Shake N' Rattle No. 921: Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y.; August 23, 1971; Small objects.

Whistle Packaged in "Cracker Jacks": Cracker Jacks Co., Chicago, Ill.; August 23, 1971; Small object.

Squeeze Lion No. 3/187: Star Mfg. Co., Leominster, Mass.; July 23, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Xylophone Player No. 9151: Larami Corp., August 25, 1971; (Phila., Pa.); Sharp edges.

Suction Toy Rattle No. 674: Electro Plastics, Inc., Newark, N.J.; August 31, 1971; Small objects.

Toy Truck Kit No. 5044: Nadel & Sons Toy Corp., New York, N.Y.; September 2, 1971; Small objects.

Baby Toy Kit No. 5088: Nadel & Sons Toy Corp., New York, N.Y.; September 2, 1971; Small objects.

"I Squeak for a Squeeze" Stuffed Mouse: Rushton Co., Atlanta, Ga.; September 8, 1971; Sharp wires in ear & eyes.

Musical Ball: The Playhouse Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; September 8, 1971; Sharp prongs.

Patty Happy Landings Doll: Lovee Doll & Toy Company, Inc., New York, N.Y.; September 15, 1971; Straight pin in tam.

Squeeze Toys Nos. 2521 and 2548 (2 Toys): West Bros. of De Ridder, De Ridder, La.; September 15, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Toy Whistle No. 662: Ralph Pressner, Metairie, La.; September 15, 1971; Small object.

Vinyl Bendy Dogs: Paul E. Sernau, Inc., New York, N.Y.; August 18, 1971; Sharp wires. Exemption granted. [Item used only as a part of an adult novelty ash tray.]

NOVEMBER 15, 1971

Squeeze Toys Nos. 4000 and 4400: Aim Plastics, New Rochelle, N.Y.; September 29, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Suction Rattle Toys No. 660P (Birds and Train Styles); Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; September 27, 1971; Small objects.

Musical Ball (Pink and White): Mego Corp., New York, N.Y.; September 22, 1971; Sharp prongs.

Party Balloons No. A24: Atlantic Stationery Corp., Jamaica, N.Y.; September 27, 1971; Noise-maker removes.

Chime Roly Toy No. 8200: F. W. Woolworth Co., New York, N.Y.; September 22, 1971; Sharp prongs.

Mouse No. I-508: Cut Rate Linoleum Store, New Orleans, La.; October 7, 1971; Sharp wires in hands or feet.

Stuffed Donkey No. 6303: Cut Rate Linoleum Store, New Orleans, La.; October 7, 1971; Sharp wires in ears.

Lady Bug No. T-215: Cut Rate Linoleum Store, New Orleans, La.; October 7, 1971; Sharp wires in ears.

Squeeze Telephones No. 2544: West Bros. of De Ridder, De Ridder, La.; October 5, 1971; Squeaker in base removes.

Clown No. S-209: Ralph Pressner Carnival Mart, Metairie, La.; October 7, 1971; Sharp wires in legs.

Musical Fashion Doll No. 5337: Ralph Pressner Carnival Mart, Metairie, La.; October 7, 1971; Straight pins.

Music Mate Pull Toy and Musical Playmate Pull Toy: Sankyo Seiki, Inc., New York, N.Y.; October 12, 1971; Small objects.

Soft Toys with music box and squeaker No. 00910 842, 00911 766, and 00916 785/938: Eden Toys, Inc., Jersey City, N.J.; October 12, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Spinning Top, red & blue color: Gamble's Import Corp., Burbank, Calif. About October 19, 1971. Sharp spike in base.

Melody Xylophone: Gamble's Import Corp., Burbank, Calif. About October 19, 1971. Keys have sharp edges.

Pop Pop Iron No. F-102: Plymouth Wholesale Corp., New York, N.Y. About October 19, 1971. Small objects.

Clothes Pin Squeeze Toy No. 183 and Squeeze Me Toy No. 2602: Childhood Interests, Roselle Park, N.J. About October 19, 1971. Squeaker removes.

Flocked Bull No. 39/412: Oriental Trading Co., Metairie, La. About October 19, 1971. Straight pin.

Candy Flutes No. 7335: Nodel & Sons, New York, N.Y. About October 19, 1971. Tone modulator shaft is sharp.

Toy Mouse No. 6/26 K: Oriental Trading Co., Metairie, La. About October 19, 1971. Sharp wires in ears & sharp eyes.

Merry-Go-Round Musical Ball: S & M Co., Minneapolis, Minn. About October 19, 1971. Sharp edges of plastic & sharp prongs.

Doll With Speaker in Mouth No. 1770: Distributors Imports Co., New Orleans, La. About October 19, 1971. Squeaker removes.

Squeaker Toy No. 435 (cow figure): Stahlwood Toy Mfg. Co., New York, N.Y. About October 19, 1971. Squeaker removes.

Elephant Squeeze Toys (old design): Eastern Molded Products, Clearfield, Pa. About October 19, 1971. Squeaker removes.

Stuffed White Dogs: R & R Toy Mfg. Co., Inc., Pen Argyl, Pa. About October 19, 1971. Sharp eyes.

Balloon-Squawkers Blowouts: Cardel Mfg.

Co., Brooklyn, N.Y. About October 19, 1971. Noisemaker removes.

Mechanical Merry-Go-Round: I. B. Wolfset & Co., New York, N.Y. About October 19, 1971. Sharp metal rod & small objects.

Toy Top (made in Germany): Frankonia Products, New York, N.Y.; About October 19, 1971; Small objects and sharp edges and rod.

Grandpa's Car No. 31519: Lord & Taylor, New York, N.Y.; September 12, 1971; Sharp and small objects.

Squeaky Lollipops: Altray Co., Inc., Bronx, N.Y.; October 18, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Stuffed Grey Mouse: Famiss Corporation, Brooklyn, N.Y.; About October 19, 1971; Sharp wire in tail.

Suarez Squeeze Toys: Suarez Toy House, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico; About October 21, 1971; Squeaker removes.

Stuffed Swan with Flowers: Arrow Fur Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; About October 19, 1971; Sharp wires in flowers.

Doll No. 8080 (old design): Jolly Toy, Inc., New York, N.Y.; October 18, 1971; Sharp wires in neck.

THE POLITICAL TAX: A WINDFALL FOR US

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, now that the Democratic majority in the Senate has managed to attach the "Democratic Relief Act of 1972" to the tax bill, we must urge the House conferees to do everything possible to have it deleted from the tax package.

I am referring, of course, to the presidential checkoff fund amendment by which taxpayers will be able to check on their income tax returns as to which political party should receive \$1 of the tax paid.

An editorial appearing in the November 26, 1971, edition of the Peoria Journal Star summarizes the thrust of this amendment about as effectively as anything I have read on the issue and I ask that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

THE POLITICAL TAX: A WINDFALL FOR US

The Senate's neat little trick of tacking on a deal to the tax cut law that would filter out of the taxpayers some 50 million dollars for the politicians' campaigns might make some sense if it had been accompanied by meaningful restrictions on fund raising.

But it wasn't.

That means a multi-million dollar windfall—and where do you think the money would end up? Who do you think would get it?

We would!

That is not an editorial "we." By "we," I mean the media that disseminates advertising. Most of those "new" tens of millions would be handed over to TV, radio and newspapers.

Therefore, with such a windfall in sight, a good many "media" may look kindly at the proposal. In this instance, it represents a "conflict of interest"—especially for the large TV networks for whom such a bonanza would come at a time when they seem to be scratching for cash, anyway.

And what would this gigantic hunk of tax money be used for, in fact? Why for carefully-crafted, professional political "ads" of the kind that "create an image" for a

candidate rather than inform of the public honestly.

The simple truth is that for presidential and senatorial candidates, alike, the Congress wouldn't need to provide vast sums of money for new gimmick campaigns if they would just let go of the nonsensical controls currently imposed on electronic media en masse.

When you set up tight rules by law, it really means that anybody who can finagle a way to technically qualify is entitled to the full benefits of such a law. In major elections, this means that there are always a number of people who are technically candidates, but who are not such in the practical or bona fide sense.

(The present proposal would vastly encourage people to manipulate themselves into the technical-legal position of candidate and thereby enjoy a publicly financed campaign of national publicity and advertising! For example, the promise of over six million bucks in public moneys to advertise would likely persuade George Wallace to run again—even if he had not intended to and had no real expectations in doing so! Thus a "political tilt" is created at taxpayers expense.)

If the so-called "fairness" controls were taken off the radio and television, the absolutely inevitable and natural result would be the presentation of all really bona fide candidates, extensively, in all media without cost. More importantly they would be presented in unrehearsed and impromptu settings far more true and realistic than the carefully tailored and artificial "spots."

That simply cannot be done under present rules because to do so opens up a no-ceiling set of obligations to burn time, money, and viewer-patience on the TV fulfilling technical requirements for every trick make-believe candidate in the land.

We would be a darn-sight better off with the kind of natural exposure candidates could get and would get with an unfettered TV-Radio industry than with all those candidates provided large sums of public moneys with which to hire specialists to concoct rigged "commercials."

That is especially true when we realize that in the meantime Congress has not even bothered to touch the real evils of political fund-raising.

The tens of millions extracted from taxes would be a plus—and little more than a windfall for all the media from taxes.

That is a dangerous road to travel, indeed. We don't need the press and electronic media involved in that kind of temptation or corruptive influence.

We must recognize that it is the Congress of the United States that has made natural exposure of candidates unworkable, and that the Senate has now attempted further to perpetuate the "gimmick" style campaigning by doing it at taxpayer's expense.

What we really need, instead, is a "new birth of freedom" for the TV industry—not a windfall of income for political campaigns.

And if they prove willing to "sell out," we're in real trouble.

C. L. DANCEY.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

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

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

How long?

RECOLLECTIONS OF J. F. K.

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, last week on the editorial page of the Washington Post, David Broder had an excellent editorial marking the 8th anniversary of the death of President John F. Kennedy. I insert this editorial, "Recollections of J. F. K." into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

RECOLLECTIONS OF J.F.K.

(By David S. Broder)

Washington went about its business yesterday with little to indicate that it was a notable anniversary. It was eight years ago yesterday that John F. Kennedy was murdered in Dallas, eight years since the gunshots at the underpass by the grassy knoll cut a brutal gash through the history of our era.

Eight years is the equivalent of two presidential terms. The eight years since John Kennedy's death have been dominated by two men who were his great rivals in life—Lyndon Johnson, who fought him for the nomination, and Richard Nixon, who opposed him in the election of 1960.

Johnson held the presidency for more than five of those years, and Richard Nixon yesterday afternoon had occupied the White House precisely as long as Kennedy was allowed.

The verdict of history is still some time distant for Kennedy's successors, and yet it seems fair to say that as of today, there is little reason to think that either the Democratic delegates or the nation's voters made any mistake in 1960 in judging that Kennedy was the best man of the three.

This is so, despite the fact that Johnson as President passed a massive liberal domestic program likely to be felt and remembered far longer than Kennedy's few bits of New Frontier law.

And it is the case, despite the fact that Nixon's accomplishments in foreign policy—given time and good luck in liquidating the Vietnam war and pursuing the negotiations with the Russians and Chinese—may dwarf Kennedy's handling of the Cuban missile crisis, the passage of the trade expansion act and the negotiation of the nuclear test ban treaty.

Kennedy's standing rests not on the specific accomplishments of his brief tenure, but on the qualities of national leadership he embodied. They are qualities which, if anything, are better understood today, after eight years of absence, than they were in his lifetime.

John Kennedy was a man of reason, a man with a love of public debate, a man who saw politics quite literally as the arena for public testing and public determination of national policy.

As a candidate, Kennedy turned instinctively to the public forum and to open debate—with Johnson, with Nixon, and with anyone else who cared to test his political worth. Confronting prejudice—the fear of his Catholic faith—he did not shrink or hide, but boldly faced the purveyors of that prejudice and disarmed them with cool reason.

As President, in times of crisis, whether economic, political or military, his instinct was to invoke the public wisdom. It may be foolish to ask what he would have done had he been confronted with Johnson's choices in Vietnam in 1965, but it is not foolish to ask how he would have done it.

He would not have led the country into massive war by stealth and indirection, as Johnson did, for he would have known, as he had always known, that a policy that cannot be enunciated openly and defended in public debate is almost certainly bad policy.

But if Kennedy was a man of reason, he was also a man of passion, who felt injustice and was not ashamed of making moral distinctions between the strong and the weak, the oppressors and the afflicted, in America and the world.

One remembers him quoting, on so many nights in that campaign against Richard Nixon, the words he loved from Franklin Roosevelt's 1936 acceptance speech: "Governments can err, Presidents can make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warmhearted in a different scale. Better the occasional faults of a government living in the spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

Those words have more force now—in this city of frozen-faced men—than they had then. As Lyndon Johnson feared the free play of reasoned debate, so Richard Nixon seems to fear the consequences of concern, compassion and a generous spirit. His is government by the grim; Johnson's was government by the sly.

Because Kennedy was neither grim nor sly, neither dour nor devious; because reason and passion coexisted so comfortably in his person; and because he made us all believe, at least for a short time, that politics could be a rich adventure, an exercise of the best that we possessed in mind and spirit; because of this, and much more, he is mourned today, eight years and two Presidents after he was struck down.

UNION CITY YOUNGSTERS HELP SAVE ENVIRONMENT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of all the Members of Congress to the activities of a group of young people in Union City, Calif. Children at Searles School, the students of Mrs. Marion Davies, planned and followed through on a program to help our environment that could be a model for youngsters all around the country. These students cleaned up their schoolyard and the territory they covered while walking to school. They convinced their mothers to save all glass—clear and green—all aluminum cans and all bimetal cans. The glass and aluminum are to be sold and the bimetal containers are taken to a recycling center. This project had two goals, the first to clean up the litter spoiling their world and the second to earn money to buy trees to help clean up the air. As a result of 6 weeks of work, the children had \$20 for the purchase of trees for the Searles School playground. In addition, they helped in the effort to

remove trash from the environment, to make this a more pleasant world to live in. I know that Mrs. Davies must be very proud of her students and I have no doubt that the parents and entire Union City community share that pride in these young and conscientious citizens. The world would perhaps be a better place if we grownups approached our pollution problems with the same vigor that these fine youngsters have shown.

HARRY CAUDILL'S TESTIMONY

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, Harry M. Caudill, a distinguished Kentucky lawyer and former legislator has achieved a global reputation as an authority on the effects of surface mining on the environment. His major work in this field, "Night Comes to the Cumberlands," is known throughout the country.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Caudill came to Washington to present his views on strip mining before the Subcommittee on Mines and Minerals, chaired by our colleague, Representative Ed EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma.

I think the Members of the entire House will find his remarks interesting, and I insert them in the Extension of Remarks of the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

A PLEA FOR A NATIONAL POLICY ON SURFACE MINING

(Testimony of Harry M. Caudill)

Gentlemen, my name is Harry M. Caudill. I reside at Whitesburg, Kentucky and am an attorney-at-law. I appear before you as a private citizen and not as a spokesman for any organization. I am grateful that at long last there is some small evidence that the Congress may begin to meet its responsibility to the American land and people and develop a comprehensive, tightly-enforced national policy regulating surface mining in the United States. Unless this is done soon I am convinced that as a nation and a people we are headed into unmitigable calamity.

I was born in 1922 in the very heart of the Appalachian mountains and have been surrounded all my life by coal mines, coal miners and coal companies. For as long as I can remember I have been profoundly distressed by the ruinous impact of the coal industry on the people who depend upon it and the land from which its product is wrested. As a member of the Kentucky Legislature in 1952 I voted for Kentucky's first strip mining law. That law was "improved and tightened" in 1956 and I supported the changes. In 1960 I sponsored the Reclamation Act that, as amended, went on the books that year. I have maintained a constant interest in my state's laws and regulations in the sincere hope that they would protect its western plains and its beautiful, timber-covered eastern hills. It is with sadness that I tell you Kentucky's seventeen year struggle has been a failure and that the ruin of its land continues unabated.

These experiences led me long ago to conclude that only federal legislation of the sternest character can be effective. A number of circumstances now coincide to make

national action in the near future an absolute imperative.

In the first place, the American land is richly endowed with solid fuels and other minerals. The ancient Appalachian range is one of the richest natural resource regions in the world and the dozen states across which it runs contain vast deposits of bituminous coal, thick ledges of limestone and silica-rich sandstone, huge deposits of marble, talc and granite, some copper and lead, and important quantities of gibbsite, grahamite, gneiss and other important but little known substances.

Across our western plains in Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Iowa and Kansas lie tremendous deposits of coal, and huge veins of it lie in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Arizona, Utah, Colorado, Oregon, Washington, Alaska and small areas in California. The Dakota wheat-fields grow above extensive tracts of lignite. Texas is underlain with great beds of iron ore, as are Minnesota and Alabama. In Florida there are valuable deposits of phosphate rock and in Georgia kaolin and other commercial clays. Arizona, Utah, Nevada and California contain copper, silver and gold. Sand and gravel are practically ubiquitous, and are always in demand. There are literally dozens of other minerals in our soil, all of which will some day be sought by miners.

The second factor is a vastly accelerated demand. The nation's population now is about 210,000,000 and its appetite for minerals is insatiable and fast growing. Its consumption of electricity increases at nearly 10% annually and most of it is generated in coal fired furnaces. Americans alone may be expected eventually to consume all the resources within their landscape as a colony of bacteria will consume the apple that harbors them. But Americans are not alone in exerting pressures against the American land. The Japanese industrial colossus is almost without mineral reserves in its homeland and must extend its tentacles throughout the world in search of raw materials. The Common Market and other industrially advanced states must reach out by ship and pipeline for the fuels and ores that keep them going. Our disastrous national economic policies have piled up billions of dollars in Japan and Europe and they are now coming home in exchange for our minerals and wood. If my sources of information are accurate foreign countries are now getting more timber out of our national forests than do Americans—and this at a time when nearly a third of the nation is still poorly housed.

The third factor in the new threat is modern earth-moving technology. From the Sumerians down to about 1950 the almost universally accepted way of recovering solid-state minerals from the earth was by tunnel and pillar mining. Entries were driven into a hillside or a deep shaft was sunk into a plain and men dug their way to the deposit of coal or lode of metal. Then they bored into it by alternating tunnels and pillars. Enough of the deposit was left in place to hold up the top until the miners could work their way to the outer limits of their territory. Sometimes as they mined back toward the portal they would remove the pillars and take out nearly all of the mineral. Obviously, this method of mining is very costly. It requires large numbers of workmen. It is dangerous and men are killed and others are injured in cave-ins and explosions. Dead men, crippled men, widows and orphans accumulate around every mine mouth and this has been true for thousands of years. Only surface mining can do more harm to men, women and children than traditional subterranean operations.

With roaring speed this has all changed. The diesel engine has given us the bulldozer and it has grown to gigantic size. We have developed the highlift, surely one of the

most remarkable tools to come from the human mind. Our scientists and technicians have assembled immense shovels that tower above hills and plains like iron Titans. The biggest of these machines is as tall as a twenty-two story building. With these machines have come a host of complementary, though lesser ones, including drilling devices and numerous rubber-tired and very agile carriers of overburden. A huge auger with a crew of three or four can drill directly into the exposed face of a coal seam and drag out the fuel at a rate which could not have been equalled by a hundred miners working in a similar vein in 1940. Of equal importance is the development of a cheap new explosive. Petroleum and fertilizer are mixed and the soupy paste can blast a mountain apart with all the violence and a third of the cost of dynamite.

In a mere instant of historic time these technological developments have rendered the old tunnel and pillar mining obsolete. Industrialists naturally want to take advantage of new efficiencies and, consequently, half of all our coal is now recovered by strip-ping, and half of all our strip mining is done for coal. Company by company they discharge the miners on their pay-rolls, lock the doors of company towns and disassemble the industrial structures on which the nation has relied for a century. Then a few men with the new machines take mountains apart layer by layer for the coveted coal, copper or iron ore. Or they go to the prairies of the Dakotas, peel back the earth and lift out the lignite to power Los Angeles. The hills and plains of Ohio, the plains of Indiana and Illinois, the phosphate fields of Florida—every place where commercially valuable minerals lie in the earth—have been or will be assaulted in this manner. No such place is sacrosanct; none is likely to escape. A mining company can now tear a mountain apart for its minerals almost as easily as a child can rip up a pile of sand. The whole earth has become the plaything of industrial man. Unless governments decree otherwise the 1970s may see the end of old-style tunnel and pillar mining.

I lament the utter ruination of the hills of my own homeland and the assault surface mining has made on people of my blood and name. I have seen once clear streams choked with mud, and lawns and gardens layered with foul sediments from the spoil heaps. And I have seen wells that once brimmed with crystalline water filled to the top with yellow mud flecked with coal. I have visited the homes of widows and work-worn old men whose basements and cellars reeked of sulphurous slime from the spoil banks. I have seen the shattered roofs, the broken grave-stones and the fences that tell of the blasting that "cast the over-burden" from coal seams. I saw the sad, disbelieving face of one-armed Herman Ritchie of Clear Creek in Knott County, Kentucky after he came home from a federally sponsored vocational school and found his house knocked from its foundations by a massive land slide. I was attorney for Roosevelt Bentley of Jenkins, Kentucky, a paraplegic ex-coal miner whose house was severely damaged by washouts from a mine operated by Bethlehem Steel Corporation.

And I sat by the desk of Governor Edward Breathitt when eighty year old Mrs. Bige Ritchie—a neighbor of Congressman Carl D. Perkins—told the Governor how she stood on the front porch of her home and saw the bulldozers come to her family cemetery after coal for the Tennessee Valley Authority. She shouted to them that the graves of her children lay in front of them, but they ignored the pleas of an old, impoverished and helpless woman. "I thought my heart would bust in my breast," she told the Governor, "when I saw the coffins of my children come out of the ground and go over the hill." Neither the TVA nor the mining company ever apologized for this enormity. All of these things hap-

pened in America and under the protection of the American flag. The Congress, swathed in the bland unconcern that has caused millions of U.S. citizens to despise their own government, took no note of these events. There were, instead, murmurs that the lights must not be allowed to go out.

Experience in the ancient societies of China and India indicates that in the long generations that lie before us all our land will have to be used by growing hordes of people. If we allow strip mining to continue as at present those who carry our genes in the after time will inhabit grim, gray spoil banks, and they will curse us for what we will have done to them.

Our heedless assaults upon the land have already made changes that will endure through a long geologic era. In Appalachia the wind and the rain long ago leached out the minerals and when rain falls upon undisturbed hillsides the runoff is fresh and sweet. The blade of the bulldozer brings up unleached soil and the mineral content of surface water rises at an awesome rate. The Kentucky River just above the town of Hazard is illustrative. In 1963 a study by the U.S. Public Health Service measured its iron content at 0.02 parts per million and manganese at 0.00 parts per million. Just three years later after extensive strip mining had occurred on the upper reaches of the watershed iron rose to 2.1 parts per million and manganese to 0.8 parts per million. The U.S. Public Health Service has set the maximum tolerance levels of these substances at 0.3 parts per million and 0.05 parts per million respectively. On other watersheds ravaged by strip-ping iron has been measured at 88.8 ppm and manganese at 74.7 ppm! And this water is consumed daily by hundreds of thousands of people. The new, costly and very dead Corps of Engineers reservoir at Pound, Virginia testifies to the impact of strip-mine poisons on living things.

Silt, too, is a deadly and inevitable by-product of strip-ping, as was determined by a joint federal and state research project conducted on two adjacent neighboring valleys between 1955 and the end of 1963. One of them, Cane Branch, was extensively strip-mined for coal while Helton's Branch was left in its undisturbed stand of second growth timber. Silt traps were installed to catch soil washing down from the hills. The stripped land was reclaimed by an agency of the industry, the Kentucky Reclamation Association, in conformity with state law. The undisturbed valley yielded 27 tons of silt per square mile, while the stripped territory across the ridge gave up mud at the rate of 30,000 tons per square mile "affected."

As global energy and raw material needs climb and more and bigger ore and coal ships are built to carry out minerals to other shores, mining surges westward. All states having deposits of coal and other minerals are certain to have strip mines in their future. The Interior Department report, *Surface Mining and Our Environment*, issued in 1967 showed that some form of strip-ping had already occurred in all states. Only Congress can fix the limits within which such mining can be tolerated and protect American citizens in their homes, lawns, gardens, fields and pastures—to assure their right to safe drinking water and to sleep at night without fear of floods boiling up from choked waterways.

I urge the Congress to adopt a three-pronged legislative solution to this problem. (1) The legislation should forthrightly outlaw strip mining in such areas as southern and central Appalachia and the somewhat gentler hills of Ohio where the slopes are so steep and the rain fall so great that restoration of the land to its former and natural utility, contour, and best natural purpose, is impractical or impossible. Unless this is done, and done speedily, there will be no Appalachian heartland. It will have

been reduced to a ruined jumble. The people will have to move to the already overgrown and mutinous cities and the desolate mountains will plague the nation with gigantic flows of mud for generations to come. The stake of the taxpayers in this proposal is tremendous. And since natural beauty is beyond price and stripping and beauty are incompatible, such mining ought to be banned in areas of significant scenic loveliness and in important wildlife habitats. Nor should it be authorized in towns and other heavily populated territories where important human values will be disrupted, nor where any highwall will be created. And, of first priority, no strip-ping should ever be authorized in those situations where legal title to the minerals has been severed from the title to the land generally, and the owner of the surface estate does not consent.

(2) It should authorize strip mining only where total restoration of the land can be carried out promptly and effectively. It should require that the top-soil be scraped off and saved with the subsoil and the rock strata being similarly lifted out of the pits and segregated. When the minerals have been removed the rock should be restored to the pits first with the subsoil following in its natural order. The subsoil should be compacted and coated with the original top-soil and, where there is enough rainfall to sustain vegetation, the surface should be treated with fertilizer and limestone, planted with trees and sowed to suitable grass or leguminous cover. These things are done now routinely in Germany, England and Czechoslovakia.

It must be noted, however, that even under the careful, systematic and costly procedures I have outlined a severe difficulty remains: subterranean water flows are permanently disrupted and charged with minerals. Sometimes strip-ping goes 800 feet into the earth and on such areas no wells can ever produce water for farms and villages. This factor may, in fact, justify the prohibition of such deep strip-ping, or even all strip-ping.

(3) The federal government should commence a massive program to purchase and restore lands already strip-ped. The inventory of ravaged earth is growing daily. It already greatly exceeds the whole land area of the state of Connecticut. In 1967 the New York Times editorialized that there was then enough to make a swath a mile wide extending from the Statue of Liberty to the Golden Gate. In ten years an area the size of West Virginia will have been ruined. In the name of all that is just and sensible let us use some of the money we are now devoting to the destruction of Vietnam to reconstruct stricken portions of our own country.

The task of repairing our mutilated lands will prove to be difficult and frustrating as well as expensive. The healing of dismembered mountains should be assigned to teams of engineers and conservationists. In many areas if acceptable results are to be achieved enormous quantities of dirt will have to be dragged back up the hillsides, perhaps by machines which have yet to be invented. Vast tonnages of stone may have to be crushed to release their nutrients for new crops of timber and grain. Other stone will have to be buried. Lavish quantities of fertilizer, and compost, as well as limestone will have to be applied, perhaps by giant helicopters designed and built for the purpose. Historic experience has indicated that the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior is best suited to accomplish this gigantic undertaking. As an Appalachian mountaineer, I hope the task of reclaiming my shattered homeland will be assigned to the Bureau. I know that an objection will be raised that the Bureau does not operate in eastern America, that its mission has traditionally been restricted to the West. But this is no argument at all. Its experience and orientation have lain in bringing life

to barren land. It has successfully handled giant projects over broad regions, as countless verdant acres now attest.

In the millions of acres in our orphan banks the Bureau of Reclamation can find a new challenge worthy of its best men and greatest traditions. It is the logical organization in the Federal Government to combine the expertise of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the National Park Service, Bureau of Mines, Southeastern Power Administration, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, all within the Department of the Interior, as well as other Federal agencies whose skills and talents would be needed for this historic undertaking.

Some day the taxpayers of the Republic will have to assume the cost of restoring, insofar as possible, the lands we have already plundered. We cannot undo history, but we can undo some of the harm history has done. The British are now spending on land restoration about \$1.15 per ton of coal mined, and we must face up to the inevitability of similar heavy outlays. It will cost billions of dollars. The \$750,000,000 indicated by Secretary Udall's report is certain to fall woefully short of the mark. No true patriot could object to the financing of this essential undertaking and I hope Congress will not hesitate to appropriate the funds to get the work started.

But the general taxpayer should not be called upon to bear the whole burden of rehabilitating our industrially maimed land. The industries that rip up our soil and their customers who share directly in the benefits of such mining should carry most of the load. Otherwise we will have capitalized the profits while socializing the losses—an increasingly popular arrangement with Congress and a large part of the nation's industry.

Let me suggest that the Congress finance such reclamation out of a trust fund supported by a special levy on extractive industries. Senator Lee Metcalf has introduced a bill to impose a federal severance tax on all minerals taken from the American earth. It is sensible legislation and the states will benefit enormously from its enactment. Each state in which large-scale extraction occurs suffers from a lack of funds caused in part by the importation of people to work in the extractive industries which simultaneously lower the tax base by damaging the land. Senator Metcalf's bill would compel huge and thriving corporations to leave behind for schools, libraries and hospitals some of the money they now take out in such astonishing amounts.

In my opinion the levy proposed by Senator Metcalf is too small insofar as it pertains to surface miners as distinguished from subterranean miners. Five percent is not enough. It should be 10% and a half of the amount should go into a restoration trust fund. The trust fund should pay for the fitting together of shattered mountains, the smoothing and seeding of ravaged prairies and plains, the cleaning of polluted air and silted streams and for research on how best to accomplish these desirable ends.

My proposals aim at restoration rather than reclamation. As I have already noted this is, to a large degree, being achieved routinely in Czechoslovakia, Germany and England and it can be done here. I urge the subcommittee to go to those countries and see for yourselves how it is possible in some terrains and under some conditions to remove minerals without apparent lasting damage to the land and its living things.

Some of you may be thinking along that silly old line, "Well, your proposals will lessen coal production and turn off the lights." If so you are pathetically ignorant of the American scene. Deep mines are closing as strip mines take their market. Deep miners are

out of work and at this hour hundreds of them are lined up to apply for unemployment insurance benefits. Before you go to Europe to see how land can be restored when a government wants it done, you might make a side trip to Whitesburg, Kentucky and talk to men who have lost their jobs to bulldozers and you might even ask them how they expect to feed their families in the bleak winter that lies ahead. From there you could fly to Iowa, the nation's breadbasket, 45% of which can be stripped for coal. There you might ponder that if your descendants are to enjoy the glories of corn-bread, bacon and beefsteak you must make certain that Iowa survives undisturbed.

If you worry about our lights going out consider slowing coal exports to Japan. It is ironic that during World War II we ravaged our land for fuel to put out the lights in the Japanese empire: now we tear up our land for coal to keep those same lights burning!

Finally and most important, I urge you to hold field hearings in eastern Kentucky and in other parts of our nation where strip-mining has taken place. Hear the opinions of local people who have seen mountains come tumbling down and whole counties subjected to the threat of dissolution. Then go look for yourselves and there amid the whirling dust and the roaring machines, by the dead streams, jumbled plains and murdered mountains, make up your minds as to the dimensions and urgency of the problem, and whether we can afford to waste another day in coming to grips with it.

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1971

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, November 21-23 is the 31st annual interfaith observance of National Bible Week. We all sense that the Bible, its precepts and its cultural heritage form the basis of American society today. But even more. Historically, the Bible provided that firm rock of faith upon which the Founding Fathers built this country. The inspiration found in its pages helped strengthen the courage of pioneers as they stretched the frontiers of this Nation westward to the Pacific Ocean.

The Bible offers each of us a sure respite from the frustrations and pressures of modern living. Its principles offer continuing guidance for personal living. With all the forces that seek to divide our peoples in these trying times, the Bible offers the unifying hope that good men will live together in peace and with charity.

The Bible, though written centuries ago, continues to brighten our lives, whatever our religious affiliations or beliefs. The principles of faith contained therein are universal. The Bible tells us the simple formula for peace for every person and for every nation:

And what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God. (Micah 6:8)

Let these words be with us during this observation of National Bible Week.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S HILDERBRAND—AGELESS SCHOLAR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an article from the San Francisco Chronicle in today's RECORD, as a tribute to a fine mind at the University of California at Berkeley.

Now 90 years old, professor emeritus Joel Hilderbrand is still working hard in his career. He is considered one of the best by his colleagues, and stands today as a tribute to the generation of Americans who are legally too old to serve, but serve anyway.

It is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to include this excellent article by William Moore for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 26, 1971]

UC'S HILDERBRAND—AGELESS SCHOLAR

(By William Moore)

It was a slightly incongruous scene, there on the fourth floor of Latimer Hall, a concrete-and-glass high rise in the midst of many on the University of California's Berkeley campus.

Students and professors scurried through the labyrinthian hallways—in and out of laboratories, classrooms, offices and elevators. "Dr. Hilderbrand," said a young lab technician, pronouncing the name with reverence, "he's right over there in room 437."

The door to the office was wide open, revealing chemistry professor emeritus Joel Hilderbrand—who'll be 90 years old on November 16—working alone, curiously aloof from the academic choreography outside.

FIGURES

Flanked by shelves, bulging with books and test tubes, he sat crouched over his desk, furiously scrawling down figures on a stack of graph sheets.

This was Hilderbrand. The man they call the dean of American chemistry, a member of the Berkeley faculty since 1913, teacher of more than 40,000 students, winner of practically every major chemistry award, college administrator, educational philosopher, prolific author, mountaineer, one-time Sierra Club president, manager of the 1936 U.S. Olympic Ski Team.

Now he was working on the research that has consumed much of his life—the nature of solubility and the structure of liquids. In a week his latest research will be published in the Journal of Science.

Hilderbrand sprang from his chair and strode briskly across his office to greet his visitors.

RULES

"Remember now, it's Professor Emeritus Hilderbrand," he said, his eye mischievous behind his wire-rimmed glasses. "The rules said I had to stop teaching in 1952 because theoretically I was supposed to be senile. I have been pseudo retired ever since."

He laughed uproariously, and it was a beguiling sight. Here was a man—a handsome, white-haired gentleman, with a sturdy, trim physique—who could have passed for some 25 years younger. Only when he laughed did the few wrinkles on his massive brow become noticeable.

SUPPORT

"Actually," he said, "the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation have been supporting much of my research since 1952."

He pulled out a sheaf of papers to explain his current work.

"I'm concentrating on the viscosity of liquids and the diffusion of dissolved substances," he said. "No progress had been made in this for a long time, but I think I have reduced it to simple terms that enable us to calculate and predict viscosity and diffusion."

GRAPHS

He pointed to some graphs that, to the layman's eye offered impressive and convincing proof that there was indeed a predictable pattern to the logarithms (the exponents of those powers of fixed numbers which equal given numbers) of certain types of solubility.

"People used to assume there were two kinds of molecules: solid and liquid," Hilderbrand said. "Well, there aren't. There is just one kind."

The applications of this and Hilderbrand's earlier research are rife.

Hilderbrand, for instance, was the first to prove, in 1925, it would be safer for deep-sea divers to inhale a combination of helium and oxygen, rather than air, because helium is much less soluble than the nitrogen in the air.

EFFECT

If a diver surfaces rapidly, Hilderbrand showed, nitrogen bubbles from air can be formed within him, causing enormous pain and even death from the bends. The phenomena doesn't occur with the less soluble helium.

But as Hilderbrand himself made clear, he does not conduct his research with such immediate practical applications in mind.

Indeed, Hilderbrand shyly admitted "the fire of poets burns within any real scientist."

To bolster the point, he grabbed a book off his shelf and turned to a quotation from Henry Poincaré: "The scientist doesn't study nature because it is useful; he studies it because he delights in it and he delights in it because it is beautiful."

ORDER

Hilderbrand, speaking excitedly now, explained: "I am trying to discern order from chaos. That's what all scientists are trying to do. When you get on the right track, you know it. Things start falling into place. Scientists don't shatter into fragments any unity. On the contrary, they collect, sort and build into structures—some of which became great cathedrals."

The professor began to pace about his office. "The scientist, if he is any good, is born curious—like a child," he continued enthusiastically. "He remains a scientist as long as hasn't become old and uninterested."

Hilderbrand said he arrives at his office at 9 a.m. each weekday and spends at least six hours a day conducting his research, with the aid of one or two graduate assistants.

"It's too exciting around here not to come to work," he said. "I don't want to miss anything, especially when I see the possibilities of explaining the next area beyond where I have been."

SUBSTITUTE

On occasion he fills in as a substitute lecturer in under-graduate chemistry classes and invariably receives thunderous applause after his lectures.

Before he retired, he prided himself in teaching the introductory chemistry course for 39 years. A dramatic speaker—he describes himself as a "ham"—his courses were among the most popular on campus.

"In freshman chemistry," he said, "I had all the properties an actor needed."

His most famous act occurred during each Stanford-Cal. Big Game week when he would bring out a giant test tube and fill it with red fluid (Stanford's colors) to an inevitably boating audience.

"I would then explain to them that chemists can change things and that it is not

what happens in the first half of an experiment that counts but the last quarter," Hilderbrand related.

Thanks to an alkaline miracle, Hilderbrand's test-tube fluid would suddenly turn blue and gold (Berkeley's colors), usually bringing an ovation.

DEAN

Hilderbrand spoke proudly, too, of the College of Chemistry, which he once served as dean, a college that for years has been considered the leader in the field. (One of its four buildings was named after him when it was built five years ago.)

Hilderbrand then turned to his great love: the mountains. In addition to his many chemistry books, including an introductory text book still widely used today, he has written several works on hiking and skiing.

Until a few years ago, he was still an active backpacker. "I used to ski a lot, but I had to give it up reluctantly at age 75 on the orders of my family," he said.

Hilderbrand has four children, 12 grandchildren and four great grandchildren.

HOME

His wife Emily—they were married in 1908—and he have lived at 500 Coventry road in Kensington since 1924.

"I still get a lot of exercise from tending a big garden there, and I walk everywhere—never take the elevator," Hilderbrand said. "My secret is to stay energetic."

"I also try to stay in contact with young people. You'd be amazed at how many freshman come up to talk with me. They want to see what Hilderbrand looks like."

The professor emeritus put on a sporty racing cap, grabbed a cane and strode briskly out of his office, passed the laboratories, the lecture halls and the swirl of younger humanity.

He was off—as he is off most days at noon—to the faculty club for lunch with his colleagues.

THE BIG BUDDY BATTLE

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in this age the word "gap"—generation gap, credibility gap, economic gap—is as common as toothpaste. It is a popular term these days.

But when the gap you are talking about is that between normal society and mental retardation, the popularity of the phrase dwindles considerably. We tend to want to turn away and forget that this gap exists at all.

Down in Austin, Tex., however, some folks are spanning the chasm of mental retardation. The tool they are using—ordinary people.

Nanette Wiese of the Austin Citizen describes a new program—sponsored by the Austin-Travis County Mental Retardation Counseling Services, funded by the generosity of local residents, and relying on people willing to give up at least 2 hours a week to be a "Big Buddy" to a mildly retarded child.

It helps to span a lot of other gaps on the sideline, too, for it is a government agency with citizen support—and a lot of university students for volunteers.

It shows a kind of spirit we could use a lot more of.

Miss Wiese's article follows:

THE BIG BUDDY BATTLE

A "soft revolution" is in the making.

The battleground: mental retardation.

The army: Big Buddies.

Volunteers in a special "Big Buddy" program sponsored by the Austin-Travis County Mental Retardation Counseling Service are conducting what project director Allen Danzinger calls a "soft revolution" because "they're trying to make the weak strong."

The mainly college-age Big Buddies are all inclusive and the ranks include males and females, anyone interested in extending an open hand to help pull a youngster across the chasm of mental retardation.

The program, which is now a year old, is a concerted effort to align on a one to one basis volunteers to work with mildly retarded youngsters or those known as the "six hour" retarded children to keep them in society and out of institutions.

"Many of the youngsters come from one parent homes," Danzinger said, "and are often classified as mentally retarded due to a low IQ score without regard to his adaptive behavior which may be exceptionally adaptive to the situation and community in which he lives."

Although the 110 children who now have Big Buddies span the race spectrum, Danzinger admits most are "black and chicano because these are the ones most often classified as mentally retarded when they don't do well in school."

Although most of the volunteers come from the university communities, Danzinger has plans to incorporate all citizens in some phase of the program.

The main participant is the Big Buddy who is assigned a Little Buddy for a minimum of two hours a week for six months. The Big Buddy volunteer has the choice of following planned activities ranging from recreation to crafts or can write his own script and take his Little Buddy on excursions into libraries, parks, stores or even his own home.

"We can't reach everybody and we can't reverse a lot of what's happened, but we can take a child with a frown and turn it into a smile," the program director explained.

One of the most successful methods of finding out how to get rid of the frowns has been outdoor camping, according to the center's recreation and physical education director Bill Griebel.

Griebel said it is a lot easier to get a child interested in outdoor recreation and then find out what the problem is than to approach his parents with offers of psychological testing.

"So many youngsters have been tagged retarded due to behavior, and if we can modify the kid's environment, the experience can prove very therapeutic," he said.

Griebel said the camping program has proved invaluable since "one day at camp can tell more about a youngster than records kept over 10 years."

"You've just got to have first-hand experience, or what we consider the meat, to understand these kids," he said.

Last weekend, the Big Buddies and Little Buddies participated in a Halloween camp-out at the state maintained Leander Rehabilitation Center 17 miles from Austin.

Griebel said the more capable youngsters pitched their own tents and "slept under the stars" while the more restricted ones bunked in the dormitories provided at the center.

"We hope this will be the first of four or five campouts, because we have seen the results, but we need new resources," Griebel said.

"New resources," of course, means new places to find money. Danzinger said the volunteers are already giving their time and burdening them with the entire expense is impossible.

"When you look at how much it is to keep

a youngster in an institution and how little that goes into facilities for the mentally retarded, it's embarrassing," Danzinger added.

"People don't want to see these kids, they want to build a big, fancy institution and stick them away out of sight," Danzinger continued, "but we see this program as a pre-occupational step that helps provide them with what they will need to get and maintain jobs."

Griebel said the whole focus of the program is that "we hope this will be a powerful enough an influence to keep them in society."

The program director said individuals and organizations can help in other ways than by becoming Big Buddies—by sponsoring one child to the special summer camp for seven weeks that Griebel supervises.

"We also need people who can give time to administrative and telephone duties since there's so much involved in keeping this thing going."

The efforts of University of Texas students provided the center with "the green bus" because transportation was a particular problem in carrying out the program.

But it's going to take more efforts by many more people, both Danzinger and Griebel agreed.

A Big Buddy button is also available for \$1 to anyone who would like to contribute monetarily to the project and Danzinger said anyone interested in becoming a Big Buddy or finding out what else can be done can contact him or Griebel at the Mental Retardation Counseling Service at 474-1581 . . . there are now 40 children waiting for Big Buddies.

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA COMMENTS ON THE COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT TITLE OF S. 2007

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Child Welfare League of America, I am certain, needs no lengthy introduction to the Members of this House. As a privately supported organization, it has, since its establishment in 1920, devoted its efforts completely to the improvement of care and services for children. Some 374 child welfare agencies are affiliated with the league. Represented in this group are voluntary agencies of all religious groups as well as nonsectarian public and private nonprofit agencies.

The league's primary concern has always been the welfare of all children regardless of their race, creed or economic circumstances.

One of the league's primary functions is to set standards for child welfare services. Particularly pertinent to the Congress, as we consider the conference report to S. 2007, the 1971 Economic Opportunity Act amendments, and the very important title V of that bill, The comprehensive child development program, is the league's work over the past 10 years on standards for day care services.

The league supports the child development program based on its understanding of what is contained in the conference report. In a recent discussion with a member of the leagues staff, I was told that the child development program is in accord with most of the leagues' principles and standards for day care services.

Since we are shortly to consider the

conference report, I asked to have the league's comments sent to me for I believe they are important in evaluating the need for this legislation. I am placing the text of the league's letter of November 24 to me at this point in the RECORD and hope that my colleagues will take a few minutes to read it.

The letter follows:

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA COMMENTS ON THE COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT TITLE OF S. 2007

The League supports the concept of federally financed, universally available comprehensive day care and other early childhood programs. More specifically we believe that there are certain basic principles which should be incorporated in any child care legislation and which can be used as criteria for judging the merits of various child care proposals. These principles include the following:

(1) The welfare of the child should be the prime consideration in child care programs.

(2) a. Child care should be available to all children in need of such care regardless of the socio-economic circumstance or employment status of the family. (Initially, there would be priorities in providing service for the economically disadvantaged.)

b. Cost for care to a family should range from free to full payment, depending upon the family's financial resources.

c. Programs should provide for continuity of care for children irrespective of changes in the economic or employment status of parents.

d. Programs should be available to children on a part-time or full time basis according to the needs of the child and his family.

e. The same programs should be available to all socio-economic groups. Children should not be separated into different programs on the basis of the socio-economic or employment status of the family. The establishment of a two-class child care system should be avoided.

(3) Child care programs should be of a comprehensive nature—that is, in addition to providing care and protection, they should make available a variety of services, such as nutritional, health, psychological, social work and educational services. Programs should not be limited solely to physical safekeeping or so called "custodial care."

(4) Standards to insure a sound quality of child care should be established with particular reference to the ratio of staff to children, and to the quality and training of staff. There should be provision and adequate funding for enforcement of standards. Government funds should not be permitted to finance child care which does not meet proper standards.

(5) There should be provisions for parental involvement in all child care programs.

(6) There should be flexibility of administration to permit adaptation of programs to meet local needs.

(7) Funding should be adequate to support the needed quality and quantity of child care.

Our comments on S. 2007 are based on the texts of the bills passed by the House and Senate, and on our current understanding about decisions made by the Conference Committee on certain key issues, although the Conference Report has not been available to us.

We believe this bill is worthy of your support because it sets a pattern for sound child care programs in the future. It is in accord with most of the League's principles. Among its merits are a primary concern for the welfare of children; sound federal standards for services which would protect and help children; child care programs of a comprehensive nature; services which would be provided

free to families with incomes under \$4320 and at low cost to those families with incomes between that amount and the BLS Lower Living Standard of \$6900. (Fees for families above this income level would be set by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.)

Although we would have preferred a higher income eligibility level for free service, we believe this compromise will achieve at least some of the desired socio-economic mix and will provide care at a low cost for non-welfare low-income families struggling to make ends meet.

Claims that the state will take over child rearing under S. 2007 are clearly not based on the facts. Such opposition reveals a lack of knowledge about the legislative provisions since parents may voluntarily choose whether or not to make use of child development or child care services, and parents help determine how the services should be run.

Although we are aware that even if S. 2007 becomes law the Administration may not fund the child care programs up to the authorized level, we believe that this bill establishes a more satisfactory basis for quality child care programs in the future. We are hopeful that budget priorities will change over the next few years and that there will be increased recognition of the importance of services to help children.

There is a need for quality child care to help all children achieve their maximum potential so that they may emerge from childhood as healthy, secure and productive adults. We believe this legislation would be a step in that direction.

WEEKLY REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS, NOVEMBER 29, 1971

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my last Weekly Report, November 29, on the pay and price guidelines set out in phase II of President Nixon's economic policy:

WASHINGTON REPORT—CONGRESSMAN LEE HAMILTON

By and large, the pay and price guidelines set out in Phase II of the President's economic policy have been well received. Most Americans apparently feel that they can contribute substantially to bringing the rate of inflation down to 2 to 3 percent by the end of next year. My general impression is that the guidelines represent a major step toward price stability.

In the abstract, the price policies seem to be fair enough. In principle, the long range annual productivity increase of 3 percent, deducted from the 5½ percent average wage increase, will produce the average 2½ percent price increase. On paper, it looks fine. In practice, of course, it may not work out that way at all.

We should remember that controls do not end with abstractions. There are thousands of specific disputes and hardships which await these Boards in enormous numbers and variety, and everything will depend upon the good sense and equity of the critical early decisions.

On the whole, the guidelines are tougher than I had anticipated. These tough rules are bound to evoke complaints from businessmen, most of whom already think their profits are too low, and from labor, which already feels that the guidelines are uneven, applying to wages but not to profits.

The sternness of the guidelines is modi-

ned by their flexibility and by the number of items exempted from controls. All of the standards set by the Commission may be modified by consideration of equity. Although a basic ceiling of 5½ percent was established for wages, the guidelines leave the door open for adjustments to allow for inequities. The long list of goods and services exempted from price control represent about one-fifth of the average family budget.

The major question and the biggest weakness of Phase II is the lack of adequate enforcement machinery. Without strict and fair enforcement, equity is not possible, and without equity, the system will lose the support of the people, and the whole effort will collapse. Voluntary compliance is relied upon heavily, while surveillance is going to focus on the big firms.

There have been suggestions within the ranks of organized labor that it should pull out of the Pay Board and begin an open battle with the President over the New Economic Policy. I hope this course of action is not followed, and I don't believe it will be. Labor's two biggest gripes have been (1.) the disallowance of pay increases during the freeze, and (2.) the way in which the White House has manipulated the Pay Board.

The whole question of retroactive pay may be overblown. The differences are not all that great. Back pay increases cover 13 weeks of the freeze and amount to something like one-half of 1 percent of the Nation's total wage bill. In many cases, there is a willingness on the part of the Pay Board to make exceptions and to permit the deferred increases, except possibly for a few outsized increases.

I must confess a disturbing feeling that the Price and Pay Boards were hurriedly assembled in an atmosphere of crisis and without sufficient consideration of the long-term implications, especially philosophical underpinnings of the controls. Concern also arises from the confusion of the initial days of Phase II, and from a recognition that many difficult problems are ahead. There is concern about what will happen if Phase II doesn't work, and whether we will ever be able to get away from controls, and if we do, will we go back to them again each time we have an economic crisis. Others, I believe, share these doubts and questions and it may help explain why the business community has held back its approval of Phase II, as evidenced by the sluggish stock market.

Finally, the goal is just not controlling inflation, but also to stimulate the economy with increasing production, expanding trade and more jobs. My chief concern is that the employment side hasn't been pursued with the same vigor as the control side.

No one envies the Boards' tough task of writing the specifics of their standards. The Pay and Price Commissions are going to need the firm backing of the President and the Congress if they are going to find genuine price stability.

DISTINGUISHED HISTORY OF COMPANY A, 1ST BATTALION, 115TH INFANTRY, FREDERICK, MD.

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I visited recently with the officers and men of Company A, 1st Battalion, 115th Infantry of the Maryland National Guard at the State armory in Frederick, Md. I was impressed by the outstanding quality of this unit, its excellent training and readiness and want to congratulate Capt. James F. Walsh and his men for the job

they are doing. I was also briefed on the unit's distinguished history which I feel indicates the continuity of pride in this National Guard unit. I would like to share that history with my colleagues:

DISTINGUISHED HISTORY OF COMPANY A, 1ST BATTALION, 115TH INFANTRY, FREDERICK, MD.

In the early history of Frederick County, the name of Cresap was a synonym for heroism. It was linked with so many deeds of military bravery and daring that people naturally turned to Cresap for leadership whenever an emergency arose. It was for this reason that the committee of Frederick County in June 1775 selected Michael Cresap to be Captain of the first company of riflemen that Frederick was sending to the Revolutionary War. The message of appointment found Michael Cresap in the midst of a pioneering project in the west and in failing health. True to the spirit of his ancestors, he accepted the appointment knowing that it was the same as a warrant for his death (Ironically, Colonel Thomas Cresap, the father of Michael Cresap, lived to be 106).

When word of the appointment of Michael Cresap, to command Company A was disseminated men who knew the Cresap family from afar hastily went to Old Towne, the Maryland home of Michael Cresap, to join his ranks. Twenty-two volunteers were at his home awaiting for him when he arrived home after accepting his appointment in Kentucky. Soon the Company numbered one-hundred thirty, and by the time the men had marched through Maryland the ranks had grown so fast that enlistments had to be halted.

The Company left Frederick on August 5th, 1775 to begin the 551 mile trek to Massachusetts. As they passed through communities, the men of Company A amazed the citizens with their marksmanship. They astonished spectators as later they astonished the British by picking off targets at seemingly impossible distances for the muskets of that day.

The manner in which Captain Cresap handled his men elicited much praise from those who saw the Company. They accepted his with absolute obedience and, from the accounts of spectators, seemed to be as devoted to him as he was to them. One observer says he had the ability to be "friendly without loss of self respect".

The long march was finished about mid-summer. Captain Cresap's company was the first to reach Cambridge from the south. On August 13th, 1775, order was received to join General Washington's forces. By that time Michael Cresap was a very ill man. Soon he was forced to retire because of illness. He left for home, but to late to make the full journey. He died on October 18th in New York City where he was buried with full military honors in Trinity churchyard. His grave remains there today.

This was the spirit of company A; the spirit that lived in the men who later served with the unit whenever the nation issued a call.

During the Civil War, Company A served as part of the First Maryland Infantry (Federal) under Colonel John R. Kenly and at Front Royal, Virginia on May 23rd, 1862 when the famous motto "Rally Round The Flag" was born.

On September 29, 1881, Company A was one of the existing units incorporated into the newly organized First Battalion of Infantry, Maryland Army National Guard. This Battalion being a direct ancestor of the First Maryland Infantry (Federal) during the Civil War contained Companies A, B, C and D. It was expanded into the First Regiment of Infantry on May 7th, 1886 by the incorporation of Companies from Elkton (E), Catonsville (F) Annapolis (G), Waverly (H), Towson (I), and Company K from Baltimore.

Company A was mustered into Federal service along with the remainder of the

Maryland First Infantry Regiment on May 11th, 1898 and was assigned to the Second Army Corps during the Spanish-American War. The unit was mustered out of Federal service on March 15th, 1899.

The Company was later called into Federal service again on June 28th, 1916 and saw duty with the Regiment at Eagle Pass, Texas during the Mexican Border incident. During this campaign the company was commanded by Captain Elmer F. Munshower. (Captain Munshower also commanded the company when it was called to duty during World War I and was Battalion Executive Officer when the 115th Infantry was again called to duty in World War II. He later served as Division I.G., and later was assigned as Post Commander at Camp A. P. Hill, Virginia. He retired a full Colonel in 1945). The unit was mustered out of Federal service from the Mexican Border on November 4th, 1916.

The Company was again mustered into Federal service on August 5th, 1917 and was combined with other units of Maryland's First and Fifth Regiments to form the 115th Infantry Regiment, 29th Infantry Division. The unit trained extensively at Camp McClellan, went overseas and served with typical distinction, mainly in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. The unit was demobilized at Camp Dix, New Jersey on May 30th, 1919.

Company A along with the other units of the old regiment was reorganized on July 31st, 1923. The 115th Infantry was redesignated the First Infantry Regiment, Maryland Army National Guard.

On January 1st, 1941 the regiment was again redesignated as the 115th Infantry Regiment and was inducted into Federal service February 3rd, 1941. Company A left Frederick under the command of Captain Guy Anders, a man who had served as a platoon sergeant during the World War I Meuse-Argonne Offensive. (Later Sheriff of Frederick County). A total compliment of more than 180 men left the city to once again answer the call to colors. Company A, along with the other units of the Regiment served with distinction at such places as Normandy (Omaha Beach), St. Lo, Villeboudin, Viro, Brest, Bethendorf, Kirchberg, and other enemy held locations. Many of Fredericks' Sons and fathers left their blood in Europe during these campaigns. The unit was mustered out of Federal service on January 17th, 1946 at Camp Kilmer, New Jersey.

The unit was reorganized with Federal recognition in February 1947 under the command of Captain Alfred Cutsall, who commanded until November 1953. Between 1953 and March 1963 successions of command in Company A went to Captain Willard Horine, Captain Paul L. Crum Jr, Captain Robert L. Strine, and Captain Kenneth L. May. In March 1963, the unit was separated from the 115th Infantry and assigned to the 2nd Battalion 175th Infantry with Headquarters in Dundalk. Along with this change the command of the unit fell to the responsibility of Captain James F. Walsh. It was also in this period of time that Company A became involved in Civil Disturbances. On three occasions the unit was sent to Cambridge, Maryland to quell the riots there. It was also during this period that the strength of Company A diminished to less than 60 officers and men. In spite of this Company A came out as the "best" company during summer camp, over other units of the 2nd Battalion 175th Infantry. Captain James F. Walsh and 2nd Lieutenant Ernest M. Snyder were the only officers in the unit at the time and the enlisted strength was a mere 53 men. In spite of the fact that other Companies in the Battalion contained nearly twice the manpower. Company A excelled in almost all phases of training.

In November 1965, another reorganization saw Company A once again as part of the 115th Infantry. This was the inception of the "Selected Reserve Force", and for the first

time in history, the unit was split between two cities, Hagerstown and Frederick. Captain Boyd M. Cook, a former Army Company Commander was selected to command the unit. This proved to be a worthy challenge since the following months saw training in all weather and drills were extended to 72 per year. (Some selected officers and enlisted men performed as many as 96 drills).

In January 1968, another reorganization combined the Hagerstown and Frederick elements together in the Frederick Armory. The troop authorized strength of 178 made it the largest post-war company ever in Frederick.

Company A saw civil disturbance action again in April 1968 following the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. The unit spent eight days in Baltimore coming home on Easter Sunday. It can be said that the actions of Company A and other elements of the 115th Infantry Regiment during this duty helped once again to prove their worthiness for any occasion. Within 2 weeks after the riot duty, the unit was called out on a voluntary basis to help search for a three-year old boy lost in the Catocin Mountains. After twenty hours, the men of Company A were successful in their search and brought the youth out of the mountains in good spirits. (Less than 1-year before the men of Company A located another lost 3-year old boy west of Frederick).

In October 1968, 1st Lieutenant Ernest M. Snyder, a sixteen year veteran of the Company gained command of the Company as Captain Cook moved on to the Battalion Staff as Motor Officer. Authorized troop strength for the unit had been reduced to 160 enlisted men and 6 officers early in 1968, and the unit no longer assigned the role of "Selected Reserve Force", was once again training on a 48 drill a year basis. Things seemed quiet now, but training has a new depth. Greater emphasis is placed in individual proficiency and a tone of seriousness is seen in all training sessions due to the far east conflict. True to form, changes are imminent.

The personality of Michael Cresap still lives in the men of Company A. This is the spirit which has, and always will typify those men of Company A, who stand ready to answer the call to colors. This is the spirit that has built the nation, protected it, and somehow becomes enlivened whenever the nation needs the citizen soldier.

The times change; the years change; the complexities of politics and modern warfare become overwhelming and the citizen soldier like the regular becomes a professional in his own right.

In four years, Company A will be two hundred years old. It is obvious to us who have served the unit that the spirit of Cresap's Rifles has remained undaunted through those many years.

POST WAR COMPANY COMMANDERS

Capt. Alfred Cutsall, Capt. Willard M. Horine, Capt. Paul L. Crum, Jr., Capt. Robert L. Strine, Capt. Kenneth L. May, Capt. James F. Walsh, Capt. Boyd M. Cook, Capt. Ernest M. Snyder, Capt. Robert B. Houser, Jr., Capt. Kenneth W. Lamont.

FOUR BILLS ASSIST THE AGED

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months, I have begun to intensely study the unique problems of our elderly citizens with a view toward developing a comprehensive legislative program designed to assist them in maintaining a meaningful and productive existence in a society whose orientation

seems to be the search for a fountain of perpetual youth. As we are all aware, no one has found the magic fountain, and no one has solved the problems of our aged. Among these unsolved problems is that of mobility, socializing, nutrition, and rehabilitation after a chronic illness.

I am today introducing four bills that promise some hope in meeting these unsolved problems. The first bill is designed to assist the elderly in obtaining access and use of public transportation, the second would provide funds to construct senior citizen community centers, the third would provide funds for a nutrition and meals program, while the last would initiate research in the problems of chronic care.

NEW TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY

The first of these four problems is perhaps the least difficult to solve. For the elderly, public transportation is often the only means by which they can visit one another, shop, and obtain medical care. Public transportation, too, is the only means by which they are able to move their domiciliary, since the availability of and the cost of transportation may preclude their moving, if it should be beyond their physical or financial means. We may not now be able to do very much about the amount of physical access; we can definitely do something about the costs very quickly. Let me indicate what this means.

In the first place, lower costs would allow the elderly to simply be able to visit their friends and take much better advantage of the many activities that are free in any city. This means that they are better able to maximize their limited incomes; and, their mobility becomes a stabilizing influence in the community of which they are a part because they can now become more active in the cultural and social life of the city.

In the second place, since all forms of transportation would be affected by my bill, long-distance travel would now become much more possible for the elderly. Many of them would be able to visit the places, the shrines, and the parks which they are not now able to visit or visit only rarely. It seems to me that providing this ability is the very minimum that we can do for those who have given the Nation with the greatest capacity for offering a dignity to life inherent in the democratic ideal.

Specifically, this bill, the Senior Citizens Transportation Services Act, provides that applications under the provisions of the Mass Transportation Act must contain provisions for a reduced fare program for those 66 and older. The bill also provides provisions for a reduced fare on common carriers in interstate commerce. Other provisions of the bill provide that motor vehicle insurance must be made available to the elderly and that all facilities for transportation must be equipped to insure access for both the elderly and the handicapped.

SENIOR CITIZENS COMMUNITY CENTERS

It is not enough, however, to just provide transportation. We must offer our senior citizens the opportunity to formulate their own programs, to obtain at an accessible site special services, and to

meet with one another in the setting of a community service center. The second bill would provide that the States shall construct, from funds provided by HEW, multipurpose centers for the senior citizen under such standards as HEW shall find acceptable in consultation with the State(s). A very important aspect of this bill is that senior citizens must be consulted in the planning stages, as well as be hired in operating the program, to the extent most possible.

LOW COST MEALS AND NUTRITION TRAINING

One of the major problems of our elderly is the lack of proper nutritional planning. This results from the loneliness and despair that often accompanies one who lives alone as well as one who lacks the resources for purchasing the proper foods. My third bill goes to the heart of this problem in two ways. It offers to the elderly low cost nutritionally sound meals served in community centers or elsewhere which allows, thereby, that the individuals receive, first, adequate nutrition, and second, the benefits of social contacts.

REHABILITATION FOR CHRONIC CARE PATIENTS

My fourth bill authorizes appropriations of \$5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$10 million for each of the next 3 fiscal years to enable HEW to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization to cover all or any part of the costs of projects for the development of demonstration programs designed to rehabilitate aged inpatients or to assist such patients of long-term health care facilities to attain self-support or self-care. This bill does not offer as an immediate impact as do my other three; it does, however, provide the opportunity for the initiation and continuation of programs designed to enable the chronically ill to be able to become self-sustaining or at least become better able to live with their ailment. The implications of this bill are far greater than the others because it is the first step of a definitive recognition of the problems of aging qua aging.

We have yet to understand the aging process; but, we do know and understand that people of certain age groups are prone to suffer from a variety of ailments that confine them to institutional care. It is important that we strive to cure them; it is equally important that we provide these persons with a will and a means to physically and mentally cope with what, if not a terminal illness, is a debilitating illness. If we recognize and do this, we will have done more to make treatment effective than any other single thing.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that many of my colleagues are equally concerned about the aged population. I am pleased to know that so many people are becoming interested in this problem because as one who has served as a pastor and community leader in one of our largest urban communities, I know what it means to people—particularly poor people—who reach those years that really ought to be the golden years. Too often these years are only bleak with a grayness that signals only death. We have the capacity to end this plight and I do hope that we act rapidly to do so.