

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE L. MENDEL RIVERS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the late Representative L. Mendel Rivers had a great many friends in many walks of life. Among these were the 100,000 members of the American Dental Association. He earned the dentists' vigorous and dedicated support by his continuing efforts to obtain better dental health programs for members of the armed services and their dependents, and to improve the status of military dental personnel.

Many tributes have been paid to the Honorable Mendel Rivers. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 26 contained several of them. However, none expressed the sentiments of dentistry, military dentistry in particular, as does the statement Journal of the American Dental Association for February, 1971.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE L. MENDEL RIVERS

For five days short of 30 years, L. Mendel Rivers was the member of the House of Representatives from the 1st District of South Carolina. His death at the age of 85, soon after heart surgery, not only robs the Congress of one of the most powerful and colorful members ever to walk its halls but also stills the voice of as vigorous a Congressional champion as dentistry—military dentistry in particular—has ever had.

SOUTHERN DEMOCRAT

Mendel Rivers was a Southern Democrat in the classic tradition. He looked the part with patrician features, a ramrod posture and a long, smooth mane of snowy hair. He sounded the part with a voice of grained velvet that he rarely needed to raise, employing it instead in a way that could drip sarcasm or bestow blessings as the occasion demanded. He acted the part by displaying that mastery of the legislative process that is an essential component of the Southern Democrat heritage.

DENTAL INTERESTS

His deep interest in dental matters was a constant characteristic throughout his Congressional career. It was barely two years after entering the House, when, early in World War II, he helped achieve legislation making it mandatory that dentists be taken into the armed forces at the officer level and assigned duties appropriate to their professional training. Further improvements in the basic laws that have come subsequently have all received his unequivocal backing.

MILITARY DENTAL CORPS

It was, as well, his legislative leadership that led to reorganization of the Navy and Army dental corps, guaranteeing two-star rank for each chief dental officer and giving the Navy corps a statutory autonomy. He never gave up on efforts to achieve totally parallel status for the Army and Air Force

dental corps and anyone familiar with the history of the corps knows how often and helpfully he also intervened on their behalf in less formal ways.

HEALTH OF THE PEOPLE

There was in Mendel Rivers as well another aspect of the Southern Democrat heritage, a Populist strain that can also be found in the careers of such other great members of Congress from the South as Lister Hill of Alabama. He had a lively concern for the health and welfare of the people, coupled with a conviction that the federal government had an appropriate role to play in improving it. His general voting record marks him as a staunch supporter of the efforts on behalf of dental care, research, and education led by such men as Lister Hill and the late John E. Fogarty.

DEPENDENT'S DENTAL CARE

Within his specific sphere of interest, he worked doggedly to persuade successive Secretaries of Defense to bring dental care benefits to military dependents. That battle is, as yet, unfinished, but its eventual establishment would be a particularly appropriate memorial to the extraordinary man who so warmly befriended dentistry for so many years.

THE NEW CHAIRMAN

Mr. Rivers' all but certain successor as Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee is, like him, a Southern Democrat. F. Edward Hebert began his House service the same day as Mendel Rivers—Jan. 3, 1941—and has ever since represented the 1st District of Louisiana. Born in New Orleans on Oct. 12, 1901, the veteran House member is a graduate of Tulane University and reflects the history of his native state by preferring the French pronunciation of his name (sounds like "A-Bear"). He came to Congress after nearly a quarter-century career in journalism, during which he gained substantial renown for his investigative reporting. Long an influential member of the Armed Services Committee and chairman of many of its most important subcommittees, Rep. Hebert is expected to bring to his post much the same general philosophy as was held by his late predecessor.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FOOD AND NUTRITION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, because it is only recently that we have become aware of the extent of malnutrition, both in this country and abroad, I took particular interest in a speech made by James P. McFarland, chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc., on February 5 in Williamsburg, Va., as a followup to the White House Conference on Food and Nutrition held 15 months ago.

Mr. McFarland's report on the steps taken, and to be taken, by the food industry, is encouraging, and, in my judgment, gives some solid hope for improvement in our continuing battle against malnutrition.

General Mills, Inc., is a large, well-known corporate enterprise with head-

quarters in the Third Congressional District in Minnesota. Because these remarks are typical of its responsible, constructive, and positive attitudes, I am proud to insert them into the RECORD today:

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FOOD AND NUTRITION

(Remarks by James P. McFarland)

Fourteen months ago those of us in this room participated in the White House Conference on Food and Nutrition. We were joined under the leadership of Dr. Jean Mayer by hundreds of concerned citizens—men and women dedicated to the proposition that we could and must find ways by which every American could be assured of a healthy and nutritious diet.

I recall that on the last day of the Conference one of our panel members turned to his neighbor and asked, "Do you think the Conference has been a success?" And the answer was, "I don't know—come back in a year and I'll tell you."

Today, our task is to evaluate the events of the past year and to measure our progress against the needs and the demands of our society. The American people are entitled to an accounting of how well we have performed against the challenges which the Conference posed for each of us in December of 1969.

I submit that in one very real sense the White House Conference of a year ago was an immediate success. It identified and isolated specific problems; it established a national climate of concern; and it marshalled the combined resources of government, agriculture, the food industry, science, education and the "man in the street" to attack wholeheartedly our weaknesses and our shortcomings. These combined resources have achieved much in the past 14 months and I am pleased and honored to serve today as the spokesman for the American food industry.

I am keenly aware of the dedication, the social consciousness, the practicality, and the determination with which our industry's people are addressing themselves to the vitally important task before us. Such responsiveness is not new, for the underlying motivation of our Free Enterprise System is based on the providing of service and value to the consumer . . . this motivation has characterized our industry for many years and has enabled it time after time to respond successfully to the particular challenge of the day.

It may be useful if at this point we remind ourselves of the basic four—and here I am not talking about food qualities but rather about the basic four responsibilities of government and the food industry as defined by the Conference.

- (1) To enhance the nutritional well-being of all Americans.
- (2) To provide information to facilitate consumer understanding of food and nutrition.
- (3) To assure the safety and quality of all food products.
- (4) To assist in the improvement of the American social environment.

Before discussing in some detail and with specific examples of how we have responded to these basic four, I should like to make some general observations about the scope and complexity of the situation facing us.

First of all, it seems clear that we need to find out a great deal more about hunger and malnutrition in the United States than is now available to us. The recent Department of Health, Education and Welfare 10

State Survey provided us all with a wealth of insight and knowledge but more data are needed.

Obviously, malnutrition is often the direct by-product of poverty and yet in the Survey it was noted that well-nourished families were living side by side with victims of malnutrition even though family income was similar and at the poverty level.

We find malnutrition in families and individuals where lack of purchasing power cannot be blamed—the bad eating habits of teen-age girls and some young pregnant women are not confined to the poor. There are special problems among some of our aged, there are pockets of malnutrition caused apparently by geographic isolation, and there are situations where ethnic-based food preferences make for an inadequate diet.

It's risky to simplify but I'll try nonetheless. Some people are malnourished because they simply can't afford to buy the necessary food. This is an economic problem. Some people are malnourished even though they have the money—they just don't know what to buy. This is an educational problem. And some people are malnourished even though they have the money and know what to buy—they just don't care about good nutrition. This is a motivational problem.

Let me now return to the basic four responsibilities set before us by the Conference one year ago . . .

The first was: "To enhance the nutritional well-being of all Americans."

One very basic response to this particular challenge continues to be our ability to provide more people with more good food at low cost than any other nation in the world. Despite inflation, food costs as a percent of earning power continue to decline. The credit for this achievement belongs to a great many different segments of our society; and our challenge for the future is to improve upon a system which works extremely well for most people and to extend the benefits of our production and distribution system to groups with special needs.

If we are to make our system work as well for all persons as it now does for most of us, cooperation between the private sector and government is essential. We have seen one dramatic example this past year of what can be done in the expansion of the Federal Food Stamp Plan. The USDA mounted a vigorous campaign to stimulate participation of local communities in the plan and in five states, local leadership and the food industry assisted in the effort. We are happy to report that we have been of help in reducing the number of non-participating counties and independent cities to but 10 out of a total of 3,129.

In another area calling for government action and industry support we were less successful. Our present food marketing systems cannot provide adequate nutrition where there is not adequate income, and many elements of the food industry, including the Grocery Manufacturers of America, supported therefore the Family Assistance Act of 1970.

We were disappointed but not disheartened by the failure of this measure in Congress, and we shall continue to fight for the passage of appropriate legislation in 1971.

The enhancement of the nutritional well-being of our citizens means better new products together with the improvement of our traditional foods—in this respect it has been a banner year. For example:

(1) A broadly distributed breakfast drink has been reformulated to include higher amounts of iron.

(2) A new pasta product has been introduced—an excellent protein value with great promise as a low cost, highly nutritious substance.

(3) A product now in test market consists of two cake-like squares containing

vitamins A, B-1, B-2, B-12, C, D, E, in addition to calcium, niacin, phosphorus and iron and with as much protein, vitamins, and minerals as a complete breakfast.

(4) Another new product in the form of a cake will when served with 8 ounces of milk provide one-fourth of the recommended daily allowance of all nutrients for a 12-year-old boy. The product is well accepted and is readily served in inner city schools since no utensils or special personnel are required.

(5) The nutritional improvement of snack products has been notable. One manufacturer now enriches his complete line of 230 wheat-based products with vitamins B-1, B-2, niacin and iron. A potato-chip like product fortified with soy protein is available.

(6) Further examples of nutritional upgrading include the widespread use of enriched flour in such products as cake, brownie and pancake mixes, the addition of vitamins to fruit drinks, margarine enriched with vitamins A & D, fortification of instant dehydrated potatoes with vitamin C, one-dish dinners with meat supplementation by textured protein products, enrichment of children's cereals with vitamins and minerals, iodization of almost 2/3 of all salt consumed in the so-called goiter belt and the enrichment of more than 2/3 of all milled rice and rice products sold in this country. Finally, we are told that the levels of iron in the flour and bread standards under the control of the Food and Drug Administration are to be increased by a factor of three in line with a recommendation of the National Academy of Science and the American Medical Association. The level of the B vitamins will be increased by 50%.

Perhaps more significant for the long term is the genetic modification of grain and legume proteins. Earlier improvement of corn and rice proteins has been followed within the year by a genetic breakthrough which substantially increased the methionine content of beans and thus improved their food value. This work was underwritten by a major food manufacturer.

Let me add one word of caution. Nutrition is not an exact science, and our knowledge and our understanding both grows and changes with each passing day. We believe strongly in the principle of the addition of nutrients to food. We do not endorse, however, the indiscriminate fortification of food products. It can be overdone. Industry, science and government must work together to make certain that in attempting to improve the health of our consumers, we do not endanger their health or so increase the cost of the products that we make them unavailable to those who likely have the most need for them.

The second basic responsibility given us by the White House Conference was: "To provide information to facilitate consumer understanding about food and nutrition." You will recall that I have suggested we are dealing with not only those who need to be educated but with those who must be motivated.

The record will show that in response to this challenge we are today providing more nutritional information to more people and through more different means than at any previous time in our history. These include efforts by individual companies, by trade associations, by different segments of the food industry and by the advertising fraternity. It is an ever growing, ever more effective communications program of gigantic proportions. We strongly believe in its achievements and potential. For example:

(1) The Food Council of America has been reestablished as a vehicle to disseminate nutrition information. Sparked by the retail segment of our industry and supported by the other elements of the food business, the Council launched a campaign based on the familiar theme, "Eat the basic four foods

every day." Literally hundreds of thousands of displays, posters, color books, recipes, articles, media advertising, point-of-purchase materials and food labels were utilized.

(2) We will see this spring and summer a major national public service advertising campaign. This is a joint effort of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, the Advertising Council, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the National Academy of Science. The planning is done, copy being written and all America will be exposed to the impact of this nutritional information and education campaign.

(3) The Nutrition Foundation, an organization supported by the food industry, is developing a program to get nutrition information to young people through the schools; specifically it is developing 15 thirty-minute television programs for teachers which will constitute a credit course on nutrition and food.

(4) The cereal industry has carried out an extensive program using package backs to tell the story of good nutrition. Over 400,000,000 packages and nutritional messages are involved.

(5) Individual company efforts have been legion and increase every day. Some examples:

A 28-minute film on nutrition and health. An experimental series of nutrition education television messages aimed at low income families.

Underwriting of the nutrition segments of 4-H Club work—largest youth nutrition education program in United States.

Development of comic books to tell the nutrition story in the idiom of inner city youth.

Massive displays of in-store material devoted to nutrition plus substantial advertising space in newspapers used by retailers for the same purpose. Here are some examples:

(Slides.)

And I stop, not because I've run out of examples but out of time.

The White House panel on Food Packaging and Labeling said regarding nutrition: ". . . We are convinced that communication must be improved with the consumer, whoever he may be, wherever he may live or shop."

One of the key elements in such communication is the matter of nutritional labeling of food products. The food industry endorses and has been cooperating with the Food and Drug Administration's studies to find the best method of communicating nutrition information to the consumer by means of the product label.

Currently, three possible approaches are being studied with actual consumer reactions and consumer understanding being tested. Any of the three approaches will provide the essential basic nutritional information about a particular food to the consumer.

The third basic responsibility given us by the White House Conference was: "To assure safety and quality in all food products."

There has been for many years a full recognition on the part of industry that government must play an essential role in this area. This is not to say that industry should only react to government pressure or mandate but rather that government and industry must cooperate in fulfilling their joint responsibility to the consumer. Some of the more recent developments in this area include:

An educational and promotional effort by the food industry to achieve universal support of GMP—good manufacturing practices established by Food and Drug.

Industry support for Congressional appropriations large enough to fund inspection needs of various regulatory agencies.

Industry support for Food and Drug in its plans to establish and publish nutritional guidelines.

A notable increase in the amount and quality of ingredient and finished product testing both by government and by industry. The extent and impact of this increase can be recognized when we look at the microbiology laboratory work done by just one food manufacturer in the past year. The number of individual analyses rose from 39,700 in 1969 to more than 57,000 during the year just concluded. All of this can be translated into a sharply increased investment in time and money on behalf of improved product quality and product safety.

The fourth and last basic responsibility as defined by the White House Conference was: "To assist in the improvement of the American social environment."

Surely, no one can argue that this is not a responsibility incumbent upon each of us. It is a challenge to the individual, to the family and to all of our institutions throughout the nation. It is a challenge which recognizes that the American dream is still a nightmare to far too many of our citizens. It is a challenge which recognizes the inescapable truth—those of us responsible for the operation and success of a profit-making enterprise must at all times pursue our goals in a manner wholly consistent with the social good.

Each of us will view his responsibilities a bit differently than his neighbor. Commitments will vary and priorities will change with the passage of time and a change in circumstance. I am in no position to speak on behalf of the men and women of our American food industry in this regard except to say that I know them to be fully dedicated to using their talents and resources so as to assist materially in the improvement of the American social environment. For example:

(1) Day care centers, housing rehabilitation, recreational programs, community clean up projects and school operations characterize food industry involvement in the inner city.

(2) The largest single supporter of reruns of Sesame Street is a food manufacturer. In fact, food companies help finance this program in over 20 major cities.

(3) Programs to assist minority entrepreneurs are numerous in the food industry as is close cooperation with NAB and related agencies.

(4) Our social environment is oftentimes most directly improved or changed by legislative action. We have within the food industry this past year given a great deal of thought and study to a wide variety of legislative proposals before Congress and have taken positions which we feel to be in the best interests of our nation. Some no doubt will disagree with our views on specific bills, and we may well disagree at times among ourselves. We do believe, however, that we should let our voice be heard and at the same time listen long and carefully to those who have a different point of view.

As I look back over the past year I am impressed by what has been accomplished. It has been innovative, it has been constructive, and it has been substantial. And as I view where we are today, I am once again impressed—this time by how much more demands to be done. None of us in industry views today's session as anything more than a brief respite, a breathing spell that gives us the chance to make a progress report. Tomorrow, like yesterday, we'll be back on the firing line and working toward the full attainment of those goals we set for ourselves one year ago.

One final word: A noted ecologist is fond of saying that a fundamental law of nature is, "Everything depends upon everything else." I believe that if we are to be successful in our fight for improved health and nutrition, we must adopt the same principle—only we might put it, "Everyone depends upon every-

one else." There has been this past year perhaps too much criticism and not enough communication. We are (or should be), after all, allies, not enemies. I would hope that in 1971 the government official, the strong consumerist, the educator, the businessman—that somehow all of us would realize that if we can but enlarge our field of common understanding and agreement we increase tenfold our chances for success.

There are two ground rules which I suggest we all adopt:

(1) Let us open wide the doors of communication and talk not merely with those with whom we agree but, more importantly, with those whose views are dramatically different from our own.

(2) Let us at all times be willing to recognize the sincerity and intellectual honesty of those with opposing views. Nothing is to be gained by impugning the motives of those with whom we disagree. The American people and their needs for improved nutrition deserve nothing less than the best efforts of all of us. We are all headed in the same direction and seeking the same objectives. The more we help each other, the sooner we will attain that goal. Toward that end, I pledge the support of our American food industry.

HONESTY IN PUBLIC LIFE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Reins on Lawmaking," published in the National Observer.

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

REINS ON LAWMAKING

The retirement of John J. Williams of Delaware from the United States Senate left a particular kind of vacancy—one that can not be filled easily. With all respect to Mr. Williams' successor and to the entire membership of the Senate, what Mr. Williams took with him was an aggressive attitude about the need for honesty in public life.

The veteran legislator also offered some final observations on the role of Congress. Asked if he thought the system works, Mr. Williams replied:

"Yes, no question of it. Of course, a dictatorship is the most efficient form of government. But who wants it? I wouldn't want to have a President that had the power to move at will, whether I agreed with him or not. Now, the President can suggest things, and we can delay it or we can kill it. But there's always another Congress coming. I've been here 24 years, and I've seen bills delayed that were supposed to hold life or death for the country. But I've never seen a piece of legislation yet that was kept off the books when the people wanted it. It may be a year or two later but it always comes to pass."

That is something for all Americans to ponder, especially the more impatient among us. The statement reminds us that while many members of Congress may now and then favor precipitous action, the mechanism of Congress was deliberately designed to compel judiciousness.

And Mr. Williams' appreciation of this truth suggests that his famous honesty is but one aspect of his wisdom.—From the National Observer.

NATIONAL FORESTS

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, our National Forest System should be a matter of great pride to all of us. I know how vital the Hoosier National Forest is to the economy and recreation potential of my own congressional district and I know just what a guiding force the Forest Service has been in the many accomplishments gained in southern Indiana.

Mr. Jay H. Cravens, regional forester for the eastern region of the Forest Service has presented an illuminating chronicle of Forest Service achievements over the years. In his remarks before the Association of Great Lakes Outdoor Writers Meeting in Chicago on January 30 Mr. Cravens has defined the public trust of which we must all be conscious if our natural heritage, America's forest lands, are to be preserved. I commend Mr. Cravens' address to my colleagues.

I include the address as follows:

THE CHANGING AND CHALLENGING ROLE OF NATIONAL FOREST ADMINISTRATION

This is an opportune time, and you are an excellent group to speak to on a subject that is both timely and important.

First, some background.

When the Forest Service was created by Gifford Pinchot the country faced a grave crisis. The crisis was that of saving our remaining forest lands, and salvaging those that had been badly mistreated. The need then was to establish scientific management on the forest lands and gain acceptance for the new profession of forestry in America.

Today we have that scientific technology and we have applied it. There is a different crisis today. It is the correct application of technology to gain a necessary balance of uses to protect and enhance the environment.

Too many of our young ecologists and environmentalists think of themselves as pioneers in a new field of awareness. Actually, they have eminent examples to emulate. Gifford Pinchot was one who preached the same message as they, at least 75 years ago. Hugh Bennett was another who labored in the same vineyard at least 40 years ago.

Forty years ago America faced another crisis, which we call the "Great Depression." Because of this Depression during the 30's, the country embarked on the greatest conservation program in history. That gentleman named Hugh Bennett was a leader in the formation of this program. This fact is too little recognized today.

Hugh Bennett loved the land. He trod over many thousands of acres of it in the Piedmont region of the Southeast, and other parts of the country. He did not like what he saw. Being a soil scientist, he was able to diagnose the spreading sickness. He made the first extensive record of land abuse in this country, statistically enumerating the millions of acres that were badly eroding because of faulty farming practices and other land abuses. Bennett was able to prove that this had a profound bearing on the economic crisis of the 1930's. One thinks, for example, of the migration of the many so-called "Okies" from Oklahoma and other farming states where the land had been badly abused and made a prey of wind and other erosive forces. John Steinbeck's classic novel, "The Grapes of Wrath," told this story very well.

The result of Bennett's work was the formation of the Soil Conservation Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It was one of the programs designed to solve the ills of that era.

SCS became a permanent Government agency. Another well known program of the 1930's did not. I refer to the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The CCC did more to bring about better resource management and use on the National Forests than anything that happened before or has happened since. Before this program came into being, the National Forests had little to offer the public in way of recreational facilities. The CCC built excellent campgrounds, picnic areas, boat launching ramps, hiking trails, and other similar facilities. At the same time, the Corpsmen planted millions of trees to regenerate the forests, even to create new forests, such as the Shelterbelts in the wind-blown plains states; they built roads to better harvest the timber; and they built fire lookout towers and other such facilities to better protect the forests.

World War II was another period that brought about significant change in National Forest administration. The war-time need for wood was tremendous. The National Forests were the last great bastions of untapped wood resources left in the Nation. It was inevitable that they would be called upon to furnish this basic raw material resources.

It is true that the Forest Service has long been an organization of foresters, that it has been making timber sales since the earliest days of the organization, and that the outfit had learned to cope with crisis. The Chippewa National Forest is a good example of this ability. Many of you are familiar with that Forest and have written about it. Your 1969 fall meeting was up there at Big Lake Winnie. While there, you were briefed on such important programs as the Wetlands, and saving the bald eagle.

In 1940, this Forest suffered two disasters. One was an ice storm in the spring that felled much timber. The Forest Service immediately made salvage sales of this damaged timber. And in August, even while the salvage harvest was going on, a terrific wind storm felled more millions of board feet of timber. Renewed effort was made to salvage that, and the Forest Service was successful in bringing about good utilization of what would otherwise have been a wasted resource. For this and other reasons connected with good timber management, the Chippewa was given a Superior Service Award by the Secretary of Agriculture.

This and other similar experiences made obvious the fact that National Forests had good timber to cut, and that it could be cut expeditiously and well. The World War II crisis made this harvest necessary, even vital. We have to admit that during and after World War II timber management became the dominant activity on the National Forests.

Before you become too critical of that, let me point out that this increased harvest of timber from National Forests was not only vital to the war effort, but was also imperative for meeting the raw material needs of our fast expanding Nation in the years following the "big war." Wood is still an important basic resource, whether as a raw material for construction and other such uses, or as a processed material such as in plastics, keeping in mind that a large percentage of plastic materials is derived from wood cellulose. There are at least 5,000 uses for wood and its byproducts in our civilization today.

That is why we began to harvest timber from the National Forests in a big way. We had to. And we are not ashamed of it. Rather, we are proud of the role the National Forests have played in making this the great Nation it is today.

Still, we do admit that we are faced today with another crisis in America. Again the situation demands change. This change means that greater emphasis will be placed on other uses besides timber in National Forest administration.

When many of us here were young, we were most fortunate in having a good environment and room in which to enjoy it. We could easily pursue the good outdoor life. The country kid had it all around him. Even those who lived in town didn't have far to go to enjoy hunting, fishing, and camping.

Today the situation is much different. Our burgeoning population, our expanding towns, cities, airports, and transmission facilities, our concrete ribbons of four-laned highways with their ground-eating cloverleaves, our wasted land areas and our polluted streams and lakes, to say nothing of our overcrowded State and National Parks, have made the National Forests, in many cases, last refuges for those who want to get away from the sights, sounds, and smells of civilization and enjoy some of that which we took for granted when we were young.

This is why we are shifting gears in the Forest Service and are heading in a new direction. In the administration of the National Forests, we are now going to give much greater emphasis to the other uses—we call it a balanced program.

I'd like to point out, however, that many years ago the Forest Service began reserving large tracts of land as wilderness. It is no accident that the National Forests are the backbone of the National Wilderness System today; practically the whole body in fact. The wilderness concept began within the ranks of the Forest Service, led by people like Aldo Leopold, Arthur Carhart, and Bob Marshall.

Here in this Region of the National Forest System where we have approximately 54% of the Nation's population, we have two units of the National Wilderness System—the magnificent Boundary Waters Canoe Area on the Superior National Forest in Minnesota, and the Great Gulf Wilderness on the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire. The BWCA came into the picture as early as 1921 when Arthur Carhart, then a Forest Service landscape architect, traveled through the area and made an intensive study of it, recommending it be managed as a primitive type recreation area, the very type of management it is getting today. Art Carhart, as you know, went on to become an outstanding outdoor writer. He is, I think, one of the all time greats in the field of outdoor recreation.

Today, BWCA is the most heavily used wilderness area in the United States because it offers the greatest canoe-camping experience available just about anywhere. Over 100,000 people annually are now going into the area, most of them during the short summer period. This poses a problem, and it is one we are facing up to. Our research people are making careful studies of recreation use in the area, and we are beginning to apply their findings. We are imposing a ban on use of non-burnable containers, requiring all users to pack out what they pack in. That regulation is in effect this year. We are also closing down some overused camp sites. We are determined to protect land values in that area just as we do in all our other recreation areas. You may expect our efforts in this respect to be intensive in the BWCA and elsewhere.

This is where you can help us. Visitors to this and other National Forest areas need education. You are the ones who can best give it to them. In BWCA for example, our studies show that probably twice the number now using the area can visit without overtaxing it too much, provided, and this is very important, that they learn about it. They need to spread themselves out better in this one million acres of marvelous wilderness, instead of bunching up as they now do. They need the expert how-to factual in-

formation on canoe-camping, and on the area itself, which you can provide.

BWCA is also, as you know, one of the last havens today for the timber wolf in America. A few months ago, Forest Supervisor Craig Rupp closed portions of the Superior National Forest, including the BWCA, to trapping and taking of timber wolves, using the Endangered Species Act as his authority. The Forest Service recognizes the right of the States to manage and enact laws pertaining to fish and game. This was, however, an emergency situation, and we felt impelled to take this temporary emergency action while continuing to work cooperatively with the State of Minnesota in this as well as other matters pertaining to fish and game. The matter is being resolved amicably, and we are sure the result will be much better protection for the wolf, an animal we would all hate to see become extinct.

Besides the two declared units of the National Wilderness System in the Eastern Region, we are managing many other areas in a special manner. Most of you know of Sylvania, on the Ottawa National Forest in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Some of you have written about it, and very well too. Tom Opre, for example, has not only written about it, but has supported our management plan for Sylvania. He did so only after visiting the area, becoming acquainted with it, and seeing what we were doing there, and what we were not doing, which is also important. This is something that I respect about outdoor writers. You write about what you know. You get out and see the country you write about, and also talk about, for some of you are broadcasters as well as writers.

Sylvania is a sensitive area and you can expect to hear more about our efforts to intensify our endeavor to manage and protect this magnificent area. We are identifying and studying more scenic areas in the Eastern Region. We will keep you posted on our progress in this effort and you in turn can help us keep the public informed and involved in our management decisions.

Everyone likes praise. When we come up with an idea, put it into effect, and it turns out to be a good idea, we are glad to be told about it. That's what Jack Ehresman has done when he writes about our Oakwood Bottoms, Green Tree Reservoir project on the Shawnee National Forest here in Illinois. Jack knows that area from having hunted ducks down there, and he knows how successful our program has been in creating such excellent duck habitat, while at the same time we are enhancing our timber management program in the area. This is multiple use in action.

That's what we think about when we refer to that much used, and sometimes abused term, multiple use. This concept of forest management which Gifford Pinchot and the Forest Service originated, is as important today as it ever was. George Tilford knows the Hoosier National Forest well. He knows we have outstanding recreational facilities at Hardin Ridge, where you can camp, picnic, swim, or launch your boat for some top fishing in Monroe Reservoir. But George also knows we are raising good hardwood timber on the Hoosier, have an outstanding turkey management area there, and have created excellent small lake fishing, such as in the case of the Middle Fork of the Anderson River project.

The Forest Service doesn't take credit for all of these projects. We work cooperatively with the States and other Federal agencies in bringing many of them to pass. The Middle Fork of the Anderson is a classic example of the local people, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service working together. That's the way it should be. Going back to the matter of fish and game again, we recognize our role to be that of habitat management. That's why we do have turkey manage-

ment areas on the National Forests. That's also one of the reasons we practice timber management; it also enhances the wildlife habitat.

You know the heat we have been getting because of our clearcutting method of timber harvest. Some of you may have helped apply some of that heat. You are not above giving us the word on occasions, and we appreciate that. It helps to keep us on our toes, and we do not claim to know all the answers.

Some of our timber management policies, including clearcutting, did need critical review. We are reacting to this criticism in a positive way. Last month, in Charleston, West Virginia, I held a press conference in which I announced changes we were making on the Monongahela National Forest which will help us to arrive at a meeting of minds with our critics. We're going to moderate our clearcutting on that National Forest, and be especially careful to make sure we do not go overboard in allowing timber harvest to be too dominant at the expense of other uses and values on the Monongahela as well as other National Forests.

Let me point out again though, that in our timber management we do try to recognize other uses and values. The Nicolet National Forest in Wisconsin is a good example. There, as well as on other National Forests in the Lake States, it is our policy to maintain small openings for deer and ruffed grouse. Here the policy is not to plant openings under 10 acres in size. In larger openings, favorable areas are also left open for wildlife and are not planted. And in our planted areas, we leave buffer strips for enhancing the wildlife habitat. On the Nicolet, we create, by timber harvest, several thousand acres of openings each year, and you folks know that these provide excellent browse for deer for at least ten years following, while the new young forest takes hold.

There are thousands of these small openings under 2 acres in size on both the Nicolet and Chequamegon National Forests in Wisconsin, and many thousands of them in the National Forests located in Michigan and Minnesota. We include wildlife habitat improvement plans in all of our timber management plans on all the National Forests.

We can't control the weather. The North Country has long and severe winters which limits the numbers of deer the country can support. We can, though, manipulate the cover so that better winter habitat can result, and that's why we do practice clearcutting in these areas.

We think it is no accident either, that such a State as Wisconsin rates excellent as a ruffed grouse hunting country. We are providing good habitat for te grouse, and we are also providing the hunters with good access to this hunting by creating hunter-walking trails on the National Forests, closing these trails to all vehicular traffic during the hunting season. This is a story we think needs to be better told.

My message here is that timber management skillfully designed and applied by a multi-disciplinary team can be used as a valuable tool to achieve multiple benefits. We have heard the public's message. We share their concern about timber cutting. We also want a quality job. You will see us sharpening up and shaping up on timber harvesting practices throughout the National Forest System.

The Eleven Point River on the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri is another example of how we are trying to meet the needs of the times in creating a better recreational opportunity in that part of the country. The Eleven Point is one of the original eight wild or scenic rivers created by Congress. We have developed a management plan for it that will maintain its pristine quality, while at the same time accommodating those who wish to float and enjoy it. We are putting float camps along the river, but putting them

away from the banks and where they will not infringe on the scenic qualities of that outstanding stream. And we are going to do the same for other streams on other National Forests.

The Forest Service now has more landscape architects working for it than any other organization, governmental or private. That is a sign of the times. We are also beginning to employ more soil scientists, hydrologists, wildlife and fishery biologists, and other disciplines that help us to gain the expertise we need to really practice multiple use management of the National Forests.

The Chief of the Forest Service, Ed Cliff, has recently sent out a message to all Forest Service employees, in which he expresses concern about the direction the Forest Service needs to travel in the 1970's. Early in this message, Chief Cliff says: "Our programs are out of balance to meet public needs for the environmental 1970's and we are receiving mounting criticism from all sides. Our direction must be and is being changed." The Chief then refers to "Framework for the Future," a recent policy statement issued by the Forest Service, and a copy of which you now have.

This is a blueprint for us to follow in the years ahead, but is also one we are beginning to apply now. It first sets Forest Service objectives and policy guides. These include promoting and achieving a pattern of natural resource uses that will best meet the needs of people now and in the future.

"Framework for the Future" also emphasizes the protection and improvement of the quality of air, water, soil, and natural beauty. It is becoming common knowledge now that forest land serves a vital function for a healthy environment. The Forest Service is becoming more involved in promoting urban forestry programs, the islands of green or forest belts in and around our large centers of population. On the National Forests we're looking a lot more critically at all our management plans to make sure they add to rather than detract from the natural environment.

The Job Corps program is an example wherein we are helping an underprivileged segment of society, while at the same time we are reaping benefits from the program for all the users of the National Forests. We still have three Civilian Conservation Centers in operation in the Eastern Region: Branchville on the Hoosier National Forest; Golconda on the Shawnee National Forest; and Blackwell on the Nicolet National Forest. Young men from these Centers have done and are doing tremendous work for us, creating recreational facilities as well as planting trees and other types of conservation work.

The Forest Service is also destined to play a very active role in the new Youth Conservation Corps program. We think this has exciting prospects. Unlike Job Corps, it is designed to recruit members from all segments of society. We think there is good merit in providing conservation work experience for the rich man's son as well as the poor man's son.

We are rather proud of the role the Forest Service has played in helping Rural America to achieve a more stable economy. We have kept many small timber operators, pulpwood cutters, farmers and grazers, in operation by making timber sales and allotting grazing permits where feasible. Closer to your interests, we have created employment opportunities for guides and outfitters where National Forest recreation opportunities exist. And this hasn't hurt neighboring motel and resort businesses either.

We have engaged in public works programs. A good current one is the Green Thumb Program that puts rural people to work improving and better protecting the National Forest areas. We think all these programs should be stepped up. We have the work for these people to do. And some of them desperately need to work. All we need is the financ-

ing. We think it will be money well spent, with good cost-benefit ratios. We think it's most vital to keep as many people as we can, usefully employed in the National Forest areas, to keep so many of them from migrating to the large population centers where they become added burdens and compound the problems in those areas.

We are also going to involve the public more in forestry policy and program formulation. We have already started doing that. And this leads me directly to you.

Education is the key word in all of this, and you are truly educators, in the best meaning of that term. You have a most important role to play in this matter of public education, of telling the people what the outdoors is all about, and what can and must be done to make the outdoors better and more available for the people. You are the most important partners a public land administrator can have in spreading the word to the public.

You have challenged me to come and lay the cards on the table for you. I have tried to do that in this short space of time. I haven't had to go into great detail, for you know the score. But now I want to challenge you.

You are important communicators to millions of people, some of them expert and quite well informed, but more of them inexperienced and unacquainted with the National Forests, what they are and why they are. These people need to know about these public lands, about our programs for them, and our plans, for these lands belong to the people, and we are their servants.

Some of you, I know, are doing a good job in this already. Virgil Bachelor has done an excellent job of telling the people about our programs in southern Illinois. Ace Extrom, in his outstanding Illinois Wildlife paper, publishes Virgil, and otherwise helps to educate his readers about the conservation problems and programs in this State. I could give other examples, but I have gone on about long enough.

We are grateful to all of you for helping to educate your readers. The people should know what is available for them in terms of good outdoor recreation. But they also need to know of the serious problems that exist, and how these problems might be met and overcome. If we public land administrators tried to tell them, even if we had your skills in communication, we would be propagandizers, and so would be less effectual. That is not the case with you outdoor communicators.

I look upon you as the eyes, ears, and voices of the people when it comes to outdoor resources. You are the main source of information concerning outdoor resources for millions of people. They rely on you to give them the scoop. You know how to give it to them.

You likewise reflect the wishes and interests of these people we call the public. This is why it is important for someone like myself to maintain a liaison with you. You can help me become a better servant of the people.

That's why I was so pleased to receive this invitation to speak to you. As a public administrator of some of the most important public lands in your zone of influence, I have the responsibility of giving good stewardship to these lands that belong to all the people. Your responsibility as outdoor communicators, as the main source of information for so many of these people, is to keep them well informed, to educate them, and to alert them to the problems associated with conservation of natural resources.

I urge you to make yourselves, and this your organization, the best possible safeguard of the public trust that has been placed in you. That is the way I look upon my job too. Working together we can bring the many others along with us, save and improve our environment, and utilize these natural resources wisely and well. Our very survival dictates that we do no less.

PREPAREDNESS: THE PATH TO
PEACE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an in-depth article exploring the causes and dangers of the present isolationist and "antipreparedness" attitude in the United States was published in *New Guard* magazine for March 1971.

The article was written by Anthony Harrigan, a South Carolinian who is at present executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, headquartered in Nashville, Tenn. In this well-written magazine feature Mr. Harrigan deals to a great extent with the change in the "American spirit" and the resulting lack of will among our people to remain in the world arena and influence history-shaping events.

Mr. President, the article deserves the attention of Congress and the Nation. It offers an enlightenment of current events seldom presented in the Nation's press. I ask unanimous consent that the report, entitled "Preparedness: The Path to Peace," be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

PREPAREDNESS: THE PATH TO PEACE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

In the last decade the American people have been witnesses to a shocking reduction in their national power. Whereas throughout the 1950's the United States was the dominant country in the world, possessed of a military posture second to none, American power in the 1960's ebbed rapidly. News accounts bring word of continuing cutbacks in the Navy, reductions in nuclear armaments, and closing of bases around the world. The antipreparedness chorus grows louder in the Congress, Universities and the media.

One asks "What has happened? Why are the American people allowing their national power to be eroded in a time of tremendous danger? While the United States takes warships out of commission, the Soviet Union presses ahead with construction of the most heavily armed blue-water fleet in history. As the United States departs from bases essential to an orderly, Western-oriented world, the Soviets obtain base rights in India and the Indian Ocean, in North Africa and in the Arabian Sea. Soviet warships cruise in the Caribbean, once virtually an American lake. In the vital area of nuclear armaments, the United States has lost the lead that gave this nation peace and security for almost a quarter century. Last year, the Soviet Union passed the U.S. in terms of missile launchers and in total megatonnage in the Mediterranean. U.S. vessels built to fight Japan provide a rusty line of defense against modern Soviet warships with superb surface-to-surface rockets. Valuable potential allies such as the South Africans are denied weapons and defense information.

The effects of this alarming change in the balance of strategic power will be enormous. Unless the United States moves promptly to rebuild its conventional armed forces and its nuclear deterrent, the U.S. will be extremely vulnerable to Soviet nuclear blackmail. The U.S. will have lost much of its capacity to influence events around the world or to intervene on the side of freedom. Smaller nations in the Western orbit will feel the need

of making an accommodation with the Soviet superpower. The credibility of American strength will vanish.

The total significance of the erosion of America's might is what thoughtful citizens must seek to understand. Ships, planes, and missiles are *instrumentalities of national purpose*. The history of U.S. might is a history of the dynamics of the American republic—an index to the goals and survival instinct of the American people. If the American people are unwilling to provide adequately for their own defense, it is evident that their survival instinct has been impaired.

To find the root cause of the current neglect of America's defenses, we have to look beyond the political figures who champion selective pacifism. We have to explore what lies behind the "peacenik" slogans and the rhetoric of those who bitterly condemn the "military-industrial complex" while ignoring the Soviet Union's colossal military build-up. Educated men and women have to consider what has been done to the American spirit in recent years.

A CHANGING SPIRIT

Transformation of this spirit has made possible the defeatism—almost the death-wish—that lies behind the desire of influential sectors of the American intelligentsia for the defeat and humiliation of the United States. This desire is manifested in books, articles and speeches.

The fatalistic acceptance of and eagerness for retreat and defeat—for a second class power status for the United States—is unprecedented for a nation that still is—in terms of total economic power—the strongest nation on earth. It suggests spiritual sickness within, a wish fulfillment in the direction of the surrender of our civilization and its value system. Searching for arguments on behalf of Western withdrawal became characteristic of a considerable segment of the American intelligentsia in the mid and late 1960's. Yet no reason exists for the United States to become a second-rate power or to kowtow to the Soviet Union. No reason, that is, except for aberrant ways in which Americans have been led to think about the realities of conflict and national power.

In the past, Americans proceeded on the assumption that seeking to win is a normal human desire. But in recent years many Americans have been persuaded to ignore the structure of human reality and to think of non-conflict resolution have been wildly successful. They have caused many Americans to downplay their country's vital interests, to ignore the lessons of history, to place trust in routine international dialogue rather than defense. In short, many people have rejected reality, as evidenced by the anarchistic furor on the campuses and the demands for instant U.S. surrender in Southeast Asia. Having come to accept that we must not resist communism because conflict—resistance—is morally wrong and futile, the American New Left and its fellow-travelers (among whom the anti-preparedness elements must be counted) there is in existence today a shocking passivity in the face of the Soviet thrust for total power.

The need, of course, is for Americans—and the dominant intellectual elements especially—to rediscover the fundamentals of history and human behavior, to appreciate anew the realities of conflict between nations and systems of government. Instead of viewing conflict as a disease, we need to search history and discover how man's character finds its manifestation and definition in struggle. No one understood this better than the ancient Greeks, the fathers of Western civilization. It would be good for the present generation of Americans to reread that great passage in *The Peloponnesian War* by Thucydides in which a Corinthian describes

the character of the Athenians and contrasts it with that of the Lacedaemonians. "They are adventurous beyond their power," said the speaker, "and daring beyond their judgment, and in danger they are sanguine; your wont is to attempt less than is justified by your power, to mistrust even what is sanctioned by your judgment, and to fancy that from danger there is no release . . . Their bodies they spend ungrudgingly in their country's cause; their intellect they jealously husband to be employed in her service. A scheme unexecuted is with them a positive loss, a successful enterprise a comparative failure."

The picture recorded by Thucydides is a picture of a people who found strength, health and greatness through a commitment to vital conflict for a worthy end. Such people, said Thucydides, take no rest themselves and give none to others. It is, tragically a picture of the ideal human condition that is little appreciated in the West in the eighth decade of the 20th century, although heretofore one which has been part of the way Americans did things. Having been led to believe that conflict is morally wrong, we adopt the passivity that stems from this outlook. From passivity our civilization moves to supineness, which is reflected in the unwillingness to seek victory in warfare, merely accommodation, and in the acceptance of loss of lands leading to a second-class and therefore dependent status in the world.

THE NATURE OF BEING

The evidence is that in the order of nature everything dies which does not have a passion for life expressed in challenge and struggle. This truth is often suppressed in our time, but the lessons of history clearly illuminate it. We know, for example, that the chief authors of civilization have been the people who were motivated by the spirit of advance beyond their national borders. We have only to examine the history of the Romans, English, Portuguese and other peoples to bear the witness to this truth.

Nations and people always have been divided into the pacific and the bellicose. In the past some of the pacific peoples have found it possible to remain outside of the sphere of international conflict. Witness the long era of peace in Scandinavia in which several countries in that region have been able to avoid wartime commitments. Or take the case of Switzerland, insulated in its neutrality.

But avoidance of commitment and conflict will be virtually impossible in the future as the clash sharpens between the advanced and the proletarian nations, the haves and the have-nots, the West and the East. Why should the Communist powers, for instance, allow Scandinavia to sit out another general war in Europe, if this should take place? Scandinavia would be a far greater prize for the Soviet Union than the countries of Iberia, which are lacking in resources and national wealth. It appears that would-be neutralists can remain out of the conflicts of the age only by submission that amounts to conquest. To think otherwise is to ignore the nature of the Communist enemy. As to what that nature is, one may refer to the very accurate statement of Czeglér Istvan writing in *Carib*. He said that "the mythical salamander of the ancients was said to live in fire. The very real Communist of today lives and breathes the fire of conflict. Virtually every facet of his doctrine directly or indirectly moulds and prepares for an existence that is unending conflict. It is an existence alien to the non-Communist."

In the last analysis Western defense depends on the degree to which we can bring our public philosophy to the point where it is in accord with the realities of struggle. This philosophy for our times necessarily will not be simple, for Western man is full of contradictions and contrasts; indeed, this

is one source of his vitality and ability to deal with complex situations. Henri Brugmans, rector of the College of Europe, has explained this aspect of Western man in this manner:

"Western society, unlike Pharonic society, for example, is not woven to a uniform pattern; it is full of elements of differentiation, even of internal contradictions. And the great periods of Western culture were never those of majestic balance comparable to that found in the ancient Egyptian civilization: on the contrary, they were 'full of noise and clamour,' conflicts and explosions."

In other words, ours is a restless civilization, in deep conflict with itself on a number of points, of which the very idea of conflict in life is one.

AN ESSENTIAL COMBATIVENESS

The question now is, what is the essential mode of life for people in the Western nations when they face grave danger from the aggressive East? This writer believes that the present style of life, which emphasizes non-combativeness, non-resistance and disinterest in national sovereignty and defense, will not make possible the kind of tomorrow that Western man wants. In an excess of generosity and social tolerance the Western countries have allowed anarchist influences to spread in their midst. Witness the anti-war protest marches in the U.S. and the outbreaks of rioting. America has found itself almost helpless to prevent social chaos in vast cities and in Universities. In order to restore order and regain a stronger position around the world, the U.S. needs a transformation in its style of life. In the West since the end of World War II, now 25 years past, we have looked to the infinite progress of man as a peaceable creature—and we have found no peace. We have been enormously tolerant of disorder and lawlessness, and various forms of anarchism have spread steadily. We have sought to emancipate new nations and lead them into a worthy independence, and many of these new states have turned to hatred of the West.

Many Americans have thought that we were through with the combative age; but as Henri Brugmans wisely observed, "In history everything remains to be done again." In this statement is embedded an idea that shocks the sensibilities of many moderns who scorn the possibility that man may have to retrace his steps in history, instead of progressing onward and upward. Contemporary liberalism is of the view that the process of history is a spiral, but this is not necessarily true. Indeed the bulk of evidence supports the contention that the round of life begins anew with each individual and each generation. Each man's fight for freedom has to start at the same point. A nation's security, moreover, is never permanently won because the world is permanently in convulsion. The cycles of birth and death are the parameters of all societies. And at each step along the path of life, for individuals, nations and civilizations, conflict must take place, or death will result.

It is well for Americans to see the world as a battlefield, exploding as it changes. Indeed, we should never forget that struggle is the steady companion of change and growth in life, the inescapable parallel to the innovations of civilized communities and the producer of inequalities that stir envy, hatred and resentment.

A PERMANENT REALITY

In the 1960's we were so busy constructing utopias and planning for what we wish would be the pattern of life that we have closed our eyes to the realities of what is, which must be acknowledged even though they may be grim and brutal. Too many young adults have been persuaded by some of their terrified elders that it is better to accept national destruction than to struggle with the

terms of nuclear conflict. Prominent churchmen have adopted a basically Hindu concept of non-violence, though Christ drove the money-changer from the temple in Jerusalem and though the Old Testament is an account of a people in permanent conflict for their faith. The presence of nuclear power did not change the nature of man, which is to say that it will not appreciably affect the conduct of nations.

We must be prepared in mind and spirit to overcome the rigors of a brutalized world in which the softer features of civilized life have been shunted aside. For too long we have cherished myths of peace and community and co-existence when the reality of life is struggle. It is the truth which must be brought to the fore in the U.S., for the truth is our shield in a war to the death with the totalitarianism of the East.

The United States in its comparatively short history has evolved into an immense powerhouse from which flow pulses of invention, idealism, exploration, economic development and international responsibility—all inspired by the tremendous energy of an American population that has its ancestral roots in many ancient nations and peoples.

Americans, while tied to several continents, are special heirs of 25 centuries of Europeanism. The least static of all human societies, the United States represents what Geoffrey Barraclough, writing in *The Observer* (London) has described as "the thrustfulness of Western civilization." The U.S. is the focal point of the Western world. If the traditions of the West survive into the 21st century, it undoubtedly will be because of the U.S. which has had the energy to respond to challenge. If they don't survive, it is in good part because Americans failed.

For these values to survive, however, it is imperative that Americans arrest the decline in U.S. military strength and acquire the arms essential to defense in the mid and late 1970's and 1980's. The American people can't afford to be outgunned by the enemies of Western civilization and freedom. Certainly, our people don't want to go the way of Carthage in the classical world. But if they want to avoid the fate of Carthage they must reject the counsels of the Left intellectuals who are sounding the trumpets of retreat. They must recognize, as Shiam Lal, the Indian writer has said, "Any nation that goes to sleep cannot last long."

If the American people are awake, they will insist that the U.S. armed forces be provided with all the tools of defense—the nuclear navy, missiles and conventional forces—that spell the difference between national life and death.

INDIA, WORLD'S LARGEST DEMOCRACY, GOES TO THE POLLS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Monday, the people of India, the world's largest democracy, began going to the polls in a national election which will take 10 days to complete.

On the outcome of this election may hinge the future of India and its political system.

Most of the former colonial possessions began their independence as democratic states, but soon were forced to adopt other governmental forms.

In 1947, India was the first of the colonies to become independent and by

far the largest, with a total electorate now of some 275 million.

Through the years it has maintained its democracy despite problems of poverty, communalism, lack of education, and lack of discipline. In doing so India often has surprised Western observers who have predicted her fall to communism or some other form of authoritarian regime.

To date, India has confounded those predictions—but once again has entered troubled political waters. If the elections prove to be inconclusive, a period of renewed instability could ensue and the result might be an end to democracy.

That and other aspects of the Indian elections were explored in an article which appeared in the *Milwaukee Journal* on Sunday, February 27. It is by Sundar Rajan, an editorial writer for the *Times of India*.

Because of the light which the article throws on a most important political event, one which could have consequences for the United States, I am inserting it in the *RECORD* at this point and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

WORLD'S BIGGEST ELECTION TESTS MRS.

GANDHI'S INDIA

(By Sundar Rajan)

NEW DELHI, INDIA.—The current general election in India ordered by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi a year ahead of schedule is considered most crucial for the country's democratic structure. The 10-day poll which begins Monday, may decide whether India with its 560 million people is to continue as the world's most populous democracy or become a totalitarian state. If no party gets a decisive majority in the 523 member Parliament, there may be a prolonged period of instability, making a leftist takeover or an army coup highly probable.

The main theme of Mrs. Gandhi's election speeches—on a single day she made 25 of them—is that the nation needs a strong and stable federal administration to keep the economy going and to put down the divisive forces which have gathered strength since the death in 1964 of her distinguished father, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.

India's political structure, once the envy of the Afro-Asian world, has become perilously weak in the last 18 months.

IMPACT OF PARTY SPLIT

The problems posed by language fanatics, tribal separatists, Communist insurgents and campus extremists have been rendered almost unmanageable by the split in the Congress Party which had dominated India as a united group since independence in 1947.

Ironically, the rift in Nehru's party was brought about by his own daughter, Mrs. Gandhi has justified the break with the old conservatives of the party as being in the best interests of the country and "in keeping with the changing mood of our people."

Calling them "reactionaries" and "stumbling blocks to progress along Socialist lines," she dismissed top politicians like Morarji Desai, Kumaraswami Kamaraj and Sridayanahalli Nijalingappa from the party.

This reduced the strength of her party in Parliament to 222 from 285 and turned her government into a minority one. But Communist and other left wing elements rallied to her support.

The 68 year old Kamaraj, a former chairman of the undivided party and a close confidant of Jawaharlal Nehru, repeatedly taunted Mrs. Gandhi for "hobnobbing" with the Communists.

Sald Desai, a 75 year old conservative, "Mrs. Gandhi has not only demolished the party

built by her own father but has deliberately invited Communist infiltration into the administration for the sake of continuing as prime minister."

One of the prime minister's women opponents, Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani, says that since the split "thousands of Communists and fellow travelers have got into Mrs. Gandhi's faction."

Mrs. Gandhi has denied that she is a Communist sympathizer. Officials close to her say, in fact, that one of her objects in ordering a midterm election is to win an absolute majority for her faction in Parliament so that she can fully dispense with outside support, particularly that of the Communists.

Nearly a dozen major parties are contesting the elections. These include the two Congress factions, the Hindu Jan Sangh (People's League), the conservative Freedom Party, the United Socialist Party and the pro-Moscow and pro-Peking wings of the Communist Party.

Mrs. Gandhi's erstwhile colleagues in the Congress Party have formed what has been called a "grand alliance" with the People's League, the Freedom Party and the Socialists.

"Our aim is to throw Mrs. Gandhi out of the administration and form a truly national government representing the various non-Communist parties," says Kamaraj. He believes that the "grand alliance" will be able to get an absolute majority in Parliament.

On the contrary, Mrs. Gandhi has been telling vast rural audiences that "the reactionaries will be trounced and will never be able to raise their heads again."

The contending parties are using every available means to woo the vast electorate of 275 million adults which is almost equal to the combined population of United States, Canada and Great Britain.

Since more than 60% of the voters are illiterate and there is no TV outside the national capital, novel methods have been adopted to carry the party messages to them.

In Rajasthan State in western India the former maharajas (princes) who are fighting Mr. Gandhi have financed hundreds of music groups. They go from village to village singing the praise of the government's opponents.

Some election posters in Bihar State show Mrs. Gandhi as a Hindu goddess showering gifts on poor peasants.

But not all is fun and games. There has been more violence in India in the last two years than at any time since the country got its freedom from British rule in 1947.

"THOROUGHLY MODERN MRS."

Vinoba Bhave, one of the few surviving colleagues of Mohandas Gandhi, the father of Indian independence, said recently: "We attained freedom from colonialism through nonviolence but things have come to a stage where one wonders whether we are not glorifying violence."

Many Indian leaders draw comfort from the fact that a sister democracy like the United States is also rocked by violence and unrest. Mrs. Gandhi reportedly told a gathering of newspaper editors in Bombay that there is more violence in the US than in her own country and that New York is a more dangerous place than Calcutta.

Violence is a major issue in the current election in which some 3,000 candidates are contesting the 523 Parliament seats. Mrs. Gandhi says that her party alone is in a position to crush extremists of various hues ranging from Bengali Maoists to religious zealots who were responsible for the massacre of hundreds of Moslems in the city of Ahmedabad.

The Indian prime minister's biggest asset is her modern outlook. Educated in the best schools in Europe and India, she is completely free from religious bias. Much against the wishes of orthodox Hindus, she married a Parsi.

Though a northerner speaking Hindi, she has stoutly resisted pressures from her fol-

lowers to impose the language on the non-Hindi South. This has prevented a Quebec-type secessionist movement from gathering momentum in Madras State where at one stage separatists had designed their own "national" flag.

GREAT WAVE OF STRIKES

United Socialist Party boss Madhu Limaye, an excellent parliamentarian, has charged Mrs. Gandhi with trying to placate Moslem rightwing organizations in an attempt to secure support from the 60 million strong minority community.

The rapid growth of Indian fascism is also attributed to the weakness of the Gandhi administration. The city government in Bombay is now controlled by 43-year-old Bal Thackeray's Shiva Sena (Shiva's Army).

A self-confessed admirer of Adolf Hitler, Thackeray believes in a mixture of militant Hindu revivalism, anti-Communism and what one columnist calls "selective modernism."

To demonstrate the power of his organization, the fascist leader recently ordered his 20,000-strong volunteer force to take over Bombay for three days. Forty citizens were killed in riots and the government was forced to open negotiations with Thackeray.

Mrs. Gandhi's regime has also been marked by an unending series of strikes which have affected every segment of the population from teachers and steel workers to milkmen and hotel boys.

On a single recent day New Delhi newspapers reported 43 strikes in various states. Over 300,000 citizens courted arrest in the State of Assam in a week of protest against the government's delay in sanctioning a new oil refinery.

Observers feel that in course of time the government may be able to contain religious hate groups and militant trade unions. But they are doubtful about the democratic prospects in West Bengal State which has become a major stronghold of Maoism.

So far, more than 600 citizens have been murdered by the Bengali Maoists. In Calcutta, a seething metropolis of over six million people, a hand-made bomb or grenade can be bought for as low as ten cents.

Police have rounded up nearly 7,000 young Maoists in West Bengal but not a day passes without its quota of murders and bombings.

ARMY AT BENGAL POLLS

Polling in West Bengal is being organized with the help of the army. This is the first time since independence that the army has been called in to do such a job.

Since elections are also being held for the state legislature, one big question is whether pro-Peking groups like the Marxist Communist Party will capture the West Bengal administration.

Mrs. Gandhi's chances of remaining prime minister of India after the current elections are rated high by many observers but this will depend on how good her majority is.

If her party scrapes through with only a thin majority, there is every likelihood of a power struggle. In that case, either Finance Minister Yeshwantrao Chavan or Defense Minister Jagjivan Ram is likely to make a bid for the premiership.

An era of coalitions will become inevitable. But the experience of many state governments since the 1967 election has shown how unstable coalitions can be. The state of Bihar alone has had six governments in four years.

If this happens in the federal Parliament the unity of India will be in jeopardy. Some of the restive areas like West Bengal, Madras and Kerala may revolt against the central government. There is also the ever-present danger of Chinese Communist intervention in the northern areas.

Many Indians are increasingly concerned over the possibility of religious hate groups like the Jan Sangh, as well as the Communists, getting a foothold in the federal government.

If the "grand alliance" wins a majority in the elections, the Jan Sangh will have to be accommodated in the federal cabinet. The Sangh's main plank is that all the people of India should be "Indianized"—which in effects means that Moslems, Christians, Sikhs, Parsis and other national minorities should accept the dominance of Hinduism. India will then cease to be a secular state.

Some Sangh leaders even want the 60 million Moslems to be sent away to neighboring Moslem Pakistan.

FOES LACK A PROGRAM

The basic weakness of the opposition parties is that they have no economic program worth the name.

According to one survey, nearly 30 percent of Indian peasants do not even earn 20 cents a day. The number of unemployed has crossed the 17 million mark. The 20 million people who live in urban slums are clamoring for such basic needs as drinking water.

Mrs. Gandhi told her election rallies that the choice before India is "democratic Socialism achieved through peaceful and constitutional means, or else a violent revolution."

This sort of talk has helped to depict her in the eyes of the average Indian as a dynamic politician determined to sweep away the cobwebs of the past.

THE PRISONER OF WAR ISSUE

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that students at the Martin Kellogg Junior High School have begun a program to help secure the release of our POW's in North Vietnam.

These students are to be complimented for their humanitarian concern and for their efforts to secure an early release of these prisoners.

For the benefit of my colleagues and the readers of this RECORD I will insert a copy of a news story describing their efforts.

I think that all Americans can draw inspiration from these activities.

The article follows:

NEWINGTON TO HANOI—RELEASE OUR POW'S

NEWINGTON.—A letter-writing campaign has been launched by pupils at the Martin Kellogg Junior High School to hopefully speed the release of American prisoners of war and secure better treatment for them while they are held captive in North Vietnam.

Spearheading the drive was an editorial by eighth grader Susan Hildreth, editor of the Kellogg Crier, the school newspaper.

She indicated that "something has to be done about this whole business." Later she added, that "we as kids growing up in America have a responsibility to do something about this whole situation."

She said that although she does not know anyone personally who is being held by the North Vietnamese, that Air Force Maj. Crosley Pitton Jr. of Newington is believed to be a prisoner.

Susan said she did not know if letter-writing would secure early release or better treatment for the men. "Maybe if we all keep writing letters, the North Vietnamese will get tired of reading them and do something."

"Even if they only release two or three men, it would still be better than nothing."

She indicated that Newington seems to be backing the letter writing campaign. "Both my parents have written to North Vietnam and so have all my neighbors," said Susan, a resident of Stuart Street.

She said that the letters written by the students would be assembled by the Kellogg Crier staff later this week.

"Then we will hold a bake sale to raise the money for postage," Susan said.

Each letter to North Vietnam costs 25 cents.

In her editorial, she said that several points should be mentioned in the letter, which should be addressed to the "Office of the President, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam."

The points include the need for: Prompt identification of the prisoners. Adequate diet and medical care.

Communication with other prisoners and families at home.

Prompt return to the U.S. of seriously sick or wounded.

Protection from reprisals.

Free access to prisoners and their place of detention by a neutral party such as the International Committee of the Red Cross.

In conclusion Susan added, "It took me 10 minutes to copy this letter form. Can you spare 10 minutes of your time for a man who has wasted two years of his life in a prisoner of war camp? Please help us get our men back where they belong—at home with their families."

R. L. LAWRENCE, JR. RETIRES

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, February 25, 1971, Mr. Robert L. Lawrence, Jr., director of the Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County Tennessee waterworks, retired after 46 years of service.

Mr. Lawrence began his service with the old Nashville waterworks commencing back in 1925. Some 6 years later, under former mayor Hilary House, Mr. Lawrence was named director of the utility, a position he maintained until his announced retirement last week.

During his nearly five decades of service Mr. Lawrence held the reigns of leadership over a department that was to evolve from a city facility to a major metropolitan service for a community of nearly a million persons.

Over this span of time Mr. Lawrence served with competence under four mayors, the most recent of whom, Mayor Beverly Briley, said of Mr. Lawrence upon announcement of his retirement:

Bob Lawrence has made an outstanding contribution to the City of Nashville, Metropolitan Government and to this community since 1925. During his dedicated service we have seen Nashville develop from a small city to a major metropolitan center. The efforts of Bob Lawrence and his dedication to the job have contributed greatly to the development.

Mr. Lawrence and his family are familiar names throughout the Midsouth region for their contributions to our community. One of their sons, Comdr. William Porter Lawrence, has been held cap-

tive of the North Vietnamese since June 1967.

Mr. Speaker, a grateful and appreciative community extends its thanks to Mr. Lawrence for his fine service. An editorial commending Mr. Lawrence appeared in the February 26, 1971 edition of the Nashville Banner and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

I include the article as follows:

"MISTER WATERWORKS," R. L. LAWRENCE, RETIRES

(By Dick Battle)

Robert L. Lawrence, Jr., Nashville's nationally recognized "Mister Waterworks," today announced his retirement after 46 years of service, nearly 40 of them as a utility executive.

The mayor said "two or three persons" are now under consideration as successors to Lawrence, but no decision "has been made at this time." Two men directly under the director are K. R. Harrington, assistant director for sewerage services, and W. F. Brock, Jr., assistant director for water services.

Mayor Beverly Briley, presenting Lawrence with an engraved plaque in recognition of his service to the community, said, "Bob Lawrence has made an outstanding contribution to the City of Nashville, Metropolitan Government and to this community since 1925. During his dedicated service . . . we have seen Nashville develop from a small city to a major metropolitan center. The efforts of Bob Lawrence and his dedication to the job have contributed greatly to the development."

Lawrence said he had "concluded that in as much as I have served the people of our fine community for almost 46 years, nearly 40 years of which have been as the responsible administrative head of these vital services, in fairness to myself and my family, I should seek retirement."

He began his service with the former City of Nashville in 1925 as a young engineer not long after graduating from the Vanderbilt University of Engineering. During his college years he was a star lineman for the Vanderbilt football team playing center on the university's winning teams of the early 1920s.

In 1932 he was named by Mayor Hilary House as director of waterworks. As director of the utility he gained national recognition for the efficiency and administration of the system and in 1963 with the advent of Metropolitan Government he became the director of water and sewerage services for Metropolitan Government.

Lawrence, thanking Mayor Briley for his cooperation and for the praise and recognition given him, said, "Although you have graciously assured me . . . that I could say on as long as I desired" he had decided to seek retirement.

Recalling his long service under four mayors, he added "any contributions that I have made are well known to our citizenry and have been rewarding to me personally. My association with you (Briley) for the past eight years has been most cordial, been most understanding and cooperative."

PROGRESS MADE

Referring to progress made during the four decades of his administrative tenure, Lawrence said, "We have a fine water system which is, as you know, nationally recognized; and we have made great strides in setting up a gatic sewerage program which has provided sewers to over 21,000 pieces of property which had remained unsewered for many years."

Lawrence told Briley, "You may rightfully claim a large measure of credit in sponsoring this project which has made such a consider-

able contribution to the economy and health of our community."

He said he was "leaving the department in a sound condition and with sound policies for my successors. I wish, also," he added, "to pay tribute to the many fine employees with whom I have worked throughout these many years. I have also enjoyed my association with many council members and heads of other departments."

Lawrence was honored in 1969 as "Water Utility Man of the Year" in the Kentucky-Tennessee section of the American Waterworks Association, and in 1968 won the coveted Fuller Award for "distinguished service in the water supply field" bestowed by the American Waterworks Association.

Concluding the brief ceremony in his office Mayor Briley commented on Lawrence. "He has done a remarkable job for our community. He should not retire without this city giving him every honor possible because of his achievement and forethought in the development of this community."

MISTER WATERWORKS

Robert L. Lawrence, Jr., retiring after nearly half a century of invaluable service to this Metropolitan community, has exemplified the highest ideals and the highest standards grateful citizens could expect of their public servants.

An engineer of nationally recognized professional ability, he has developed and maintained a water service utility for the people of Nashville and Davidson County that has been a major factor in its development, progress, and the preservation and improvement of public health.

Since 1963 he has headed and directed the combined public utility of water and sewerage services. Under his direction there has been a tremendous expansion of both water and sanitary sewer services.

His untiring devotion to the high ideals and standards of public service he has set for himself, for his department, and for the people who have worked with him and under his direction, has won for him the deep respect, affection and high regard of the people he has served since 1925.

Bob Lawrence, "Mister Waterworks" himself, has earned the right to rest on well deserved laurels and relax a little from the stress and strain of high administrative responsibility.

His professional skill and integrity, his wise direction and vigorous attention to the job of building for his community the best utility service possible mark a goal and a degree of excellence his successors must strive to reach and maintain.

The Nashville Banner joins Mayor Beverly Briley and a grateful citizenry in recognition of the fine and rewarding contribution of one of the real giants of public service.

Thanks, Bob Lawrence, for work well done. We will not forget you or your work for the welfare, progress, and good health of this community.

A WORTHWHILE PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, an ambitious and worthwhile program for improving the environment has recently come to my attention. The Adolph Coors Co. of Golden, Colo., has for the last year been engaged in a program aimed at the

recycling of aluminum containers, and plans such a program for its glass containers. The program illustrates that an environmentally beneficial plan can achieve positive results in the area of solid waste and litter.

It is undeniable that the public is rewarded by efforts aimed to relieve our environment of the ponderous solid wastes of 200 million avid consumers. In this case, it is important to note that a well-designed program can be mutually beneficial. Industry has everything to gain from good ecology.

The distinction between goods and service industry is an artificial one on a crowded continent. Those whose factories merely spit out goods and wastes from a diminishing stockpile of resources are a disservice to society if they feel they are relieved of all responsibility when the product is sold. Products in "disposable" containers inevitably result in trash. It is pointless to pretend that this trash is totally the responsibility of the consumer.

I commend Coors for their forward-thinking efforts aimed at providing not only the goods, but the vital service of facilitating the reuse of the byproduct of this use, and I offer my colleagues Coors' statement of their program.

ADOLPH COORS Co.,
Golden, Colo., January 12, 1971.

Hon. JEROME R. WALDIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: A year ago I wrote all legislators in Adolph Coors Company's 11-state marketing area to advise that our company was embarking upon a cash-for-cans aluminum recovery program. We did that because this company and its distributors are solemnly committed to fight litter and solid waste in order to help keep America the kind of place we all want it to be. In light of that commitment, I believe you will be interested to know these things:

Public response to the cash-for-cans program has vastly exceeded our expectations. During the first 11 months of 1970, our 166 distributors received 5,218,463 pounds of aluminum or more than 120-million cans. We paid the organizations and individuals who picked up that aluminum \$521,846 for doing so. The program is not restricted to Coors cans . . . we pay for all aluminum containers, of whatever brand. Literally hundreds if not thousands of youth, civic and service organizations are cooperating with this program; they use the dime-a-pound proceeds for worthwhile community causes of all kinds.

As you can image, our cash-for-cans program did not always meet with immediate public enthusiasm in our various marketing areas. Getting people concerned and involved has been the major Adolph Coors Company management effort during 1970, and in some cases it has been a long, uphill fight. In areas where the community has gotten behind the effort, we are showing returns of over 60% of our cans. Since our studies indicate that not more than one percent of our cans actually end up as litter and that fully 99% of the users of our product dispose of the empty can properly, a 60% return not only all but eliminates the litter but makes an appreciable dent in the solids waste aspects as well.

Litter has been defined as the visible portion of the solids waste iceberg. Although unsightly and repugnant, litter is but a small

fraction of the real, long-range environmental problem of solids waste disposal. We are confident that in the long run recycling of aluminum containers will be a more satisfactory answer than returnable glass bottles in minimizing solids waste. For example, both Pepsi Cola and Coca Cola report that they only average 90% return on returnable soft-drink bottles which are sold for home consumption. In densely populated urban areas, the rate of return drops as low as 75%. One thousand returnable bottles weigh about 750 pounds. At 90% return, each 1,000 bottles sold adds 75 pounds of glass to litter and solids wastes. One thousand aluminum cans weigh only 40 pounds. With no salvage at all the aluminum cans would comprise only about half the weight of solids waste that returnable bottles do. Yet we are confident of reaching a minimum 75% recycle level given the time to do so.

Although we regard litter as the pressing and immediate problem and our initial efforts with the cash-for-cans program have mainly been directed at correcting litter, we view the impending and ominous matter of solids waste and its disposal as the real and serious long-range environmental challenge. Thus, we regard aluminum can salvage and recycle as a permanent part of our overall operation. Of all of our management objectives it has the top priority. Our hope is that we will be allowed sufficient time to make it work. Our success to date exceeds our fondest hopes although we regard it as just a start.

Adolph Coors Company and its distributors will intensify their efforts to make the cash-for-cans program even more successful in 1971. We anticipate that far more aluminum will be recovered for recycling. More and more companies are turning to aluminum packaging because they realize its environmental value. Further, in 1971 our company will discontinue use of the tall tinplate can replacing it with an aluminum can of our own manufacture. When that changeover is complete, all canned beer marketed by Coors will be in aluminum cans.

A new and important program at Adolph Coors Company will provide for the salvage and reuse or recycle of our convenience bottles which have heretofore been nonreturnable. All such bottles will soon have a redemption value of one cent each. The majority of these will be suitable for reuse. Those that are not will be returned as cullet to a glass factory located a few miles from our brewery in Golden and melted up to be made into new bottles—that is—recycled. Glass like aluminum can be infinitely recycled.

Thus with the completion of our 1971 changeover on the tall can from tinplate to aluminum and the immediate adoption of a complete system of returnable bottles, every Coors can and bottle will have a cash return value. Both plans will be in effect throughout our entire marketing area . . . Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah and Wyoming.

One other thing. A top management committee at our company now is meeting regularly to determine how we can recycle everything that Adolph Coors Company uses . . . not only aluminum and glass but also wood, paper and the rest. We have found some answers; we are seeking a total answer. This effort also has top management priority.

Our company is totally dedicated to the business of keeping this nation clean and inviting. We share and appreciate your concern with this vital problem. You have my personal pledge that Adolph Coors Company will be an outstanding leader in the preservation of a quality environment for America.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM K. COORS,
Chairman of the Board.

SPACE EXPENDITURES

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter written by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Esther H. Dawkins, of Detroit. The letter is one of several I received from constituents concerned with huge Government expenditures for the space effort. Questioned is the necessity of this type of Government spending in view of vital domestic needs and challenges facing our population on earth.

I include the letter as follows:

DETROIT, MICH.

Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS.

DEAR Mrs. GRIFFITHS: I just had to write this letter. I know you are bogged down with mail, but this one comes with a sincerity of my convictions.

It really is a revolting sight to see this moon landing in almost all of its entirety on TV on every channel except Ch. 50.

The first lunar landing was of much interest to us & the entire world, the second was a duplication & now the third is in triplicate. The same old phraseology "everything looking good." So this has become the same old thing over & over.

Secondly, to see all of the waste of billions of dollars in this project makes one sick at heart to know that it is so much needed here on earth to help stamp out hunger, to clean up pollution, to clothe needy families, to give children a better education, to revitalize the large cities & clean up crime & stop corruption in high places. Also stop making this country nothing but an asphalt jungle. We keep destroying our rural & pastoral beauty day by day & year by year. Everyone has said we have to progress, progress to what? Oblivion. That's just where we are headed for.

Thirdly; we scream bloody murder about pollution and now we are polluting the moon. No wonder the younger generation is disgusted with us. Can't we go any where without polluting everything we touch? To let the universe see the astronauts empty garbage, throw away golf clubs & ball on the moon beside other trash is disgusting. Then to hear of the waste, leaving cameras and other very expensive tools on the moon that costs the taxpayers millions of dollars is a sin. We have conquered the moon we have found out that is not a livable planet so why not let well enough alone. We beat the Russians on the moon & I think that was & is one of the main reasons that we tried this moon landing first.

It reminds me of the people here on earth "Try to out do the Joneses"

Its about time our elected officials stand up to the Pentagon complex.

This is the place that God gave us to inhabit not the planets.

I think if we can get these supposedly brilliant men & women that work in the field of science to come up with a formula to irrigate the deserts & make it a useful place of habitation, to research cleaning up the waters & purify our air & many other things our earth needs, they will be giving us as human beings something to look forward to.

I may not live to see it but America will have a revolution so violent that it will devastate our great country to the point of no return. This is the only country I know since my mothers people (as

slaves) was brought here to Jamestown, Va., in 1672 & my father who was a full blooded Indian was here long before the Mayflower landed. So you can see why I am so concerned.

What prompted me to write this letter to you as my representative in Congress, was listening to the people talking. Since my retirement I started working with our city (Detroit) Police Community Council. Also the Justice League & have did some public speaking so I come in contact with quite a number of people & this was discussed at length. The waste of our monies & the moon probe.

I hope you want throw this letter aside & forget because middle class people are just talking now. But they feel they are being pushed to the brink. You can't stretch a rubber band to the breaking point & expect it not to snap.

With kindest regards,

ESTHER H. DAWKINS.

MAN AND HIS ENVIRONMENT—
SPEECH OF DR. SAMUEL R.
ALDRICH

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have been handed the speech of Dr. Samuel R. Aldrich in his appearance before the Foundation for American Agriculture in Chicago, Ill., on December 2, 1970. The Foundation for American Agriculture meeting was composed of leaders from agriculture and agribusiness throughout the country and addressed their interests at the meeting to problems of the environment. The environment is a matter of grave concern to all of us these days, and Dr. Aldrich's reasoned approach should reassure us that we do not have to add ecology and environment to the areas of our current hysteria. The problems of environment and ecology can be solved, and we are indebted for Dr. Aldrich and others of the Illinois Pollution Control Board for their mature contributions. I am inserting in the RECORD Dr. Aldrich's presentation, so that the Members of the House can read it in its entirety:

MAN AND HIS ENVIRONMENT

(By Samuel R. Aldrich)

Agriculture has a tremendous impact on the environment. The goal of agriculture is, in fact, to manage the environment for the long-term benefit of mankind. This it has done with eminent success.

Decisions to this point in time have been based mainly upon economic considerations. To put it bluntly, if it paid we did it (with minor restrictions for known hazards). Recently a new dimension has been added. Society is insisting that long-term effects on all aspects of the environment be considered in deciding practices to be followed. Society has the right to place certain restrictions on the use and abuse of the environment.

The image of agriculture is poor in the minds of environmentalists. Ecologists generally view farmers, agribusiness, and agricultural scientists as interested only in making a profit and as having little knowledge of or concern for effects on the environment and even human health. Ecologists and social scientists feel that they must, therefore, assume responsibility for saving the environment.

In contrast persons in agriculture perceive themselves as being responsible for producing high quality food at a reasonable price and thus contributing to the welfare of mankind. They view ecologists as idealists without practical knowledge of agriculture, hence capable neither of suggesting acceptable changes nor of foreseeing the disastrous effects of some simple solutions they suggest.

During the past few years when the attitudes of society were being formulated, ecologists and many social scientists were effectively using the news media to mold public opinion. Meanwhile, we in agriculture were mainly going about the business of efficient production. Consequently there is both lack of information and much misinformation about the effects of agriculture.

Every school kid has heard about the pervasive effects of DDT and the claim that nitrogen and phosphorus from fertilizers are destroying streams and lakes. Most everyone has heard of the "concentration of DDT in the food chain". I submit that there is a corollary: "The concentration of unsubstantiated information in the information chain."

We should not blame environmentalists and the media entirely for this state of affairs. We simply have been remiss in analyzing the overall, long-term effects of practices and making them known to scientists in other disciplines and to the public through the news media.

Many persons have been led to believe that science and technology have caused the problems and therefore must be restricted in a wholesale manner. The fact is that, though science and technology in agriculture and elsewhere have created certain environmental problems (along with tremendous benefits), only more science and technology correctly applied can solve the problems!

We are experiencing an unusual phenomenon. A substantial number of people, especially young people, believe that we are on the verge of catastrophe unless we immediately stop many forms of pollution including fertilizers and pesticides. Since a lot of people hold that view, it should not surprise us that some drastic measures to curb pollution are being suggested. Desperate persons are susceptible to radical ideas.

Agriculture and society would benefit from a thorough understanding of the effects, both favorable and unfavorable, of modern agriculture on the environment. But there is a barrier to effective communication. How do you reach persons whose views are already firmly set and who therefore interpret your sincere attempts at objective presentations as merely defending continued use of fertilizers, pesticides, etc., for personal gain?

There are two ways to react to environmentalists whom you believe to be wrong:

(a) Watch for their mistakes and then "slap them down". The trouble with that course is that charges make the front page headlines whereas rebuttals are put on the back pages near the want ads.

(b) Assume they are sincere and thus try to work with them before they have interpreted their data, made up their minds and published their mistakes. This is a more mature and effective course of action.

There are three false impressions about nitrogen that are generally held by environmentalists and widely accepted by the public:

(1) That nitrate in water is increasing at an alarming rate.

(2) That commercial fertilizer is the cause.

(3) That returning to legumes, animal manure, and soil humus for nitrogen would correct the supposed situation.

The nitrate content of the Mississippi River at Chester, Illinois, has not increased over the past ten years. Nitrate in the Illinois and Wabash Rivers appears to have increased slightly since 1956. The Kaskaskia near its confluence with the Mississippi has not in-

creased in nitrate concentration since 1946. This is the river which through an unfortunate error in data summary is the basis for the widely disseminated idea that nitrates tripled between 1946 and 1966. Specific cases of high nitrates and rapid increases in small rivers and streams can be found and undoubtedly nitrogen fertilizer is a contributing cause. There are also instances of decreases in nitrates.

An important problem in charting trends in nitrates in streams is that records are generally of 5-year duration or less. We should continue to be concerned but not generally alarmed about nitrates in water. Research on sources and means for reducing should be supported.

Impressions 2 and 3 are predicated on the belief that nitrogen from fertilizer behaves differently than nitrogen from animal manure, legumes, or soil humus. Regardless of source nearly all of the nitrogen used by crops is in the ammonium (NH₄) form prior to conversion by nitrifying soil organisms to nitrate (NO₃). Nitrate derived from fertilizer is neither more nor less leachable than nitrate from manure, legumes or soil humus.

Equal amounts of nitrate nitrogen are required to produce 100 bushels of corn irrespective of source. The potential then for having excessive nitrate appear at unwanted sites in the environment is determined by the crop yield goal rather than by the supplying source.

The undesirable effects of agricultural technology have been extensively, though not always accurately, nor in proper perspective, analyzed in both popular and scientific literature and through the news media.

The beneficial effects of technology on the environment have not received the attention they deserve! The usual approach in supporting continued use of fertilizers, pesticides and antibiotics is quite logically that they are essential for the production of adequate amounts of high-quality food at a reasonable price. *But I feel that technology properly used is justified because of its positive effects on the environment.*

Data from the Morrow Plots on the campus of the University of Illinois illustrate the effect of different levels of fertility. The plots are nearly a century old hence they are a valid index of long-term effects.

Illinois grows about 10 million acres with intensive use of modern technology. The Morrow Plot data indicate that if only manure, lime and phosphorus were applied in a continuous corn system, 14 million acres would be required. If no fertility treatments were applied the need would increase to 27 million acres.

An alternative cropping system of corn-oats-legume hay with manure, lime, and phosphorus would require 14 million acres to produce usable therms of energy equal to 10 million acres of corn with full treatment (nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, limestone) and 30 million if no fertility treatments were applied.

These are, of course, extreme and unrealistic alternatives, but they illustrate the point that fertility treatments minimize the cropland acres needed for food production. What then would be the effect on the environment of greatly reducing or giving up fertilizers?

It would be a disaster.

Without nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and limestone applications our soil resource could not be preserved and future generations would reap a tragic harvest of famine. Nitrogen is the key to maintaining soil organic matter in intensive cropping systems. Soil organic matter is a key to maintaining surface structure and water infiltration capacity.

The increased acres needed for food production with lower acre yields would increase water runoff, floods and erosion hence, accelerating pollution due to sediment, phosphorus, pesticides, and organic matter. Two

contributing causes would be a) increased acres of cropland and b) more cropland on sloping fields.

Increasing the acres of cropland would further reduce the small areas of woodland, wildlife habitat and recreational land in much of the midwest.

I have used fertilizers to show that technology has a positive effect because it minimizes the acres required for food production. The principle applies to all of agriculture. The fact that one modern dairy cow replaces two of a few generations ago or that a broiler can be grown on little more than one-half as much feed, reduce the undesirable impact of man's demands upon the environment.

There are few if any simple solutions to the control of pollution. In agriculture, as in the ecosystem as a whole or among the facets of a free enterprise economic system, practices are intricately intertwined. Restrictions on the use of science and technology in agriculture must be approached with caution and with broad understanding of the side effects lest the cure be worse than the disease.

Henry Hazlett in his epilogue to "The Art of Thinking", (Nash Publishing Corp. 1969) makes some comments that I feel could well guide anyone who wants to contribute to environmental improvement.

"No man can hope to do original work or even profitable thinking in any science or branch of knowledge until he has gone to the trouble to learn what has already been discovered in that branch of knowledge. He must know the previous state of the question. Then he will see whether he can make any contribution of his own.

When the great Isaac Newton was asked how he had been able to make such tremendous contributions to human knowledge and thought, and to see so much farther than other men, he answered modestly: 'I stood on the shoulders of giants.' In other words, he was able to build on what his predecessors had discovered.

We who live today are in one respect in a more enviable position than any other generation in history. We stand on the shoulders of giants. . . . So an intelligent college student today is in a position to learn more about calculus than Newton, more about economics than Adam Smith, and more about evolution than Darwin", and, may I add, more about the environment than any scientist to this point in time.

I am convinced that concern for the environment will continue to grow but will likely receive less attention from the news media and politicians. Though agriculture is presently a target for criticism, I believe that by choosing the right strategy the interest that has been generated in agricultural practices can be used for the betterment of agriculture and society as a whole.

I have a positive, constructive attitude toward our economic system. It has produced miracles within a framework of limited objectives. I do not feel that it is fair or serves any useful purpose to blame previous generations for blindness, ruthlessness or sheer greed in their use of the environment. They had as many thoughtful, sensitive citizens as we have. But we have the advantage of observing the cumulative effects of our activities over a longer period of time. Consequently we evaluate some practices differently and should act accordingly.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. BROWN of Ohio and I are today intro-

ducing another bill identical to H.R. 3809 and H.R. 4541, the proposed Consumer Protection Act of 1971. The addition of Mr. BAKER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DENT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. KING, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THONE, and Mr. WILLIAMS brings to 30 the number of cosponsors of this proposal. I would like to offer a brief history and explanation of our bill at this time.

Congress over the past several years has become increasingly concerned about effective protection for consumers. Because of this concern, extensive hearings on this subject—and, in particular, about a means by which consumers may have a voice in government—were conducted during the 91st Congress by the Government Operations Committee.

As members of that committee, the gentleman from Ohio and I heard witness after witness testify about the inadequacy of the present organization of activities in the Federal Government to protect consumer interests. We learned that hundreds of consumer-related activities are spread through 33 agencies of the Federal establishment. For example, responsibility for enforcing the Truth-in-Lending Act is vested in nine separate agencies; administration of the Fair Packaging and Labelling Act is divided among three agencies; no less than five Federal agencies are responsible for consumer protection.

Our attention was drawn to conflicts between Federal agencies—the Food and Drug Administration, for instance, may want to license a pesticide the Public Health Service contends is harmful to health—and to the lack of an advocate for the consumer point of view before Federal agencies responsible for setting rates and taking other actions that have a direct effect on consumers.

Our committee determined, and we agreed, that a legislative remedy was necessary. The bill we reported, H.R. 18214, proposed an Office of Consumer Affairs within the Executive Office of the President with statutory authority to coordinate consumer activities and to assure that consumer interests are considered in formulating Federal policy. Additionally, it proposed an independent Consumer Protection Agency, its primary purpose being to represent the interests of consumers in proceedings before Federal agencies and in the courts. A tie vote by the Rules Committee, as you know, prevented that bill from coming to the House floor.

The Consumer Protection Act of 1971, as proposed in H.R. 3809, H.R. 4541, and in the bill we are introducing today in general takes the same path as was proposed by our committee in 1970, and as is proposed in the Rosenthal and Dwyer bills of this Congress. There are several differences, and we call your attention to the major one. That difference, we believe, will accomplish our goal more effectively, more expeditiously, and more expertly—at less cost.

Instead of establishing an independent Consumer Protection Agency, and thus proliferating Federal agencies with duplicate goals, we would provide the Federal Trade Commission with the tools

that are needed to serve as a consumer advocate in Federal matters. The FTC already has considerable responsibility in the area of consumer protection; it already has a corps of consumer protection specialists; and it is, at long last, becoming a loyal friend of consumers.

For those of you who are skeptical about the FTC—as we were before our long struggle in committee about how this consumer need could best be met—we commend to you the following article from the Wall Street Journal of February 24:

FEDERAL TRADE AGENCY SETS OUT TO PROVE IT IS THE CONSUMER'S FRIEND

(By Ronald G. Shafer)

WASHINGTON.—The little old lady was languishing with a bad case of tired blood. But a recent transfusion has the old gal kicking up her heels like a liberated woman.

That's the consensus view of the 56-year-old Federal Trade Commission, also known as "the little old lady of Pennsylvania Avenue," since a revitalization began about a year ago under new leadership chosen by Richard Nixon.

The "old" FTC was much mocked as a feeble enforcer of consumer protection and anti-trust laws. Its image was epitomized by a fruitless 11-year effort, begun in 1959, to get J. B. Williams Co. to stop advertising that its Geritol tonic could relieve "tired blood" in older Americans.

But that image is rapidly changing. Among other things, the "new" FTC has finally taken the Geritol people to court, seeking \$1 million in penalties. And it's reaching out in other directions, seeking "to give consumers better, broader and quicker protection," says Joseph Martin, the agency's general counsel.

ASPIRIN, NOT CHINCHILLA

The commission will strive increasingly to bring major cases raising issues with broad consumer impact (such as challenges to deceptive advertising of widely sold products) rather than emphasizing narrower questions involving, say, sales of chinchilla furs or instead of responding to individual consumers' gripes. Coming targets are likely to include pain relief claims for aspirin and nutrition claims for bread.

The remodeled FTC will probe the outer limits of its authority by seeking preliminary court injunctions to quickly quash some suspect sales practices and by imposing tougher sanctions, such as requiring advertisers to publicly confess past deception. It will even ban some products or ads.

The commission may also test its power to require restitution. Several complaints now before it seek to require offending companies to pay damages or refunds to consumers.

One complaint proposes to require Coca-Cola Co. to award \$100 prizes to many persons said to have been wrongfully deprived of such prizes in a promotional game in 1969. The charge states that Coca-Cola and Glendinning Co., which devised the contest, failed to disclose that some questions required more than one answer. The complaint is being challenged by both Coca-Cola and Glendinning.

The new FTC is steaming ahead on other consumer-protection courses. In recent months, it has taken tough action ranging from a requirement that gasoline octane ratings be posted on gas pumps to a proposal that would require phosphate-detergent packages to carry a warning that such detergents pollute water.

GETTING STRONGER EVERY DAY

"The Federal Trade Commission is alive and well and getting stronger every day," asserts Miles W. Kilpatrick, the 52-year-old Philadelphia antitrust lawyer who took over as FTC chairman in September. He succeeded Caspar Weinberger, a California attorney who

got the reform ball rolling after he took office in January 1970 with a Presidential mandate to shape up the commission. (In August, Mr. Weinberger became deputy director of the President's Office of Management and Budget.)

Just how successful the new FTC will be remains to be seen. Several of its potentially powerful enforcement actions are sure to be challenged in court. But the agency's new boldness is winning the applause of consumer advocates—and is making business groups a little nervous.

Indications so far are that "the commission is waking up to its responsibilities, which is attributable to a new and more vigilant staff," says Ralph Nader. "If they keep up the accelerated pace, the FTC may become a prime recruiting group for idealistic young lawyers who want to use the authority of a democratic government to protect consumers and root out anticompetitive practices."

The business community has more mixed views. "The most prevalent feeling is that a strengthened FTC is preferable to an independent (government) consumer agency," says Kenneth Stinger, an official of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. "But there's also a little feeling that they might be going too far; this really frightens a few people." Some advertising men complain that some FTC proposals, such as requiring corrective ads are "antibusiness."

NOT OUT TO ATTACK BUSINESS

In an effort to calm such fears, Basil Mezines, the FTC executive director, recently assured a grocery-industry group that the FTC wouldn't allow its interest in consumerism "to cloak an attack on business." He and other FTC officials say tough action in selected cases protects businessmen who don't deceive. One antitrust case now before the commission involves a company that may have grabbed a major chunk of a consumer-produce market through deceptive ads, these officials say.

FTC officials agree with businessmen that a strengthened commission is preferable to a new federal consumer-protection agency. Congress this year is expected to consider legislation to create an agency with power to intervene on behalf of consumers in all regulatory proceedings. But FTC men suggest it might be more practical just to give them the added power and funds.

"It seems to me if there's going to be a consumer advocate agency, we might as well be it," say chairman Kirkpatrick. "We have the staff, we're here, we don't have to be created."

Such a move would surely be fought by persons active in consumer affairs, but there appears to be nonpartisan support for legislation, which the President is likely to request in a special message to Congress today, to reinforce and expand the FTC's authority to obtain preliminary injunctions, impose penalties and police certain local frauds.

Reforms at the FTC began in early 1969 after a report by Nader aides blasted the agency and its top staff officials as inept consumer protectors. A committee of the American Bar Association, in a study requested by President Nixon, subsequently agreed that the FTC spent too much time on trivial matters, such as a charge that a company's "navy shoes weren't made by the Navy, and said that it relied too much on voluntary compliances that critics call toothless.

The ABA committee, which was headed by current FTC chairman Kirkpatrick, recommended that the commission be reformed or abolished.

THE MISSION AND THE PEOPLE

The FTC has the mission of enforcing the Federal Trade Commission act barring "unfair and deceptive" trade practices, plus textile labeling rules, flammable fabrics laws and certain antitrust statutes. Its actions, based on staff investigations and proposals,

are voted on by the five commission members. The commission currently consists of three Republicans—Chairman Kirkpatrick, Mary Gardiner Jones and David Dennison—and two Democrats—A. Everette MacIntyre and former chairman Paul Rand Dixon, who bore the brunt of the past criticism.

In contrast to past public quarreling, the commission now seems united behind the activist efforts. "I don't see anybody dragging his heels," says Commissioner Jones, a strong supporter of the new direction.

FTC officials say the prospect of litigation won't slow their movement toward tougher and more innovative enforcements. But "we still have to win some cases," admits 41-year-old Robert Pitofsky, a New York University law professor who was appointed head of the FTC's Consumer Protection Bureau last November. Mr. Pitofsky was counsel to the ABA committee that prepared the report urging more aggressive FTC action.

That report, and parts of the Nader critique, are serving as road maps for FTC reform. In reaction to complaints about excessive bureaucracy, Mr. Weinberger slashed the number of operating bureaus to two from four. He also began replacing veteran officials with aggressive newcomers.

"It's startling how changes in the cast of characters (at the staff level) have changed the whole ball game," says Commissioner Jones. "I look forward to the time when they will be wilder than we are and we have to put the brakes on. In the past, the commission was pulling the staff along." Officials say the FTC has become a popular place for bright young lawyers. The agency plans to hire about 50 of them this summer, including at least one of "Nader's raiders."

SWITCH IN PRIORITIES

One big change based on the ABA report is the switch in priorities to big cases with big impact. That means emphasis on deceptive advertising and product claims beamed at millions of consumers, especially those dealing with health and safety.

The FTC can formulate trade regulations setting requirements for entire industries, and in these, too, says an official, "we've gotten away from rules on the sizes of sleeping bags" and have moved to more substantial issues. Thus the commission has proposed rules requiring certain auto-pricing disclosures, and it wants a three-day "cooling-off period" on door-to-door sales, to give the customer a chance to change his mind.

Another change is tougher penalties. In the past, most FTC complaints were settled by orders that merely stopped an alleged deception, often long after it had already ended. "The old sin-no-more remedies just don't work," says Mr. Pitofsky. Future orders will be designed to "take away the fruits" reaped from deceptive tactics, he says.

Still another goal is quicker action. Last month, for the first time in a decade, the FTC obtained a preliminary court injunction—this one against a California hair replacement company. The commission charged the company, Medi-Hair International, failed to disclose medical risks of its process, which involves surgically placing anchors in customers' scalps to hold weavings of hair. Officials plan to seek similar court action in other cases.

For the long range, however, the FTC sees antitrust action to increase competition as its heavy artillery for the defense of the consumer. The antitrust efforts, involving action against price-fixing, mergers and existing industrial concentration, will be intensified in the coming year. Particular efforts will be made "to identify and eliminate illegal business conduct in basic consumer industries and in industries affecting the prices of essential consumer commodities," according to a statement in the administration's new budget. Alan Ward, new director of the FTC's Bureau of Competition, indicates he will look into franchising arrangements.

The FTC already is investigating concentration in seven industries: cereals, drugs, automobiles, steel, electrical machinery, chemicals and energy. The studies are aimed at determining whether companies in an industry with only a few major producers are less responsive to competitive forces than those in less-concentrated industries.

If such studies "establish that firms in such industries tend to compete through advertising gimmicks rather than price," says general counsel Martin, "then I am certain that the FTC will wage increasing and effective warfare against such industrial concentrations."

In seeking support of our proposal by this body, we offer also a summary of the Consumer Protection Act of 1971:

SUMMARY OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

The Consumer Protection Act of 1971 upgrades the Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President to statutory responsibilities. The Office, headed by a Director appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, has the primary responsibility for the oversight, coordination, and direction of consumer policy and operations among Federal agencies.

BUREAU OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND REPRESENTATION OF CONSUMER INTERESTS

In addition, there is established by law within the Federal Trade Commission a Bureau of Consumer Protection, headed by a Consumer Counsel appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The primary responsibility of the Bureau is to represent the interests of consumers before other Federal agencies and courts.

PRODUCT TESTING

In support of its representational functions, the Bureau shall have the right to contract with other Federal agencies and non-Federal sources to conduct product testing. Other than for this purpose, however, the Act does not authorize the Bureau or the Office directly or indirectly to engage in or support product testing.

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

Additionally, the Bureau is authorized to receive, evaluate, develop, and act upon complaints from consumers. This authority includes transmission by the Bureau of such complaints to other Federal agencies and non-Federal sources for investigation and action.

As part of its responsibility in this area, the Bureau shall maintain a public document room where complaints may be made available to the public for inspection and copying. To safeguard against abuse, these complaints shall not be available to the public until three conditions have been met:

1. The complainant has given permission for his complaint to be made public.
2. The party complained against has been given at least 60 days in which to comment.
3. The governmental agency to which the complaint has been referred has indicated how it intends to handle the complaint.

CONSUMER INFORMATION

Both the Bureau and the Office are authorized to gather and disseminate to the public information of interest to consumers, including information concerning items purchased by the Federal Government for its own use.

As part of the consumer information authority, the Office is authorized to publish and distribute a Consumer Register designed to make available to consumers information which may be of interest to them, including that relating to government activities.

Under the Act, interested persons are given the right to comment before the release of such information pertaining to brand names,

and Federal agencies are prohibited from declaring one product to be superior to another.

OTHER FEDERAL ACTION

The Act provides that every Federal agency, in taking action that substantially affects the interests of consumers, shall provide notice of such action to the Office and the Bureau and shall give due consideration to the valid interests of consumers.

3-YEAR AUTHORIZATION

The authorization for both the Bureau and the Office is limited to three years.

DEFINITION OF CONSUMER

A consumer is defined in the Act as "any person who is offered goods or services for personal, family, or household purposes."

THE MERITS AND DEMERITS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S REVENUE SHARING PROPOSALS

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD for the perusal of the Members of this body two letters which I feel will contribute something to the current discussion now in progress on the relative merits and demerits of the administration's revenue sharing proposals. The first letter is a letter I received from one of my more thoughtful constituents who outlined in a very well thought-out fashion his arguments for favorable consideration of revenue sharing as a solution to the problems confronting our Federal system today. The second letter is my reply which addresses itself to some of the excellent points made by the gentleman in his letter. By including in the RECORD discussions in this manner, I feel that the House will be able to capture some of the flavor of the discussion and also a capsule summary of some of the arguments on both sides:

BUREAU OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,

Chestnut Hill, Mass., February 9, 1971.

HON. JAMES A. BURKE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: This letter is being written to you, not so much as director, Bureau of Public Affairs, Boston College as a resident of the 11th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

It concerns revenue-sharing, and much of the contents of this letter I have repeated to the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, chairman, Ways and Means Committee on which committee you also sit.

Philosophically, I have no hang-ups on revenue-sharing, either pro or con. We have read a great many articles and reports on revenue-sharing, and without taking a fixed position, I can say that on the balance, there appears to be more than can be said in its favor than against it. The debate is not terminated, however, meaning that all there is to be said has not entirely been said to date. As more knowledgeable people enter the debate and offer new thinking to the issue, each citizen's own attitude will become clarified for him.

If I can be candid, my own interests are principally identified with those of local government. Local government is where the problems come to rest; this is where the ac-

tion is, in the language of the "new generation." I have been a city manager for in excess of six years prior to assuming my current position with this urban university, Boston College. There is much to be said of a program which would permit Congressmen and Senators to exchange places for a period of one year with administrators of some of our larger cities. Both the administrator and the legislator could gain much by this temporary transfer of duties. I am afraid that what is happening is that the elected legislator cannot accurately become cognizant of the problems of the big city major, any more than the major can become aware of the demands upon the congressman, no matter how each might try to make the assessment.

One fact stands out as paramount, at least from this office. The distribution of public funds at all levels is not being carried out in a way as to render the citizen—the recipient of the government service—assistance either in the form or in the dimensions the citizen feels he needs. Something is definitely wrong in this very affluent society of ours in the way services are delivered to the citizen. At the base of this problem is a combination of available public monies, (at all levels) and the level of government charged with the delivery of service to the citizen. It does not appear to be a case of "either . . . or", but of "both and".

Few people, for example, know how many federally-funded programs there are in existence today aimed at correcting or abetting an area of need. The estimate varies from a figure of 379 to something well over the 1100 mark. And yet, one could question how well most of these programs are conceived and carried out.

There are those who would say that we have these many programs primarily because Congress as a body is essentially jealous about its prerogatives in paying particular heed to particular groups of constituents—the image of the beneficent monarch of old, but displayed under a banner of generous funding.

Whatever is the cause of the maladjustment between funding and the delivery of service to the ultimate recipient, the citizen is in need of government assistance. The entire Federal system is being questioned today—and, by many thinking citizens, it is found wanting.

There are no easy solutions, and anyone who attempts to put forward the "pat" solutions can be seriously questioned. It does seem that we must keep our options open. It may be, for example, that the best way to administer a public assistance (i.e. public welfare) program is for the federal government to take over and direct (and fund) the entire program, using state agencies only as the vehicles for getting the work done. It may be that the best method for educating our children, kindergarten through twelfth grade, is to take this responsibility away from municipalities and school districts and vest it squarely with state governments. Certainly, a re-assessment of what function belongs to what level of government has to be done, and done soon, if we are to have a domestic program worthy of that designation.

In the same manner, it is likely to be too early in the game for any of us, including your correspondent, to take any fixed position that one method of funding is all good, and another is all bad. Some programs ought to be tested before a general application is undertaken. Recently, working as a citizen member of a regional planning agency, we have embarked on a program of a block grant from HUD, based on an approved work program—a work program that provides both flexibility within it and strict fiscal accountability. It is working out well. It will serve to eliminate much red tape, formerly needed in the approval of individual programs. It is good for the receiving agency,

and it is good for the federal government. What more could one ask?

My request in this letter is to ask that you keep an open mind on revenue-sharing. It may not be the last word in public finance, but if given the chance, and with proper safeguards, it might just work out well. It may be that opening this sort of avenue for broader funding might lead to better solutions, such as tax credits. My plea is that local government is in such a critical situation with regard to its own constricted tax base that the very least it can expect of its parent (i.e. the federal government) is that it will not permit the municipal child to die without trying a number of prescriptions. The situation is really that bad.

You are quoted in the press as suggesting that the Federal Government assume the direction and cost of the entire public assistance program as an alternative to revenue sharing. I would hope, Congressman, that Congress would see the wisdom of this take-over, not as an alternative to revenue-sharing, but as a supplement to it. You cite the scarcity of funds to support revenue-sharing. You might be very surprised where the average citizen feels the federal budget ought to be changed to give greater priorities to domestic programs. Might I suggest that you conduct an opinion poll among your constituents on the ordering of national priorities—and on revenue-sharing?

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. M. O'HARE,
Director.

MARCH 1, 1971.

ROBERT J. M. O'HARE,
Director, Bureau of Public Affairs, Boston
College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.

DEAR BOB: Many thanks for taking the time to send me your lengthy and reasoned epistle of recent date, regarding the subject of revenue sharing. It is always a pleasure to hear from you, even on such serious matters. Given the controversy surrounding the proposal, it is a pleasure to be able to encounter someone who still advertises an open mind on the subject. As you say, up until this letter, there seemed to be more that could be said in favor of the proposal than against it. Hopefully, this letter will tip the balance against the proposal. Now that more knowledgeable people such as Chairman Mills have begun to speak out in detail on the subject, and, even more important, some of the details of the Administration's proposals are being released, much of the original enthusiasm for the concept seems to be melting away.

As you say, your own interests these days are principally centered around the problems facing local government. Here I couldn't agree with you more. Whichever generation you subscribe to, the massive financial problems confronting local governments at all levels are too well known to need documentation here. I don't think anyone in this debate in a responsible position has challenged the analysis of the problem which led to the enthusiasm for a program such as revenue sharing. It was a disarmingly simple solution to what appeared to be a very complicated and hopeless problem. If I were a mayor, I could dream of nothing better than to wake up from the nightmare of financial catastrophe to find a blank check with no strings attached from Uncle Sam waiting in my mailbox. However, is blank check financing the best or the only solution to the problem facing the cities and towns? I don't think it is. I think that there are a number of other serious alternatives which have been offered, which avoid the serious philosophical problems inherent in the concept of revenue sharing, namely, the separation of the tax-raising from the tax-spending functions. I do not feel that responsible government is

really encouraged by turning over vast sums with little to say about national priorities.

As you should have known in writing your letter to me, unlike some of the mythical legislators referred to in your letter, I came to Washington with considerable experience in government at the local level, both in municipal government and in the state legislature. By the time I left Massachusetts, the burdens of welfare for the City of Boston were becoming crystal clear. The problems of expanding schools and quality of education were already upon the State. Agreed, these problems have been multiplied over the intervening years to the point that today there seems to be no end in sight other than fiscal chaos and a real breakdown of government on the local level. I was also around when promises were made in the past about reducing property taxes. If only the sales tax were passed, the property owner would realize a reduction in local taxes. Subsequently, not only did the tax reduction not materialize, it proved impossible to prevent property tax increase. More recently, I followed very closely the debate over state assumption of local welfare costs in Massachusetts. Again, there were those who pointed out the tremendous tax savings for the local property owner if the reform were accomplished. Well, the reform was accomplished and yet the lot of the local property owner hardly improved. In fact, the worsened plight of the property owner is one of the principal moving forces behind the current spirited debate over and pressure for revenue sharing.

Because of my involvement in local government over the years, rather than in spite of it, I have come to my present opposition to the Administration's revenue sharing concept. Not only do I not feel that the burden of the local property owner will be improved under revenue sharing as preached by the Administration, but I also feel that state and local government have a long way to come before they can be considered eligible for "blankcheck" government. You and I both know the poor reputation government enjoys on the local level, not only in Massachusetts, but across the nation. While in some cases it may not be deserved, I think you will be the first to agree the quality of local government around the country varies tremendously when one moves from section to section. I have been amazed to read in leading newspapers in Massachusetts arguments on the editorial page for trusting local government with vast millions without any Federal directives as to how the money will be spent, while on the opposite page the latest in a series is being run exposing some of the most scandalous accounts of fiscal irregularities on the local government level. In fact, the stories this month coming out of Massachusetts seem to indicate that little has changed from the salad days of what the "new generation" probably feels is a by-gone era.

Don't forget that Federal programs did not just materialize out of thin air. Each and every one of these 379 to 1100 programs were devised to tackle specific problems on a national basis which had been neglected for decades by state and local government, either because they lacked the funds or as often as not because they lacked the political will and determination. Going back to the days of the sweat shops and child labor scandals of the turn of the century, most of the great social reforms and improvements have been achieved because of concerted action on the Federal level. Similarly, with labor legislation and civil rights matters. No Federal program is ever as simple as it appears. There are usually a number of objectives behind every piece of government financial assistance. In fact, it is almost impossible to judge one program by itself, separate from the others. This is particularly true of the great volume of legislation with accompanying grants-in-aid to

emerge from the New Frontier-Great Society days. Behind much of the financial assistance is the opportunity to improve the society in which we live. Even something as seemingly unrelated as Federal financial assistance under Title III, the Higher Education Facilities Act, presents the Federal government with an opportunity to encourage colleges to take on more students from the underprivileged, economically deprived sector of the society. Eligibility for financial assistance, in other words, can be made to hinge on a college's social efforts. Now while I would expect criticism from some quarters about this kind of social engineering and excessive government interference, I would hardly have expected them to come from New England, least of all, Massachusetts.

In other words, I am saying that the grand alliance for revenue sharing is made up of some strange bedfellows, indeed, I find it difficult to see how many Northern liberals have allowed themselves to buy an idea which is only thinly disguised states-rightism at best. If every state in the country were as advanced or as enlightened as Massachusetts, then Federal government would probably not have had to work as hard over the past fifty years as it did to make this country a better place to live, work or grow up. But the fact of the matter is, not all states are like Massachusetts. This "new Federalism" that we hear so much about lately, from my vantage point here in Washington, is nothing more than a massive and well-run publicity campaign for concepts which ceased to be fashionable some 150 years ago.

Now, I agree that the great debate in our Constitutional history between those favoring a strong central government and those favoring states rights has never been resolved. To a large extent, the Constitution enshines these diametrically opposed ideas and the resulting tug-of-war over the years has been with us every step of the way. Undoubtedly, Federal government now is enormous and, to some, frightening. Without doubt, there is considerable evidence that the citizen-Democrat, the mythical man-in-the-street, has been excluded from much of the decision-making process of the Federal government, and this is regrettable. A shift in emphasis from the national to the local level would be welcome. There is also a significant amount of evidence to justify reforming some of the existing programs to make them more responsive to local needs and differences from section to section, but I disagree with those who argue for the complete dismantling of the present system of Federal grants-in-aid. What we need is constructive criticism and piece-meal reform, not wholesale destruction lest we throw out the baby with the bath water. To do so would be to play into the hands of those that disagree with the social aims and objectives behind the many programs.

Already my office has been swamped with protests of mayors and local officials around the country as the details of the special revenue sharing package have been leaked out and they see some of their favorite programs being phased out of existence to be replaced by what is at best a promise of state assistance. Again, it is important to remember that not all state governments have reacted over the years with as much concern for urban problems as others have. Even in Massachusetts a good argument could be made out that Boston and its problems have never received the share of attention and effort from the state legislature that they deserve. This is certainly the case with New York City and the forces that control the State from Albany. While you are at it with historical comparisons of Congress with benevolent monarchs of old, I think you would do well to remember another comparison from history, namely nations split up into local feudal domains, jealously presided over by local petty nobility. Travel from one community to another was like going into a foreign country.

I am opposed to the Administration's revenue sharing package because it is a "pat" solution to borrow from your vocabulary. It poses as a panacea. The very amalgamation of left to right views behind the proposal seems evidence of this. Apparently everyone is supposed to be satisfied by a return of government to the local level. As you say, there are many programs that have been well administered by the Federal government. We should not just dismantle the whole apparatus and turn it over to the local governments. You, yourself, argued a reassessment should be made as to which level of government does which job best. Until we determine which level does the job best, it seems to me that you have offered one of the best arguments for going slow on general and special revenue sharing until some much-needed studies can be made. The Administration has not been very selective as to which programs are to be restored to the states and local communities. It has made a sweeping recommendation that all existing programs in education, urban matters and transportation be consolidated.

This all leads me up to my proposal, which is that there is a demonstrated need for welfare reform and takeover. This is an area where the state and local governments have had a chance to do something over the years and now find themselves completely overwhelmed. Because of the differing standards from one state to another, we have witnessed severe population dislocation as people have migrated to take advantage of the differences in financial assistance prevailing in other states. Too many states are not doing enough to tackle the problem, while those that do seem to end up in more serious trouble than before they started. The one valuable product of the revenue sharing debate has been the creation of a climate where, for the first time, something significant can be done in this area. By taking over the welfare costs around the country lock, stock and barrel, the Federal government would not be separating the tax-spending from the tax-raising function and yet would be sharing revenue. In taking the burden of welfare costs off the states, funds would be freed for other worthwhile projects. Through participation at the local level, decisions could be made as to how locally generated funds could best be spent for local projects. Massachusetts would undoubtedly be better off under this proposal than the Administration's revenue sharing proposals. In this proposal, I have received overwhelming support, to judge from the letters received from constituents. In contrast, this office has received fewer than ten letters (including yours) urging my vote for the Administration's revenue sharing program.

Again, it was a pleasure to discuss this very timely topic with you. I hope that you find my views worth reading and that you will accept them in the spirit with which they are offered. I am well aware that men of good will can agree to disagree. I do not expect this letter to convert you, but hopefully it will at least be considered.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

REVENUE-SHARING IMPLICATIONS: A REPLY

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, critics of the administration's revenue-sharing proposals have envisioned all sorts of ill if it is enacted. These attacks are unfair, both to the President's programs and to

those persons holding local and State offices. Christopher Demuth in the Wall Street Journal of February 25 refutes each of these charges, and I submit his article for inclusion in the RECORD as an excellent, logical discussion of revenue sharing:

REVENUE-SHARING IMPLICATIONS: A REPLY
(By Christopher Demuth)

Monroe Karmin's analysis of "The Politics of Nixon's 'Revolution'" (Feb. 11) suggests that the objective of the President's revenue sharing proposal is to shift government attention and largess away from the big central cities, and particularly the poor and black communities within them, and toward the suburban and rural areas where "Nixon people" are found. There is a certain political logic to this, if one is willing to believe that Presidents are strongly motivated by considerations of patronage. But I think it is mostly wrong, and distracts from the more important issues that revenue sharing presents.

Whatever may be the merits of concentrating federal resources on rural areas, revenue sharing is an unlikely vehicle for the task. The existing system of categorical grants-in-aid does redistribute tax money from the wealthier urban states to the less prosperous rural ones. For example, in 1968 New York received from the federal government \$313 per capita less than it had paid in income taxes, while North Dakota received \$180 per capita more than it had paid. Revenue sharing would distribute funds according to population and local tax effort, and reduce this redistributive effect greatly. The urban industrial states would get back a much larger share of their federal payments. Governors Rockefeller and Ogilvie did not get where they are championing causes that lose them money.

A LESS THAN FAIR MEASURE

Even the most urban states are really more suburban and rural than urban. And, says Mr. Karmin, regardless of how much revenue sharing is earmarked for the hard-pressed big cities in these states, their claim on federal funds "seems likely to be sharply restricted." Compared to what? A domestic "Marshall Plan"? It seems less than fair to measure the President's performance against the campaign slogans of the man he defeated. Had Mr. Humphrey been elected would we have an urban "Marshall Plan" today? Assuming that he took his campaign slogan seriously, he would first have had to figure out what it meant—different from, say, urban renewal (under which even modest programs now take over ten years to complete, and which frequently has difficulty spending all the money appropriated to it) or Model Cities (which was once touted as something of a "Marshall Plan" itself). Then he would have had to steer the program through Congress, which would have meant, if the Model Cities experience is any guide, "Marshall Plans" not only for the big cities but for many very small ones as well (at least as many as there are Senators and Congressmen on the appropriations committees). Then he would have had to find the money to pay for the "Plans," and he almost certainly would have ended up taking more money out of the big cities than he would have eventually turned back to them.

My point is that it is mere speculation to say that a Democratic administration would have spent more on the cities or on the poor.

Federal spending on urban social programs is higher today than it ever has been, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of the federal budget. If the President's revenue sharing and welfare reform proposals are adopted it will be much higher still. No doubt many would like it to be even higher (I am one), especially those who are not in-

convenienced with the responsibility of preparing the federal budget. Many will want more under any circumstances. Our desires will always outstrip our means.

The importance of revenue sharing is not in the amount of money it would give out or even in the apportionment among the several layers of government. The important point is that it changes the rules of the game, eliminating massive federal regulation and giving state and local officials far greater say over how federal funds are spent within their domains.

Mr. Karmin states that the President would like to do this "on the theory that they know best how to solve their problems." The theory, I think, is that such officials are elected by voters rather than hired by the Civil Service Commission. They are subject to certain disciplines and obligations that federal employes may freely ignore, for example, the need to reconcile the competing interests of diverse groups of citizens and the need to meet payrolls. Being politicians they must follow not only their private instincts and attitudes but those of the public as well; being executives they must not only promise but perform. But under the present system of narrow categorical grants, with dozens of federal strings tied to every dollar, these officials have been reduced to wards of the federal agencies, scurrying to and from Washington, tailoring their budgets to meet the available programs, drafting scores of applications and reports for the satisfaction of federal civil servants. This is why no one thinks it odd or disingenuous when a big city mayor seeks to blame all of his troubles on Washington. The central purpose of revenue sharing is to free these officials, to give them the capacity and the responsibility to accomplish themselves the difficult tasks for which the voters elected them.

But, Mr. Karmin notes, the effect of removing those federal strings will likely be to "dilute" the funds that are now focused on the central cities. Good management and good political science, perhaps, but a bad deal for the poor. Other writers have made a similar but much harsher point: state and local governments, they say, are dominated by racists, reactionaries and even Republicans, who are bound to turn their backs on the poor once the federal agencies loosen their grip. What're Sam Yorty and George Wallace going to do with all that cash, anyway?

DISREGARDING THE OBVIOUS

The latter argument (not Mr. Karmin's) shows a remarkable ability to disregard the obvious, especially coming as it so often does from mid-town Manhattan. The mayors of our large cities are, on the whole, the most progressive-minded public officials in American politics, certainly far more "liberal" than their respective congressional delegations. In this they are followed closely by the nation's governors, again taken as a group. Surely these men can be trusted to look out for the interests of the poor and the interest of minorities with at least as much energy and commitment as any others in American government. If, as Mr. Karmin anticipates, revenue sharing funds are more "universalized" and less focused on the physical confines of the poorest neighborhoods, that is not necessarily against the interest of the poor or the cities. The notion of "targeting" funds on discrete neighborhoods was central to the original operation of the Model Cities program, and before long it was precisely this feature that governors, mayors, and Model Cities directors alike were imploring Washington to change. And is there a big city mayor who thinks his city's most serious social problems can be solved wholly within the city limits?

Of course each of us can think of state and local politicians whom we would hardly trust to take to heart the interests of the poor or

anyone else: they may have obnoxious political views, may be corrupt, or may simply be incompetent. Such men are mercifully few, but what of them?

If they are men of extreme political views, it must be admitted that they represent public resentments that cannot be ignored. It seems likely that we are destined now for a full generation of fairly high and constant social friction. In such times James Madison's famous maxim, that federalism is the best protection against the formation of national factions, holds with especial force. The Max Rafferty of American politics (read in your favorite political villain, right or left) are bound to have their day: far better at the local level than nationally. They will find government far more ambiguous and complicated than they had imagined. They will have to learn to negotiate and compromise just like the rest of us, or be swiftly retired back to private life. (It should be noted here that federal civil rights laws will apply fully to all revenue sharing funds.)

If they are corrupt, it is noteworthy that it is in state and local governments that opportunities for corruption abound. And this is in large part because these governments are heavily dependent on taxing schemes—taxes on real estate values and race tracks, for example—which vest in relatively obscure officials an altogether unhealthy degree of discretion over private economic activities. Revenue sharing (federally audited) will reduce this dependence and increase the use of automatic, corruption-proof taxes.

A SOLUTION FOR INCOMPETENCE

If they are simply incompetent, obviously the only solution is for more competent people to become involved in state and local governments. Today the brightest men and women seek federal office, or at least federal employment, because that is where the opportunities are for leadership and achievement. State and local governments will not attract large numbers of these people until they offer equal challenges.

The wonder is that, under present arrangements, so many able people go into local government at all. When John F. Kennedy was an ambitious young Congressman planning his political career, he avoided running for governor of Massachusetts because he didn't want to be "handing out sewer contracts." Sewer contracts have become much more fashionable since then, as concern over pollution has mounted. And as concern over a host of other, more difficult, urban problems has mounted, so has the importance of other governmental tasks that once were considered mundane and lacking in glamor. Revenue sharing would go a long way toward seeing that they are performed wisely and well.

EXCELLENT SPEECH

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a speech given by the president of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Mr. Estill S. Heyser, Jr., at their annual meeting in Tulsa February 11. I think it is an excellent speech, and I believe it should be given thoughtful consideration:

ADDRESS OF ESTILL S. HEYSER, JR.

Members of the Board of Directors of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association and distinguished guests, if occasion had existed for me to deliver a presidential valediction two

years ago, I would have talked primarily about petroleum industry problems. I would have been critical of the experience with natural gas regulation. I would have exhorted us to greater efforts in the field of environmental matters. I would have expressed concern over the urgent need for improvement in product prices. I would have been alarmed over the decline in drilling activity and admonished vigilance against further governmental encroachment on industry affairs.

Now—two years later—those same subjects could be timely topics for comment. However, my recent experience as a rather close observer of governmental affairs convinces me there is an even more imperative consideration that warrants our attention. The consideration to which I refer relates to our quality of government and its impact on our free enterprise system that is basic to our American way of life.

In my judgment, assertions and actions of governmental entities too often have been a major contributing factor to a serious deterioration in the purpose, resolution, and direction of the endeavors of our citizenry. Because of this, we have undergone a dissociation from the precepts underlying our Republic. We have acquired a disdain for authority, a disregard for conscience, a distaste for patriotism, and a distrust of self-initiative and enterprise. The course of this unsought, but essentially self-imposed deterioration must be reversed if freedom in the world is to survive the Twentieth Century. Human liberty will not long endure without a preeminently strong America.

The restoration of our Nation to a proper course need not entail adoption of a complex set of new guiding principles. Such adjustment in our course need not entail revolutionary change and may, in fact, avoid it. Indeed, a reaffirmation of allegiance to some traditional and simple ethics would do much to redirect our Nation and its people toward a future considerably more promising and reassuring than our present practices and prospects would seem to warrant.

The ethics which I espouse for reaffirmation are—

First, our citizens need to attain greater factual knowledge about the affairs of our Nation. A factual informed electorate would do more to enhance the quality of our government from the precinct to the White House on an enduring basis than any other single thing we might do. From experience we can conclude that leaving the job of informing the public solely to the New York-Washington based communications media is obviously not the answer. Effective and continuing leadership from the business community in fostering public knowledge should be an essential part of this effort. We must become thought-leaders and problem-solvers with respect to the issues before us.

A second ethic involves an unrelenting aspiration for excellence as individuals and as a society. The commonplace and the mediocre cannot be acceptable norms. The parlor world-wide ambitions of Communist tyranny and the magnitude and urgency of our unmet domestic needs precludes acceptance of anything but every American's best effort to be a good citizen. We need to encourage and heed the acts, thoughts, and leadership of people who bring proven credentials of excellence to the solution of the challenges that confront us in politics, commerce, and business. We must encourage creative initiatives and appropriately recognize their undertaking.

Thirdly, we must return to an awareness that a person's compensation belongs primarily to him rather than to the government; and the share of that compensation ultimately taken by taxation should not make government the majority partner in the deal. The taxpayer's dollar is his unit it

is fairly and equitably levied upon to finance the legitimate functions of government. We need to be mindful of the fact that in a free enterprise system, government has neither the function nor the capacity to create economic wealth. That comes only from the productive efforts of our individual citizens and government should use prudence and restraint in seeking to redistribute the proper rewards of those efforts. In this context, it is a concomitant imperative that one generation should not so conduct its governmental affairs as to bequeath public indebtedness to be paid from the productive endeavors of succeeding generations.

A fourth and last ethic to which I will refer has to do with the mutuality of responsibility in the relationship between government and business. Good government and good business are good for one another. The public official and the businessman need to recreate a shared awareness of the mutualism of the purposes they serve. There needs to be a moderation of the prevailing business view that government is an intractable oppressor whose motives are suspect and whose actions are to be resisted. Similarly, moderation needs to occur in the public official's too widely held attitude that the imagined wickedness of business necessitates massive governmental intrusion into the day-to-day functioning of the market place. The powers of government and the prerogatives of private enterprise must be exercised within the reasonable restraints of the public interest.

A greater observance of these ethics of citizen knowledge, aspiration for excellence, encouragement of initiative through prudence in governmental fiscal affairs, and mutuality of respect and understanding between business and government would contribute greatly to the improvement of the quality of our government and to the enhancement of the public benefit.

Abandoning my role as your friendly Trinity River Philosopher and relating my earlier remarks to some pragmatic concerns affecting the oil and gas industry, it cannot be gainsaid that more scrupulous past observance of the principles just enumerated would have alleviated the severity and urgency of many of our present problems and perhaps some of them could have been avoided completely.

For example, our industry's most persistent critic over the years has been the demagogue who has preyed upon a public lack of knowledge and deliberately chosen to disregard the truth. Through innuendo and distortion he has succeeded in creating doubts about the oil man's parentage, citizenship, and patriotism. He has disdained fact and has been interested only in the impression, image, and notoriety that ensue from his misrepresentations. This result has had its impact on our industry in such vital areas as environmental matters, taxation, import policy, conservation, and regulatory practices. If we had been more successful in our efforts to contribute to citizen knowledge, the effectiveness of the demagogue would have been thwarted; and, indeed, greater citizen knowledge may have denied the demagogue a public platform to begin with.

Similarly, a greater public recognition of the importance of maintaining incentives for initiative and allowing an adequate reward for risk-taking would markedly contribute to a better understanding of the need private enterprise has for return on investment that is commensurate with the uncertainty of the undertaking. It is inevitable that fiscal policies affect tax policies. A level of public spending that rises faster than the level of national income will inevitably result in disproportionately greater tax burdens being placed on the productive efforts of our citizens; it will inhibit the available options and flexibility in formulating tax legislation. This is exactly what happened to us in the

decade of the 60's. Then we heard oft repeated pronouncements about prudence in spending as we spent profligately; we heard about the excessiveness of taxes while we were being taxed more and more. The result of this fiscal expediency by government is a cost-push inflation that has vitiated the purchasing power of fixed incomes, dangerously depressed business profits, and caused economic dislocations adversely affecting every aspect of American life.

Another very real example of governmental policy causing serious economic dislocation is concerned with natural gas regulation. Today's shortage of natural gas is directly attributable to past governmental policies that ignored economic realities by failing to provide an incentive for initiative and risk-taking. It was a clear case of regulatory overkill. We must now strive to make certain that the currently prevailing indications for improvement in regulatory climate result in conditions that will permit our industry to find adequate reserves to supply the needs of the American consumer.

Part of the fault for our present day problems that grew out of the policies of prior years must rest with the industry because too many of us were unwilling to work as industry advocates at governmental and public relations. But the fault is not ours alone. The public record is replete with instances in which the industry story was factually stated and accurately projected only to have the record disregarded in the development of governmental policy. In this area, it is imperative that the industry do better in the 1970's with more of us individually sharing in the burden of time and resources that are required to make fact, truth, and understanding prevail.

And so, as I conclude these remarks and my term as President of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, I wish time permitted me the opportunity to give proper recognition to the many people who have aided me in the discharge of my responsibilities. The list of names would come from the distinguished ranks of our Association's Board of Directors and Executive Committee as well as from the Legal Committee, the tax committees, and from the staff. To all of you I extend a very personal expression of grateful appreciation for your time, talent, and cooperation. I look forward to being of whatever service I can to you in the future. I wish my successor well and express a confidence that he will find his new responsibilities challenging and interesting. He will also find them worthwhile because of the wonderful people working with him in behalf of what I regard as the greatest industry in the world. Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES MANATT

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the past decade it has been my privilege to have been associated with a young man whom I believe deserves recognition as an example of the constructive force of youth in our society.

His name is Charles Manatt. Raised on a farm in Iowa, he was graduated from Iowa State University and took his law degree from George Washington University in Washington, D.C. His military background includes service as a captain, Judge Advocate Corps, U.S. Army Reserve.

Today he is the senior partner of his own California law firm, president of

the San Fernando Valley Bar Association, and member of the San Fernando Neighborhood Legal Services Board of Directors.

His governmental activities have led him to the chairmanship of the Democratic State Central Committee. He has been of invaluable assistance to me through the years, and has a political track record that is unsurpassed in the State.

We in Government need the contribution of young men like Chuck Manatt. His is the kind of intelligent, vigorous leadership that will provide a responsible, realistic, thoughtful approach in seeking new ways to resolve our problems. He recognizes that we must work together in order to move forward and build for the future.

We need his ideals, creative thinking, recommendations, enthusiasm, energy, and humanity. We need his interest and involvement, his motivation and commitment.

His is the kind of leadership we must develop and maintain, for it demonstrates that the system really works; that it provides a realistic way to contribute; and that it is truly the American tradition.

THE LONG-RANGE IMPACT OF INSTALLMENT BUYING ON EXTENDED FEDERAL PROGRAMS

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it has consistently been one of the faults of our governmental system—and the private sector of the economy as well—that we can be persuaded to go along with Federal spending programs or credit purchases so long as the monthly payment can be brought within what we feel our national or personal budget can stand. What we fail to do is to look at the long-range impact of installment buying on extended Federal programs.

The Congress made significant progress, as far as the buying public is concerned, on credit purchases when it passed the Consumer Protection Act requiring creditors to spell out to the buyer in figures the total amount involved on long-term credit purchases. Thus, the buyer can see what the total amount of money actually will be and will be fully aware of what he is obligating himself for.

Mr. Speaker, the same sort of requirement ought to be imposed in the Congress on long-term Federal programs. A good example of how the Congress has obligated this Government, almost unknowingly, for hundreds of billions of dollars is found in the Housing Act of 1968. We recall that we set the noble goal of 6 million housing units over a period of 10 years in that bill. Further, that legislation provided for an interest subsidy to encourage construction of

apartment units under the section 236 program.

Mind you, on an annual basis the cost does not look too great. The average experience of the FHA on these programs is \$1,000 per unit per year for interest payments. However, this overlooks the fact that the life of such mortgages is usually 40 years and thus, the \$1,000 must be paid on each such unit every year for 40 years. In other words, if this Congress lives up to the goal of building 6 million units in a 10-year period and provides the interest subsidy payments for each of these units for the full term of the mortgage, then we will have obligated this Government to a total of \$240,000,000,000.

Somehow this monumental debt obligation has been kept from the public and the Congress has apparently not faced up to it. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, facing a request for the largest increase in the limit on the national debt in recent memory and we are ignoring having obligated ourselves for expenditures which, on a long-term basis, total more than the entire annual Federal budget. I would not want anyone to interpret my remarks as being against housing programs, because I support reasonable Federal efforts to help provide housing for all our people. However, I do feel that we should closely reexamine the debt obligations to which the Federal Government was committed under this legislation and see if more workable and less costly means of providing housing can be worked out. One of the programs financed under the Housing Act, the section 235 program, already has faced some scandal. I think it would be safe to say that if we let the 236 program stand as it is now written, scandal will be found there also. I urge the appropriate committee to reexamine this matter closely on behalf of our taxpayers who are already staggering under heavy debt and excessive taxes.

TV COVERAGE OF THE VIETNAM AND LAOS FIGHTING IS DEPLORABLE

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but be both amused and disgusted over some of the national TV coverage of the Vietnam and Laos fighting and our efforts in these countries. We see some reporter in fatigues sticking a microphone in some private's or sergeant's face and the conversation goes something like this:

"Question: You've had a pretty tough battle here, haven't you?"

"Answer: Yeh, geeze, real tough."

"Question: How do you think it's going?"

"Answer: I dunno—I mean, geeze, it's real tough."

"Question: Do you think we ought to

be here fighting a war half way around the world from home?"

"Answer: I dunno—wisht I was home."

"Question: Don't you think it is wrong for the U.S. to be bombing and killing civilians and women and children in an illegal and immoral war?"

"Answer: Sure."

"This is Joe Blatz, TV News, Laos."

What would have been the case if today's typical TV reporter had been in Gen. George Washington's boat as he crossed the Delaware, Christmas in 1776. I am sure the interview with Pvt. Simeon Slob, Delaware Regulars, would have sounded something like this:

"Question: You've had it pretty tough here in Valley Forge, haven't you?"

"Answer: Geeze, it's tough—I mean I'm half froze. I been cold for a month."

"Question: How do you think the war is going?"

"Answer: Geeze, I dunno. I'm freezing. This damn boat's leaking. I'm getting wetter 'n wetter."

"Question: Do you think it's right to fight on Christmas Day?"

"Answer: I guess not. I wish I had some waterproof boots. Geeze, I wisht I had some boots!"

"Question: Wouldn't you rather be warm at home enjoying Christmas dinner with the family than fighting an illegal and immoral war in the ice and snow?"

"Answer: Hell, yes! You crazy or sumpin? I'm freezing my—bleep—off."

"This is Joe Blatz, TV News, crossing the Delaware."

THE SST: WHO NEEDS IT?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Paul Ehrlich of Standard University has forwarded to me a discussion of the SST composed by John Holdren. Mr. Holdren is a plasma physicist at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore and holds a degree in aeronautical engineering.

His pertinent insights into the issues surrounding the supersonic transport program are worthy of note, and his concerns over the social and biophysical by-products of the SST are based on the most salient information. He is genuinely disturbed by the prospect of the plane's operation.

The judgements of such knowledgeable and informed commentators are worthy of consideration. The criticism leveled by Mr. Holdren is against the continued development of an aircraft capable of providing the Nation with a host of health and comfort headaches and so little substantial benefits.

Surely, there is good reason taking into account the striking hazards predicted by Mr. Holdren for the SST. Therefore, I submit his statements for consideration by my colleagues in the House:

THE SST: WHO NEEDS IT?

"It may soon be possible to fly from Watts to Harlem in two hours and to disrupt the lives of everyone in between."¹

Discussions of the U.S. Supersonic transport program customarily focus on the aircraft's irremediable sonic boom, its unacceptable takeoff and landing noise, and the other, more speculative, environmental costs of operating a fleet of them. These arguments all mitigate against the expenditure of public funds on such an enterprise, and they will be included for completeness here, but there is no case for the SST even without them. The use of society's limited monies to subsidize the well-off minority of its members who fly at all is itself a dubious proposition; if we really want to do so, there are alternative means to bring greater benefits to the air traveller at less cost; and the contention that the SST program will benefit the U.S. as a whole economically has been discredited by the most distinguished bodies to examine the issue.

As a diversion of society's resources, the SST has in one sense received more attention than it deserves: the 700 million dollars of government money in the project so far is less than a fortieth the sum applied to the destruction of Vietnam last year alone. Were the latter fiasco not available for comparison, however, this figure and the 5 billion dollars the taxpayers stand to lose eventually on the SST would be more appalling. Moreover, as an example of the mad momentum of technology, to the absurd extreme of the public financing an environmental insult of virtually no demonstrated social utility, the SST program is unexcelled.

The specifications of the American SST call for an aircraft carrying 298 passengers at a cruising speed of 1800 mph, and costing an estimated 52 million dollars each. The first flight of a prototype is not expected until 1972. Both the Soviet Union and a British-French combine have prototypes of smaller and slower SST's in the air today. Both are expected to carry about 125 passengers at 1400 mph, and will cost something like 20 million dollars each. The "head start" now held by the Soviets, the British and the French in getting an SST into commercial operation is offered by the U.S. administration as a compelling reason for us to press ahead with our own program. The argument runs as follows: In the absence of a U.S. SST, our airlines will be forced by the competition with foreign carriers and with each other to purchase large numbers of Anglo-French or (much less probably) Soviet aircraft, worsening the balance-of-payments problem. This argument assumes of course, that the SST will be a profit-making item for which there will be large airline demand; as will be discussed below, there is no reason to believe this will be true. To the detached observer, in fact, the U.S. must present an amusing spectacle—hastening to join the French, English and Russians in a headlong rush down the road to an economic and environmental debacle.

Let us accept for a moment the premise that improving the lot of the air traveller is a worthy object for government funds. What will the SST do for him? As a start, passage on an SST will be more cramped, less smooth, more expensive, and in all probability less safe than the same ride on the Boeing 747 or air bus with which the SST must compete. It will be more cramped because supersonic aerodynamics requires a long, slender fuselage for efficiency in an aircraft of this type, and economics requires that there be lots of seats crammed into it. The flight will be less smooth because a long,

flexible fuselage interacts particularly violently with gusts and turbulence in the air through which it passes, and because small bumps at 600 mph become jackhammer jolts at three times the speed. (Concerned aeronautical engineers assure us that the ride can in principle be smoothed somewhat with the use of sophisticated "feedback" techniques; these are expensive, however, and neither Boeing nor the government seems inclined to up the price of an already scandalously expensive technological experiment.) As it stands, the cost per seat mile will be perhaps 40 per cent higher than on the Boeing 747. The speed of the SST, permitting more total flights, cannot compensate entirely for its higher purchase price and huge fuel consumption. The airlines may, of course, elect to artificially hike supersonic fares while depressing fares on the SST, forcing all air travelers to subsidize the industry's economic white elephant.

The matter of safety is more speculative, but there is every reason to suspect that the SST will not be as safe as today's jets. It will carry more fuel (and store a greater fraction of it in the fuselage) than any other commercial aircraft, thus increasing the hazard from fire. Existing problems with metal fatigue are far more ominous for an SST: the structure is subjected to greater stresses at supersonic speeds, there are aggravated by surface temperatures approaching 500°F, and we have relatively little experience with the fatigue behavior of the titanium-alloy components which the SST requires. The SST under cruise conditions will be less maneuverable than a subsonic jet, three times as fast to close the gap in potential collision situations, and far more vulnerable to loss of cabin pressure. Technology of all sorts must be stretched to build an SST—controls, lubricants, engines, sealants, brakes. In these regards, there is no backlog of military experience comparable to that which benefitted subsonic transport development. The U.S. has only one operational military aircraft capable of 1800 mph, the Lockheed SR-71, and it is much smaller than the proposed SST. The trouble-plagued and now retired XB-70, of which only two were built, provided some data on large supersonic aircraft but hardly a reassuring basis for a civilian program. The safety record of the Air Force's B-58 Hustler, capable of 1400 mph sprints but not sustained cruise there, is abysmal.

What then, will the cramped, jolted, and perhaps slightly nervous SST passenger get for his premium fare? The answer is a thirty to forty per cent reduction in travel time, if that is measured (realistically) from home to hotel, rather than runway to runway. (Note that part of the SST's speed advantage on longer flights, such as San Francisco-Tokyo, is lost because the SST must refuel in Hawaii while the Boeing 747 goes non-stop.) Whether reducing travel time further is a worthwhile goal is itself debatable. Even today's subsonic jets cause considerable disruption in the "biological clocks" of travelers crossing many time zones. A number of corporations and even governments forbid their representatives to transact business for 48 hours after transoceanic flights, on the grounds that poor judgment may be part of the disorientation accompanying too rapid change of locale.

The SST does not seem destined for great passenger demand, then, even in a speed-worshipping society such as our own. For the speed, itself a mixed blessing, hardly warrants the host of discomforts and threats likely to accompany it. But if such planes are not popular with passengers, they will certainly not be popular with airlines, and the balance-of-payments argument goes out the window. The airlines are presumably not

ecstatic about financing yet another generation of still more expensive aircraft in any case. They had just begun to enjoy some long-awaited profits from the Boeing 707-Douglas DC-8 generation of jets when the smaller jets and jumbos came along to plunge them deep into debt again. The SST, following so close on the jumbos' heels, could easily be the financial death blow for any number of airlines, yet they feel locked into this destructive course by competition and, now, government pressure.²

The government's position on the SST is so absurd as to be inexplicable. Its "loan" to Boeing and the engine manufacturers will not be repaid until at least 300 SST's are sold, and it will take 500 sales for the manufacturers to come up with the agreed upon interest. If, against staggering odds, any substantial passenger demand for the SST actually materializes, it is implausible that the airlines could finance this number of 60 million dollar aircraft. It is impossible that such a market could exist without flying the SST supersonically over populated areas, and one can only conclude that the government intends to permit this despite its pathetically transparent hedges to the contrary.

So many competent groups have discredited the economic "arguments" in favor of the SST that there is no need to do more than quote a few of them here. The President's own Ad Hoc Review Committee on the SST³ concluded, on the balance of payments:

"If the U.S. overall balance of payments is considered, there is substantial reason for delay in proceeding to the next stage of the SST project."

The Committee argued that, if the plane did happen to sell, the increase in American tourist expenditures abroad would more than cancel the effect of SST purchases by foreign airlines. On the alleged benefits to the U.S. employment situation, the Committee reported:

"Very few unskilled workers will be required . . . such employment should not be considered as a justification for proceeding with the program but only as a dividend from it."

Others have pointed out that it is easy to "create" jobs—war does so, as do vandals, arsonists, and hijackers. The more difficult matter, in which the SST fails so miserably, is to create jobs in a way which benefits society.

In a report released August 19, 1970, the joint House-Senate Subcommittee on Economy in Government stated that "No further support of the SST development program is justified at this time", continuing that "it is entirely possible that the government will recover none of (its) investment." Still other critical reports by competent authorities exist, but have been suppressed by the administration. And a group of America's foremost economists, including J. K. Galbraith, Paul Samuelson, Milton Friedman, and Walter Heller, recently concluded that the SST program is utterly without economic merit.⁴

If the government feels it must pour money into commercial aviation, there are ample genuine needs to fill. The air traffic control system is overloaded and its radar antiquated. Collision avoidance systems for all commercial, military, and private aircraft should be developed, short-take-off-and-landing (STOL) aircraft to service population concentrations are needed, and desperately needed rapid transit systems would re-

² See, e.g., "For the SST, a Case of Over-sell?", Wall Street Journal, Sept. 9, 1970.

³ Released Oct. 31, 1969 after having been withheld since its completion in March of that year.

⁴ New York Times, Sept. 16, 1970.

¹ William F. Baxter, —Stanford Law Review, Nov. 1968, p. 1.

duce travel time for air passengers as well as everybody else.

As the foregoing arguments have indicated, there would be no valid case for proceeding with the SST program even if it were free of environmental liabilities. It is not. The now well-publicized sonic boom is an inevitable consequence of supersonic flight through the atmosphere. It is to be emphasized that the boom is created continuously (rather than only when the plane passes through the "sound barrier"), and that a supersonically cruising SST will therefore lay down a carpet or swath of booms—some fifty miles wide—for the entire length of its flight path. There is abundant evidence that the boom at "standard" intensities will be intolerable to a considerable fraction of the exposed population, and that damage to property will also result. I refer to "standard" intensities because it also happens that sonic booms can be magnified by atmospheric conditions, by maneuvers of the SST itself, and by the coincidence of the shock waves from more than one such aircraft. It has been shown that a two-fold magnification can be expected to occur about 0.1 per cent of the time, which corresponds to an area of 125 square miles from the 125,000 square miles "boomed" on every coast-to-coast flight. (As noted above, the government's assertion that supersonic flights will not be permitted over land is not to be taken seriously.)

Additionally, the sideline noise of the SST on takeoff and landing will be unbearable—some 40 times more intense at 1500 feet than the proposed FAA standard for subsonic jets (which is itself at a level which most people find intolerable.) Finally, the responsible bodies which have considered the matter have most recently been unwilling to place any bets on whether a fleet of SST's will substantially alter climates. The introduction of vast quantities of water vapor (a combustion product) into the stratosphere might increase cloud cones, and even if it did not would certainly increase stratospheric humidity. Both phenomena could affect the global energy balance and circulation patterns. Nor is the effect of the SST's combustion products on the stratospheric ozone concentration well understood. While it seems unlikely that any significant reduction in the amount of ozone present would result, the potential consequences should dictate caution: ozone is our principal protection against ultraviolet radiation from the sun; ultraviolet radiation can be deadly to exposed animals, including man.

The SST, then, is a technological circus *par excellence*. The air traveller doesn't need it, the airlines don't need it, and society certainly does not. If the government claims to need it, one can only ask, whom does the government purport to represent? Indeed, the only *frank* argument which has been advanced for building the SST is that it would challenge the ingenuity of our engineers—we must build it because it can be done. We could perhaps permit our technologists such amusements if there were not real and crying needs for their talents, and if the circuses were not to be pursued with vast amounts of public funds. That this swindle is being justified with specious economic arguments and sanctified with empty words like "prestige" and "leadership", and that it will subject a helpless populace to insufferable sounds and further environmental gambles turns the merely bizarre into the absolutely incredible.

The ultimate responsibility for this debacle must of course rest with government. Engineers do not control the allocation of funds, and if they often advocate projects of less than optimum social utility, society must trust its elected representatives to choose more wisely. Continued governmental support of the SST program, a monument to misplaced priorities, suggests that our trust has been abused.

DOD DECLASSIFIES TWO DOCUMENTS RELATING TO COLLECTION OF INFORMATION ON CIVILIANS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. REID of New York, Mr. Speaker, on February 24, the Department of Defense declassified the two basic documents setting forth its plan for the collection of information about civilians who may be involved in civil disturbances.

Officially entitled "Annex B—Intelligence—to the Department of the Army Civil Disturbance Plan" and "Department of the Army Civil Disturbance Information Collection Plan," these documents show the full extent of the Army's pervasive intelligence collection activities during several months in 1968 in which no military or civilian official blew the whistle on these operations. Reading these documents convinced me more than ever that the military has no business in this area in the first place.

I have been urging for some time that DOD remove the "confidential" designation on these documents because I believe that the American people are entitled to know all the facts. I am inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in their entirety so that all Members will have the opportunity to see for themselves the precise Army directives concerning surveillance of civilians.

I particularly appreciate the thoughtfulness of Secretary Resor in discussing and answering questions on the facts and ramifications of this matter. In addition I am grateful that Secretary Resor and General Council Buzhardt urged the declassification of some of this material.

The material follows:

ANNEX B (INTELLIGENCE) TO DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CIVIL DISTURBANCE PLAN (U)

Reference: Maps, Civil Disturbance Planning Packets (where available) or special editions of commercial map reproductions provided by Army Map Service.

1. (C) Situation

a. General

(1) Civil disturbances which are beyond the control of municipal or state authorities may occur at any time; however, in the past the majority have been a summer occurrence. The majority will probably continue to occur in hot weather which is particularly unsettling in crowded, urban centers. Dissatisfaction with national policy manifested in the anti-draft and anti-Vietnam demonstrations, and the environmental conditions contributing to racial unrest and civil disturbances in the United States are recognized factors within the political and social structure. As such, they might provide a preconditioned base for a steadily deteriorating situation leading to demonstrations and violent attacks upon the social order. The consistency and intensity of those preconditions could lead in time to a situation of true insurgency should external subversive forces develop successful control of the situation. Federal military intervention may be ordered to save life and property, alleviate suffering, and restore law and order.

(2) Analysis of civil disturbances: see OACSI, DA, Counterintelligence Research

Project, CI Special Study, subject: Civil Disturbances CONUS—1967 (U), dated 31 July 1967.

b. Dissident Elements

(1) Civil rights movements

Although widespread, civil disturbances have occurred as individual, localized actions apparently resulting more from a general climate of opinion than from specific convert orders from a single source. There is no indication of directional control by any single organization, nor does any one organization appear to have sufficient authority or power to exercise such control. An effective consolidation of organizations or the formation of a supra-control agency could alter the situation in a short time and provide an improved capability for the development of subversive direction of civil disturbances. Meaningful degrees of subversive influence and organized control are distinct future possibilities in the United States civil disturbance problem.

(2) Anti-Vietnam/Anti-Draft Movements

Anti-Vietnam and anti-draft movements have increased in scope and number in the past two years. Protests against war have been common for many years and have generally followed the pattern of marching, picketing, and distributing literature by individual groups. The first nation-wide attempt to coordinate these peace movements was effectively made in the spring of 1966 by the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (SMC). In 1966 the SMC coordinated and staged anti-war rallies in San Francisco, New York City, and a number of minor demonstrations in other cities. Because of the success of the SMC's initial endeavor, the anti-war movement established the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (NMC) to act as a permanent coordinating committee for demonstrations. Originally distinct from, but aligned with the NMC in ideology, were the anti-war/anti-draft groups. At the present time, even though the anti-war/anti-draft groups profess individuality and separation from other groups, their similarity of aims and actions operate to have almost the force and effect of an interlocking directorate similar to the NMC. Very strong support to the anti-war movement is also forthcoming from such "left" groups as the Communist Party, USA (CPUSA), the CPUSA youth front group, the W.E.B. Du Bois Clubs of America (DCA), the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), Youth Against War and Fascism, the Progressive Labor Party and a veritable host of smaller organizations. Tactics of the various organizations have undergone a change from passive actions to more militant actions, with "direct confrontations" now the main objective. Although the majority of anti-war protesters appear reluctant, for moral, practical, or legal reasons, to engage in public demonstrations of a nature which violate existing laws, there is a significant minority of professional agitators and young students who advocate either violent action or so-called disobedience of such a nature that violence is almost sure to ensue. Although many of the more articulate voices in the peace movement counsel against illegal actions, it appears that they have slight influence on those persons already committed to such action.

(3) Subversive Conspiratorial Aspects

a. Peace Movement

Although it cannot be substantiated that the anti-war and the anti-draft movements are acting in response to foreign direction, it must be pointed out that by their activities they are supporting the stated objectives of foreign elements which are detrimental to the USA. Many leaders of the anti-war and anti-draft movement have traveled to foreign countries, including Cuba, East Europe and North Vietnam to meet with Communist leaders. Therefore, the possibility ex-

ists that these individuals may be either heavily influenced or outright dominated by their foreign contacts. They may, in turn, influence their followers, the majority of whom have no sympathy for the Communist cause, but are unaware of their leaders' affiliations. Groups, such as The Resistance and the Students for Democratic Society (SDS), have openly announced their continuing intention to violate the law by aiding and abetting individuals desiring to criminally evade the draft. Both these groups have become increasingly more militant and are co-sponsors of illegal demonstrations against the draft, the military, and civilian and government recruiters on college campuses.

b. Civil Rights Movement

The Progressive Labor Party (PLP), a Marxist-Leninist group, was able to capitalize on an incident in order to spur Negroes to violence in Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, New York City in 1964. Another Communist oriented, Marxist-Leninist group, the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) has been shown to be conspiring to commit murder and wanton acts of vandalism. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and in particular its chairman, H. Rap Brown, has been instrumental in aggravating tense situations in ghetto areas and in prolonging civil disorder. (While most civil rights leaders are moderates and the majority of the Negro population abhors violence, a sufficient number of individuals seem susceptible to the violent rallying cries of the militants to make these individuals dangerous to society.)

c. Friendly Forces

USCONARC and CONUS Armies, and the U.S. Army Intelligence Command support the Department of the Army by continuing current reporting of information on civil disturbances.

2. (C) Essential elements of information (EEI). All CONUS-based major Army commands and subordinate commands will report information as obtained to satisfy Department of the Army EEI relative to:

a. Plans, operations, deployment, tactics, techniques, and capabilities of individuals, groups or organizations whose efforts are to reduce U.S. military capabilities through espionage, sabotage, subversion, treason, propaganda and other disruptive operations.

b. Patterns, techniques, and capabilities of subversive elements in cover and deception efforts in civil disturbance situations.

c. Civil disturbance incidents or disorders which involve CONUS military installations or personnel.

d. Thefts of significant quantities of weapons and ammunition from civilian companies or industries. Thefts of significant quantities of government weapons and ammunition from Active Army, Reserve, National Guard, or ROTC installations and facilities.

e. Strikes, civil disturbances, and labor disturbances which affect military installations, or other strikes or labor and civil disturbances of sufficient magnitude to indicate a probable employment of federal troops to preserve or restore order.

f. Information concerning opposition that may be expected by Military Forces if called upon to maintain or restore order. Specifically, possible courses of action, methods and capabilities, weapons and support.

g. Impact or significance of changes in federal, state, or municipal laws, court decisions, referendums, amendments, executive orders, or other directives which affect minority groups.

h. Cause of civil disturbance and names of instigators and group participants.

1. Indicators of potential violence:

(1) High unemployment rate among minority groups.

(2) Noticeably heightened crime rates among minority groups.

(3) Dissatisfaction and complaints arising from disparity of average income between the whites and the non-whites.

(4) Declining rapport between law enforcement officials and minority groups.

(5) Migration of large numbers of a minority group into a city slum area.

(6) Protests of the minority community relative to conditions in slum areas, such as de facto segregation in housing and schools, lack of jobs, lack of recreational facilities, police brutality, and overcharging of goods and services by local merchants.

1. Indicators of imminent violence:

(1) Presence or participation in local activities by militant agitators.

(2) Increase in thefts and sales of weapons and ammunition.

(3) Increase in efforts of extremist, integrationist, and segregationist groups to instigate violence, e.g., increase in numbers of handbills, pamphlets, and posters urging acts of violence.

(4) Increase in number of incidents of window breaking, false fire alarms, thefts, and other harassments of damaging nature to the community.

(5) Reports and rumors of planned violence.

(6) Presence of known instigators of violence.

3. (C) ORDERS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

a. Supporting plans of USCONARC and CONUS Armies, and the U.S. Army Intelligence Command will include provisions for rapid reporting and dissemination of responses to the above EEI in the following priority consistent with appropriate security regulations:

(1) Task Force Commander

(2) Army Operations Center (AOC), DA

(3) MDW or CONUS Army wherein the disturbance is imminent or in progress.

(4) USCONARC/USARSTRIKE

(5) CINCSTRIKE

b. Commanders will insure that units and personnel are familiar with announced EEI.

c. Local liaison with federal and civilian agencies by the military intelligence operating elements of the USAINTC is encouraged.

4. (C) INTELLIGENCE AND COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

a. Information required to accomplish the mission of the Chief of Staff, US Army, will be obtained through all resources available to the commanders, to include intelligence reports, estimates, studies, and special studies prepared by the commands.

b. OACSI, DA, will prepare and disseminate reports, estimates, studies, and special studies, as appropriate, from information obtained or received at the national level.

c. The primary organization for direct support of the Department of the Army in the coverage and reporting of information on civil disturbances is the US Army Intelligence Command. The Command's operational planning will include provisions for providing civil disturbance information to the Task Force Commander upon announcement of his appointment and thereafter.

d. Upon dispatch of Personal Liaison Officer by the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, to the area of anticipated trouble, ACSI, DA, will, in turn, designate an ACSI point-of-contact (ACSI-POC) who will respond to satisfy the requirement of the Chief of Staff, Army (CofSA) Personal Liaison Officer.

5. (U) Maps—appropriate maps for the objective area will be provided by the Army Map Service.

6. (U) Counterintelligence summary (See Section 4 of the Civil Disturbance Planning Packet pertaining to the objective area and current SPIREP).

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CIVIL DISTURBANCE INFORMATION COLLECTION PLAN (ACDP) (U)

1. (U) References:

(a) JCS SM 695-63, 25 May 1963.

(b) JCS Publication 2, paragraph 40505, 40506, and 40507.

(c) DA Civil Disturbance Plan (U), 1 February 1968.

2. (C) General:

a. The Department of the Army Civil Disturbance Information Collection Plan (ACDP) provides basic guidance and direction for the planning, coordination, and employment of DA intelligence and counterintelligence resources in the collection and reporting of information pertinent to civil disturbances.

b. It is recognized that Army assistance to local or State authorities in peacetime, as well as in wartime emergency, is a long standing tradition in our country. In most instances in the past, such assistance was rendered with a minimum of advance information concerning the situation. The current civil disturbance situation dictates a change in the degree to which the Army must seek advance information concerning potential and probable trouble areas and trouble makers.

c. The Army is well aware that the overwhelming majority in both the anti-war and the racial movements are sincere Americans. It also realizes that in both groups there is a small but virulent number who are out to tear America apart. During demonstrations and disturbances these are the activists that control the violent action. These are people who deliberately exploit the unrest and seek to generate violence and terror for selfish purposes. If the Army must be used to quell violence it wants to restore law and order as quickly as possible and return to its normal protective role—to do this it must know in advance as much as possible about the well springs of violence and the heart and nerve causes of chaos. To do less means the professional violence purveyors will have a better chance to achieve their end aims—law breaking, social disintegration, chaos, violence, destruction, insurrection, revolution.

d. In obtaining the information called for in this plan the Army seeks only to collect that needed to exercise honest and sound judgment of the measures to be taken in suppressing rampant violence and restoring order—to assure that only the mildest effective measures are exercised—to insure that no overstepping of the degree of force or circumscription needed is applied—to conserve military resources and to avoid infringement on the responsibility and authority of civil government agencies—to insure pervasive vigilance for the fundamental rights of private citizens by the selective and enlightened use of force in restraint against those who are truly violating the rights of their fellow citizens.

3. (C) Mission: To procure, evaluate, interpret, and disseminate as expeditiously as possible information and intelligence relating to any actual, potential or planned demonstrations or other activities related to civil disturbances within the Continental United States (CONUS) which threaten civil order or military security or which may adversely affect the capability of the Department of the Army to perform its mission.

4. (C) Situation:

a. Possible military action required of the Army may include the commitment of federal forces to restore and maintain law and order, to enforce the laws of the United States, or to protect the rights of citizens within a State. Information required to fulfill assigned missions is obtained through liaison conducted with federal, state, and local agencies by US Army Intelligence Command (USAINTC) personnel and by the collection sources designated in Appendix B. USAINTC personnel will not be directly used to obtain civil disturbance information unless specific direction to do so has been received from Headquarters, DA. Pre-disturbance information to satisfy Army requirements will be obtained by drawing on other Federal as well as State and local sources which secure such data in the course of car-

rying out their primary duties and responsibilities.

b. When need for military intervention in a civil disturbance situation appears imminent, the Personal Liaison Officer of the Chief of Staff, US Army (PLOCofS) will be dispatched in advance of the task force to the objective area to coordinate with municipal and state officials, make an estimate of the situation, and report directly to the Chief of Staff, US Army. To fulfill his responsibilities, it is necessary that the PLOCofS have up-to-date and detailed information on the current situation in the designated area.

(1) The officer directing the USAINTC operations in the objective area will provide maximum assistance to the PLOCofS in matters of liaison, coordination, information, and other needs of the PLOCofS in accomplishing his responsibilities.

(2) Upon commitment of Army forces and/or arrival of the Personal Liaison Officer of the Chief of Staff, US Army (PLOCofS) in the objective area, US Army Intelligence Command (USAINTC) personnel are authorized to operate more actively to fulfill intelligence requirements; specifically, intensify or initiate contact with local police and government officials, civil leaders, members of private organizations, and observe demonstrations, riots, and other activities which have a bearing on the situation.

(3) USAINTC personnel will not engage in covert operations pertinent to civil disturbances without prior approval and direction of this Headquarters.

(4) During the execution of civil disturbance control operations, the USAINTC unit covering the civil disturbance responds to the EEI and other support requirements of the Task Force Commander and PLOCofS until they depart the objective area.

c. Dissemination. Information and intelligence will be disseminated without delay to higher, parallel, and subordinate headquarters in accordance with their requirements by the most expeditious means consistent with its importance and security classification.

5. (C) Execution: This plan is directive to DA elements only and is furnished to other agencies for information and coordination purposes.

a. DA Agencies: Those DA agencies indicated are requested to respond to requirements listed in Appendix B. Designated agencies may publish supplemental guidance and procedural instructions consistent with this plan. In the event such supplemental instructions are prepared, request that two copies be forwarded to the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (ACSI), DA, ATTN: ACSI-DSCD, Washington, 20310, within 30 days after publication.

b. Mutual Support Arrangements. Agencies, offices, and commands from whom mutual support arrangements will be requested are listed in Appendix B. Details of mutual support arrangements, when required, will be outlined in separate correspondence with each agency concerned and will not be made a part of this collection plan.

c. Comments and Recommendations: Users of this plan are invited and encouraged to submit recommended changes or comments to improve it. Comments should be keyed to the specific page, paragraph, and line of the text in which the change is recommended. Reasons should be provided for each comment to insure understanding and complete evaluation. Comments should be forwarded directly to the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (ACSI), DA, ATTN: ACSI-DSCD, Washington, D.C. 20310.

6. (U) Priorities: Civil disturbance information collection priorities are contained in Appendix C.

7. (U) Distribution:

a. Distribution list is contained in Appendix D.

b. Addresses are requested to make dis-

tribution of this plan within their respective agencies and commands. Reproduction of this document in whole or in part is authorized to meet the requirements of individual addressees.

APPENDIX A: REPORTING ON "THRESHOLDS OF CONTROL" FACTORS

1. (FOUO) Violence which is beyond the control of local authorities does not exist solely as a function of the number of incidents. Rather it exists as a function of the commitment of those reserves available to local civil commanders, the capabilities of their personnel, the rate at which the reserves are being used up, compared to the "staying power" of the disturbance causers, the trends in the character of the disorder, and the interpretations of those specific incidents which reflect on the moods and possible courses of future action by the groups involved in both sides of the disturbance. For example, an outbreak of incidents far in excess of normal levels may not constitute an emergency if local authorities have not committed all of their reserves. In most large cities, with many reserves such as off-duty personnel and personnel from unaffected areas, and a well ordered system of commitment and shifting of resources, this type of situation could perhaps be handled routinely. Conversely, an outbreak of incidents not greatly above normal levels which was sustained for a prolonged period could prove to be an emergency, if the reserves available to civil commanders were committed and exhausted at a rate greater than that at which they could be relieved and rested. A large outbreak of fires may be handled routinely by a fire department that can draw on the reserves of surrounding areas, but a small outbreak may be disastrous if other factors are considered: for example, in the event firemen refused to answer alarms in areas where snipers were active, it could result in the spreading of fires which under normal circumstances could have been easily controlled. The point at which control by civil authorities can no longer be maintained is considered to be the "threshold of control."

2. (FOUO) Thus, the best collectors and analysts are the civil commanders and experts on the scene: the fire and police chiefs, the city managers and like officials. Such individuals will not be expert at predicting the exact course of future events, as has been proved in past riots, but they will be the authorities on the commitment and capabilities of their reserves, the character of the disorder, and the moods of the hostile minority groups. They will differentiate between normal incidents and incident levels, and disturbance incidents and incident levels, without resorting to numerical manipulation. They will make judgments based on consideration of all of these important numeric and non-numeric factors, and their past experience with all elements involved. A police commissioner may not be able to cite the statistics on arrests, fires, false alarms, or looting in his area on an hour-to-hour basis. But he may be able to report with reliability, that "if these incidents continue at this level for six more hours, my men just will not be able to handle it without help."

3. (C) The Counterintelligence Spot Report System concentrates on incident reporting. Such information is needed in order to chart the course and tempo of an ongoing civil disturbance and keep the responsible military authorities advised of the scale and character of the disorder. However, in addition to the spot reports, information is needed regarding the capabilities of local civil officials to maintain control. Such information will be of great assistance to federal authorities in anticipating the point at which local and state agencies are no longer able to cope with a violent civil disturbance.

4. (C) Liaison with those individuals and agencies who can be expected to have in-depth pictures of the situation, the problems, and the maintenance of order is, in most cases, already established. If these sources are used to provide information regarding advance planning, reserves, commitments, personnel capabilities and limitations, trends in the character of the disorder, and the ability to contain continuing violent disturbances, the picture of future developments and requirements will become clearer than would be the case with incident-by-incident reporting alone.

5. (C) The types of information contained in Appendix B, Section II, Activities During Civil Disturbance, will provide the Federal authorities with the information necessary to weigh the capacity of the civil officials to maintain control of the disturbance.

APPENDIX B TO DA CIVIL DISTURBANCE INFORMATION COLLECTION PLAN (ACDP) COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS

1. (U) Headquarters, Department of the Army civil disturbance information collection requirements are stated in this appendix. [These requirements reflect the information which DA requires for the effective discharge of its mission.]

2. (C) DA collection agencies who are requested to respond to specific requirements are indicated by the symbols listed below and as annotated on pages B-3 thru B-16. DA collectors are also requested to report information pertinent to other requirements that may be obtained as a by-product of their other activities:

- A. Continental Army Command (CONARC)
- B. US Army Intelligence Command (USAINTC)
- C. The Provost Marshal General (TPMG)
- D. Commander-in-Chief, US Army Forces, Strike (CINCARSTRIKE)
- E. The National Guard Bureau (NGB)
- F. US Army Security Agency (USASA)
- G. Other DA Agencies in CONUS
- H. Major US Army Oversea Commands

3. (C) Other Department of Defense Agencies, as indicated by symbols below, are requested to report to DA, as soon as obtained, any relevant information which they obtain pertinent to these collection requirements:

- I. Department of the Navy
- J. Department of the Air Force
- K. Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
- L. Other Department of Defense Agencies

4. (C) The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is requested to provide information and reports which are relevant to those collection requirements annotated with the symbol "M."

5. (C) Requests to cooperating agencies for information: The following US Government agencies are requested to furnish to the Department of the Army, as soon as obtained, any information which is pertinent to the collection requirements stated herein:

- Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)
- Subversive Activities Control Board
- Department of Transportation
- US Coast Guard
- Department of the Treasury
 - (a) Office of the Special Assistant (Enforcement)
 - (b) US Customs
 - (c) Bureau of Narcotics
 - (d) US Secret Service
 - (e) Internal Revenue Service: Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division.
- Department of Justice
 - (a) Community Relations Service
 - (b) Civil Rights Division
 - (c) Internal Security Division
 - (d) Federal Bureau of Investigation
 - (e) Inter-division Information Unit
 - (f) Immigration and Naturalization Service: U.S. Border Patrol
- Atomic Energy Commission (AEC)
- General Services Administration (GSA)

AREAS OF COVERAGE AND COLLECTION AGENCIES—Continued

Requirement	Military District of Washington	1st U.S. Army Area	3d U.S. Army Area	4th U.S. Army Area	5th U.S. Army Area	6th U.S. Army Area	Other areas
3. Postdisturbance activities.							
a. Activities following civil disturbance:							
(1) Is disturbance likely to recur?	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	
(2) When can it be expected to break out again? In what locations? In what form? To what degree?	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	
(3) Are factors that precipitated the outbreak still present? What factors? To what extent do they still exist?	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	
(4) What is attitude of minority groups who participated?	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	
(5) Have militant agitators and other leaders left the area of civil disturbance? Where are they currently located?	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	A,B,C,D,M	

Requirement	USAREUR	USARPAC	USARSO	OTHER
4. International activities related to civil disturbances (Civil disturbance group relationship, international):				
a. Manifestations of support by "peace" organizations or other organizations in either Communist or non-Communist countries.	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	I,J,K,L
(1) Name of organization demonstrating support	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	I,J,K,L
(2) Leaders	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	I,J,K,L
(3) Number of participants	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	I,J,K,L
(4) Nature of protest activities	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	I,J,K,L
(5) Salient features of protest, if any	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	I,J,K,L
b. Exploitation of U.S. prisoners-of-war and internees by foreign countries in support of civil disturbance in CONUS. All available details.	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	I,J,K,L
c. Exploitation of U.S. deserters and defectors by foreign countries in support of civil disturbance in CONUS. All available details.	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	C,H,I,J,K	I,J,K,L

APPENDIX C: CIVIL DISTURBANCE INFORMATION COLLECTION PRIORITIES

1. (C) Priority Assignment Base. The Priority Assignment Base (PAB) consists of numerical priorities from 1 through 3. Within each priority, three subpriorities (A, B, C) are established to indicate further the relative degree of urgency for satisfying a requirement. The criteria on which priorities and subpriorities have been determined are shown below:

a. Priorities:

(1) Priority 1: Information concerning the existing civil disturbance/subversion threat against U.S. national interests, the realization of which could result in large-scale riots involving U.S. forces. This category of information is of such importance as to warrant maximum increased effort.

(2) Priority 2: Information concerning a potential civil disturbance/subversion threat against U.S. national interests, resulting from nationwide local racial incidents, deliberate provocations or regional difficulties which could result in limited involvement of U.S. forces. This category of information is of such importance as to warrant moderate increased effort.

(3) Priority 3: Information concerning natural phenomena and human adaptations, their interrelationships and effects on the civil disturbance situation in the nation. Collection of this information warrants routine effort.

b. Subpriorities:

(1) A—Items requiring action before subpriority B or C items.

(2) B—Items requiring action after subpriority A but before subpriority C items.

(3) C—Items requiring action after subpriority A and B items.

2. (C) Priority Intelligence Objectives. Department of the Army priority civil disturbance intelligence objectives to be supported by this plan are stated below:

a. Priority 1:

(1) Maximum prior warning of an impending major civil disturbance outbreak in the United States.

(2) Major developments in the composition, disposition, and capabilities of dissident/subversive groups in the United States.

b. Priority 2:

(1) Plans, activities and capabilities of dissident/subversive organizations to create disturbances and effect arson, demolition, vandalism and other disruptive activities against property and persons of particular interest to the U.S. Government.

(2) Present and prospective dissident/subversive capabilities to initiate or support civil disturbances, subversive and paramilitary operations in the United States.

(a) Contact with dissident and subversive elements in target areas and support of such elements' activities.

(b) Logistic support to anti-Government elements.

(3) Major developments in the composition, disposition and capabilities of subversive/dissident groups.

(a) Organization

(b) Strength, location

(c) Support

(4) Vulnerabilities of local and state governments to penetration, internal subversion and overthrow, through violence or other illegal means, by subversive/dissident groups and biographic data on current, key leaders of such groups.

(5) Nature and extent of insurgency potential in low income, racially troubled areas.

(6) Extent and nature of Communist aid to dissident/subversive groups.

(7) Intra-group relations and schisms; extent and nature of internal resistance and disagreement within subversive/dissident organizations.

(8) Circumstances, trends and occurrences that substantially affect capabilities of subversive/dissident groups to create civil disturbances, including acquisition of arms and enactment of new legislation.

c. Priority 3:

(1) Routine developments in the composition, disposition and capabilities of subversive/dissident groups.

(2) Circumstances, trends and occurrences that routinely affect capabilities of subversive/dissident groups to create civil disturbances.

(3) Routine data on personnel, funds, resources, organization, and location of dissident/subversive groups.

(4) Other information concerning civil disturbances that requires routine collection effort.

TABLE OF COLLECTION PRIORITIES

Subject	Key cities	Other areas, United States	Other areas, foreign	Subject	Key cities	Other areas, United States	Other areas, foreign
(1) PREDISTURBANCE ACTIVITIES				(b) Activities preceding planned civil disturbance:			
(a) Indicators of threatening violence in community having a discontented populace:				(1) Probable causes, locations, and objectives of disturbances	1B		1B
(1) Presence of militant outside agitators	1B	1C		(2) Probable types of persons who will create or participate in disturbances	1B		1B
(2) Increase in thefts and sales of arms and ammunition	1B	1B		(3) Probable numbers of persons who will create or participate in disturbances	1B		1B
(3) Increase in efforts of minority extremist groups to instigate violence	1B	1B		(4) Probable assembly areas or routes	1B		1B
(4) Sharp increase in number of incidents of violence such as thefts, window breaking, false alarms, muggings, arson	1B	1B		(5) Known leaders, overt and behind-the-scenes	1B		1B
(5) Reports and rumors of planned violence	1B	1B		(6) Plans, activities, and organization prepared by leaders	1B		1B
(6) Increase in activity of extremist groups	1B	1B		(7) Friends and sympathizers of participants, including newspapers, radio, television stations, and prominent leaders	1C	1C	
(7) Sharp increase in absentee rate of discontented minority workers	1B	1B		(8) Location of arms and supplies available to rioters	1B	1B	
(8) Increase in number of incidents of resisting arrest; gathering crowds at scenes of arrest	1B	1B		(9) Location of arms and supplies liable to seizure by rioters	1C	1C	
(9) Increase in charges of police brutality, resentment of law enforcement	1B	1B		(10) Important buildings that may be threatened	1C	1C	
(10) Increase in gang activity; antisocial activity of minority group members	1B	1B		(11) Location of communications systems, public utilities, and stores of volatile fuel	2C	2C	
(11) Increase in assaults on police/firemen	1B	1B		(12) Threat to Federal property	1C	1C	
				(13) Identity of DA personnel (civilian or military) who may be involved on side of disturbers	1C	1C	

TABLE OF COLLECTION PRIORITIES—Continued

Subject	Key cities	Other areas, United States	Other areas, foreign	Subject	Key cities	Other areas, United States	Other areas, foreign
(1) PREDISTURBANCE ACTIVITIES—Continued				(2) ACTIVITIES DURING CIVIL DISTURBANCE			
(c) Indicators of potential violence:				(m) Logistics: Sources of supplies, weapons, vehicles. Location, stocks, capacities of stockpiles. Method of resupply.....	2C	2C	2C
(1) High unemployment rate for discontented minority groups.....	2C	2C		(2) ACTIVITIES DURING CIVIL DISTURBANCE			
(2) High crime rates for minority groups.....	2C	2C		(a) Activities During a Civil Disturbance:			
(3) Disparity of average income between white and non-white.....	2C	2C		(1) Location of violence.....	1A	1A	
(4) Poor relations between law and minorities.....	2C	2C		(2) Identification of participants and leaders.....	1A	1A	
(5) Migrations of minorities into cities.....	2C	2C		(2) Specific aims and roles. Coordination with other minority groups and dissident organizations. Support obtained from agencies.....	2B	2B	2B
(6) Lack of means to redress grievances.....	2C	2C		(f) Capabilities and vulnerabilities of dissident groups; Evidence of strengths and weaknesses in terms of effectiveness to create civil disturbance situations, to expand activities to meet emergencies, to enlarge potential for disturbance, and to maintain own internal security.....	2C	2C	2C
(7) Protests of minority community to conditions.....	2B	2B		(g) Funds: Source and extent of funds, how are funds distributed, and general purposes for which funds are used.....	2C	2C	2C
(8) Efforts by minority groups to upset balance of power and political system.....	2B	2B		(h) Organization of dissident groups:			
(9) Failure of law enforcement agencies to properly respond.....	2B	2B		(1) High Command. Composition and structure of headquarters. Relationship to other agencies. Exact titles, location of functions and responsibilities, lines of authority, organization charts. Rosters of key personnel.....	2A	2A	2A
(10) Inequitable law enforcement.....	2B	2B		(12) The direction of the disturbance; whether anti-authority, anti-white, or undirected.....	1A	1A	
(11) Public apathy or negative reaction to civil rights issues and impartial law enforcement.....	2B	2B		(13) The trends of riot connected activity; sniping, looting, bombing.....	1A	1A	
(d) Evidence of subversion:				(14) The types of attacks on authorities; rock throwing, sniping.....	1A	1A	
(1) Formation of covert subversive organizations.....	1C	1C	1C	(15) The reactions of authority to attacks; whether withdrawing or counterattacking.....	1A	1A	
(2) Evidence of or attempts by subversive organizations to penetrate and control civil rights or militant organizations.....	1C	1C	1C	(16) The authorization for use of riot control equipment.....	1A	1A	
(3) Collaboration between subversive groups and non-white organizations.....	1C	1C	1C	(17) The riot control equipment presently in use.....	1A	1A	
(4) Assistance to non-white militant groups from outside the United States.....	1C	1C	1C	(18) The use of mass media to influence civil disturbance elements.....	1A	1A	
(5) Indications of movement into extremist, integrationist and segregationist groups by the Communist Party and other subversive organizations.....	1C	1C	1C	(19) The refusal of local agency personnel to respond in disturbed areas or while under fire.....	1A	1A	
(6) Aims and activities of groups attempting to create, prolong or aggravate tensions.....	1C	1C	1C	(20) The presence of news media representatives in the disturbed area.....	1A	1A	
(e) Purposes and objectives of dissident groups:				(21) The effect of news media representatives in the disturbed area.....	1A	1A	
(1) Overall purpose and objectives. Long-term and short-term objectives and relationship to problems of minority groups and the country. Estimates of plans and objectives; capabilities; resources to be employed.....	2B	2B	2B	(22) The extent of reporting from the disturbed area, and its sources.....	1A	1A	
(3) Targets or planned targets of violence, burning or looting.....	1A	1A		(23) The communications with personnel in the disturbed area.....	1A	1A	
(4) Patterns of violence that suggest organization.....	1A	1A		(24) The emergence of spokesmen for the minority element.....	1A	1A	
(5) Indications of participation or instigation by subversives.....	1A	1A		(25) The indication of organization of the rioters.....	1A	1A	
(6) Expected duration of disturbance.....	1A	1A		(26) The presence of militant leaders and their activities.....	1A	1A	
(7) Motive for the disturbance. Anti-authority? Anti-white? Mixed?.....	1A	1A		(27) The efforts to instigate or perpetuate violence.....	1A	1A	
(8) The reserves committed by local agency commanders in the current situation.....	1A	1A		(3) POSTDISTURBANCE ACTIVITIES			
(9) The effects on the current situation of reserves that have been committed.....	1A	1A		(a) Activities following civil disturbances:			
(10) The projected effects of reserves that have been requested but not yet committed.....	1A	1A		(1) Is disturbance likely to recur?.....	1B	1C	
(11) The ability of the forces currently on the scene to contain the area and intensity of the disturbance.....	1A	1A		(2) When can it be expected to break out again? Where? In what form? To what degree?.....	1B	1C	
(2) Subordinate Elements. Administration, organization, functions, responsibilities, principal and alternate locations, strengths, facilities, lines of authority organization, and key personnel.....	2A	2A		(3) Are factors that precipitated the outbreak still present? What factors? To what extent do they still exist?.....	1B	1C	
(f) Tactics and strategy of dissident organizations: How are civil disturbances and related actions planned and executed? Nature and scope of tactics and strategy. Proposed or planned deviation from usual or accepted tactics.....	2C	2C		(4) What is attitude of minority groups who participated?.....	1B	1C	
(g) Personnel:				(5) Have militant agitators and other leaders left the area of civil disturbance? Where are they currently located?.....	1B	1C	
(1) Number of active members; breakdown of membership by ethnic group, age, education, economic status, criminal record, and biographic data on key members.....	2B	2B		(4) INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES RELATED TO CIVIL DISTURBANCES			
(2) Potential for increasing membership, numbers of persons, source of members.....	3A	3A		(a) Manifestations of support by "peace" organizations or other organizations in either Communist or non-Communist countries.....			1B
(3) Women members. Age, position, and authority within group. Biographic data.....	3A	3A		(1) Name of organization demonstrating support.....			1B
(4) Pay. What members receive pay? Are expenses reimbursed? Source of funds.....	3A	3A		(2) Leaders.....			1B
(k) Administration: How is organization supervised and controlled? Who is responsible for correspondence and related action? Does organization produce publications? Identify.....	2C	2B		(3) Number of participants.....			1B
(l) Training: Are skills useful in civil disturbances taught, e.g., fabrication of Molotov cocktails, firearms? Communication training. Countersurveillance, other countermeasures. Clandestine skills (infrared photog, SW). Training, areas, instructors. Sources of training support.....	2C	2C		(4) Nature of protest activities.....			1B
				(5) Salient features of protest, if any.....			1B
				(b) Exploitation of U.S. prisoners of war and internees by foreign countries in support of CONUS civil disturbances. All available details.....			1C
				(c) Exploitation of U.S. deserters and defectors by foreign countries in support of CONUS civil disturbances. All available details.....			1C

1 As relates to civil disturbances only.

APPENDIX D (DISTRIBUTION) TO DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CIVIL DISTURBANCE INFORMATION COLLECTING PLAN (ACDP) (U)

Organization:	Number of copies
OJCS	3
DN	3
DAF	3
USMC	2
USSTRICOM	3
DSA	1
DIA	3
DCA	3
USCONARC	3
USARSTRIKE	5
USAREUR	2
USARPAC	2
USARSO	2
USARAL	2

Organization:	Number of copies	Organization:	Number of copies
USAEDC	2	III CORPS	3
USAINTC	20	XVIII AIRBORNE CORPS	3
USAINTS	2	2D ARMORED DIVISION	2
USAMC	5	5TH INFANTRY DIVISION (MECHANIZED)	2
USARADCOM	7	82D AIRBORNE DIVISION	2
USASCC	3	DA	103
USASA	3	SA	(2)
USASA School	2	CofSA	(2)
MTMTS	2	VCofSA	(2)
FIRST US ARMY	2	SGS	(2)
THIRD US ARMY	2	DCSPER	(2)
FOURTH US ARMY	2	DCSLOG	(2)
FIFTH US ARMY	2	DCSOPS	(2)
SIXTH US ARMY	2	ACSI	(15)
SEVENTH US ARMY	2	ACSFOR	(2)
EIGHTH US ARMY	2	ACSC-E	(2)
MDW	3	CORC	(2)
USAJFKCENSPWAR (ABN)	2		

APPENDIX D.—Continued

CRD	(1)
COA	(1)
CINFO	(2)
TAG	(1)
TIG	(1)
TJAG	(1)
TPMG	(3)
TSG	(1)
CofENGRS	(2)
CofCH	(1)
OFO	(1)
*NGB	(50)
* (One copy for each CONUS State AG)	
Directorate of Civil Disturbance Plan- ning & Operations	8
USAMPS	2
USAWC	2
NWC	1
ICAF	1
DIS	1
AFSC	1
USACGSC	1
ASD (I&L)	1
Dir, Scty Policy, ASD (Admin)	1
2. Non-DOD agencies	
Organization:	
The President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board	2
National Security Council	2
United States Intelligence Board	2
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)	5
Department of Transportation	
U.S. Coast Guard	2
Department of the Treasury	5
Office of the Special Assistant (Enforcement)	(1)
United States Customs	(1)
Bureau of Narcotics	(1)
U.S. Secret Service	(1)
Internal Revenue Service, Alcohol & Tobacco Tax Division	(1)
Department of Justice	10
Community Relations Service	(1)
Civil Rights Division	(1)
Internal Security Division	(1)
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)	(3)
Interdivision Information Unit	(1)
Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Border Patrol	(2)
Atomic Energy Commission (AEC)	2
Subversive Activities Control Board	2
General Services Administration	1

NEED FOR FEDERAL REVENUE
SHARING

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the critical need for some form of Federal revenue sharing with the States has been graphically illustrated this week by the fiscal crisis in Pennsylvania. On Monday, Gov. Milton Shapp was forced to announce that the State of Pennsylvania could no longer pay its bills or meet its payroll. Some 88,000 State employees were faced with a total loss of income.

While it now appears that the immediate financial impasse will be resolved by the enactment of a State income tax; the problem is still there and it will not go away until the Congress takes action on the President's proposal for revenue sharing.

The Pennsylvania crisis was dramatic; but it was not atypical. Many other large States face similar dilemmas simply be-

cause the demand for public services is greater than the money the State can raise to provide them. It is time now to begin using the efficient tax-generating structure of the Federal Government to raise additional funds and then pass these funds on to the States and cities.

I would also add a footnote for those who favor the federalization of welfare as an alternative to revenue sharing. In the case of Pennsylvania, welfare payments, since they are paid out of special funds, would not have been affected by the cutoff in State spending. The crisis was in the area of delivering public services to the citizens of Pennsylvania and this was where revenue sharing would have helped. I hope in the near future we will have such aid.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS—
A TRIBUTE TO QUIET COURAGE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 1970 marks the beginning of the Disabled American Veterans sixth decade of service to veterans of the United States.

From a Christmas Day party in 1919, this national organization has grown to a thriving institution rendering invaluable service to our country, both in war and in the aftermath of war. Their service has come in several forms: service to disabled veterans and their dependents, sponsoring legislation for the benefit and welfare of our Nation's wartime disabled veterans and their loved ones, and support for the growing effort to secure humane treatment for our prisoners of war.

These men know war, and as our own General Sherman stated:

You want to know what war is? War is hell.

The members of DAV know this and they know that our manifest destiny rests upon peace—peace with honor. It is the noblest aspiration of Americans who love their country. It is for this cause that our sons and comrades have given themselves in battle.

The goal of peace, and the achievements of our country are also the truest monuments and highest tributes we can pay those heroes who have served our Nation so well. Their contribution toward saving our Republic, and their great deeds and duty, so nobly completed, will never cease to be prized by a grateful country.

There comes to mind the words of Abraham Lincoln:

Let us strive on to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan.

Lincoln was reminding us that it was not enough that we should merely remember those who served in our behalf. We have an additional obligation. While we have little power to repay our war dead directly, we can and should honor

them by making certain that we have adequately provided for their families and for their comrades who survive.

We have taken some steps in paying this debt—but we must realize that much remains to be done. Present medical care is not adequate; present levels of pensions and compensation are not sufficient; educational assistance benefits are not at a level to cover the cost of education.

With the help of the Disabled American Veterans organization, we will achieve the great goals as presented by those who know war and know that our obligation to our comrades who served, is never over.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY HENKIN ON
"THE SELLING OF THE PENTA-
GON"

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert into the RECORD a copy of a letter I have today received from Daniel Z. Henkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, concerning the CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon."

The letter speaks for itself. Also inserted is a copy of a press release which CBS issued on March 12, 1962.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D.C., March 3, 1971.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,

Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You asked me yesterday when we were luncheon guests at the National Press Club to send you a letter giving you my overall assessment of and comments about the CBS program, "Selling of the Pentagon."

First, I want to make four points:

1. The Pentagon is not for sale.
2. The men and women in the Department of Defense, military and civilian, are not for sale.
3. Our national security is not for sale.
4. And not for sale either, is the right of a free press to criticize the Pentagon.

I am aware that you have asked us a number of detailed questions about this show, which was eleven months in the making. I will have answers to these detailed questions for you shortly.

There are some who might question our right to have spent thousands of dollars and hundreds of manhours in assisting CBS to produce this show. But I believe most emphatically that such assistance was appropriate and that we have the responsibility and obligation to provide such help.

We have completed a preliminary analysis so that we could accurately respond to your questions, including those related to truthfulness and professional ethics.

There are a number of factual errors. These errors range from the erroneous statement that there are 30,000 offices in the Pentagon—actually there are about 5,000—to important errors and distortions. As an example, the program asserts that a military officer in a public statement at Peoria, Illinois, made an inappropriate personal comment related to foreign policy. Actually the officer was reading a quotation from the Prime Minister of Laos. I think you will agree that this distortion misinformed the viewers of that pro-

gram who were led to believe they were hearing one U.S. military officer's personal view rather than a quotation from Souvanna Phouma of Laos.

The CBS Report gives considerable attention to a number of troop information films made and cleared for public release nearly a decade ago, but currently available to the public under provisions of the Congressionally-approved Freedom of Information Act. I know that as a former city editor and longtime member of the Congress, you share with me a strong conviction that the Freedom of Information Act should be supported, and that we at the Pentagon should not rewrite history by destroying or suppressing previously cleared films which are requested by the public.

Interestingly, CBS uses an excerpt from a film called "Road to the Wall."

The CBS narrator did not inform his viewers that on March 12, 1962, the CBS Information Service, 485 Madison Avenue, New York City, put out a two-page press release—a copy is attached—announcing that it was producing a 45-minute documentary film for the Department of Defense on "The History and Objectives of Communism." The CBS press release quotes the Vice President, Programming, CBS Films, as describing "Road to the Wall" as "an historical treatment of the Communist Party in operation throughout the world—its doctrine, its pronouncements." CBS was, of course, paid by the Department of Defense for production of this troop information documentary.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think CBS is in the business of propaganda. Neither is the Department of Defense.

I have never questioned the integrity of CBS News, and I do not do so now. However, I do question the integrity of this particular show.

Needless to say, as a person who has spent his life in the news profession, I could not be pleased by the fact that the program's producer chose to re-arrange my words as given during an interview of more than one hour with the CBS narrator. In one instance, CBS censored the first sentence of a reply I made, and then put in two sentences which were lifted from my answer to a different question.

Additionally, I cannot help but express to you my satisfaction that the former military information officer, who bragged that he had fooled a CBS news team in Vietnam, is today a former member of the Armed Forces. I was surprised that CBS should use an individual who said he had not played squarely with them as its single military information authority on the program.

Among other distortions in the program is the footage which CBS aired depicting a daily Pentagon briefing given by my Principal Deputy, Jerry W. Friedheim.

The CBS narrator states that Mr. Friedheim "does not, of course, tell all he knows. He wouldn't have his job long if he did," the narrator says. The fact is that if Mr. Friedheim did tell all he knows, such as responding to the question asked at this session about the size of the possible multiple nuclear warheads on the Soviet SS-11 ICBM, he would be violating the law by disclosing national security information. Further, the responses made by Mr. Friedheim to numerous questions were rearranged in a manner similar to the treatment of my responses.

Let me emphasize again, Mr. Chairman, that I do not question the integrity of CBS News. My concern is with the particular show you have asked me about. In my view, this program has misled and misinformed the people who watched it.

In a free society, it is vital that a free press keeps a close and continued watch on the Department of Defense and on its information programs. We do make mistakes;

these mistakes should be brought to public attention by ourselves, and, if we fail to do this, by a vigilant free press.

Sincerely,

DANIEL Z. HENKIN.

FORTY-FIVE-MINUTE DOCUMENTARY ON HISTORY OF COMMUNISM TO BE PRODUCED BY CBS FILMS FOR DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

(Robert F. Lewine in Charge of Production for CBS Films; Producer: Robert Saudek; Writer: Don Mankiewicz)

March 12, 1962.

CBS Films Inc. will produce a 45-minute documentary film for the U.S. Department of Defense on the history and objectives of communism, it was announced today by Robert F. Lewine, Vice President, Programming, CBS Films. Mr. Lewine will serve as executive producer of the film, tentatively titled "The Road to the Wall."

Robert Saudek, whose "Omnibus" series received a total of 72 awards and who won Peabody Awards for the documentaries, "Hiroshima," "Communism—U.S. Brand" and "Clear and Present Danger," has been named by Mr. Lewine as producer of the film. Don Mankiewicz, whose novel, "The Trial," won the Harper's Prize, will write the script. Mr. Mankiewicz' previous writing credits include the screenplay for "I Want To Live" and dramas for such television series as "Playhouse 90," "Studio One," "The Kraft Television Theater" and "Armstrong Circle Theatre." He also wrote the screen version of "The Trial."

Negotiations for the production of the documentary, which is scheduled for completion in mid-April, were made by Tom Judge for CBS Films with Assistant Secretary of Defense Carlisle P. Runge, who is in charge of military manpower policies. Directly responsible for the production in behalf of the Pentagon is Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education and Manpower resources.

The film, described by Mr. Lewine as "an historical treatment of the Communist Party in operation throughout the world—its doctrine, its pronouncements," is one of the projects of a long-range, three-year military information program by the Defense Department. It will be distributed for showing at all military bases inside and outside the U.S.A. and will be backed with pamphlets, posters and other informational material on communism.

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT!

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in view of all the concern with protecting our citizens from the ravage and waste of flooding, I would call attention to the following editorial in the Salisbury Press Specator on Thursday, February 25, 1971.

I include the article as follows:

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT!

All indications right now point to some more damaging floods this Spring—heavy snow and ice to the north which will no doubt be swelled by the normal Spring rains. And the people in this area can look forward to the same thing they have been living with for years—crop losses, property damage and the despair that comes with seeing your potential living washed away.

Why? Because President Nixon has discriminated against this area by refusing to release \$400,000 appropriated by the Congress for flood control work on the Chariton-Little

Chariton Rivers in fiscal 1971. Let me emphasize: The U.S. Senate and The U.S. House of Representatives appropriated this amount for this project months ago. The President then reduced it to \$350,000 and then "froze" it so that not a penny can be used.

Meanwhile, one billion, three hundred million tax dollars (including tax dollars you and I are paying) will be spent for flood control and water projects in other parts of the United States. And the President is so concerned about the welfare of the states and cities that he wants to send tax money back to them to solve local problems. Still he refuses to release money *already appropriated* by the Congress to help this area, which has suffered losses of \$7,000,000 from floods in the last ten years.

Local people have worked hard and long on these projects, but they are getting discouraged. Can you blame them. This is not government for and by the people. This is dictatorial rule by one man, in direct opposition to the expressed wishes of the Congress.

What can be done? Write to Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States: The White House; Washington, D.C. He probably won't see your letter, but somebody will and maybe, just maybe, it might make a difference. Write today!

RECLAIMING THE PATUXENT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, Donald Hirzel of the Washington Evening Star, has called attention to a serious problem in the despoiling of Maryland's Patuxent River. A major cause of this is soil erosion, soil runoff, and resulting siltation of the tributary streams. Real solutions to such problems can be found through local government action; such as by good planning, zoning, and subdivision regulations to properly control subdivision development, along with adequate regulations on sand and gravel pits and on agricultural operations.

Last week I met with Federal, State, and local officials, including Paul W. McKee, director of the Maryland Department of Water Resources; Edward Webb, administrative assistant to Executive Joseph W. Alton, Anne Arundel County; and John Baumeister, of the Environmental Protection Agency, to consider steps to be taken to deal with a disgraceful soil erosion and water pollution problem at Maryland City in Anne Arundel County. Due to a lack of appropriate regulations, a tremendous mountain of dirt, covering 14 acres, along with poor storm sewers have contributed to the sedimentation and despoiling of the Patuxent River. Fortunately, Anne Arundel County Executive Alton is moving to correct these conditions by recommending an item in the county's capital budget to begin the reclamation of the exposed earth. In addition, State and county officials are working together to remedy the inadequacies of the storm drainage system.

This is an example of the type of persistent teamwork which will be necessary for the cleanup and restoration of the Patuxent.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the article from the Sunday Star of February 28, 1971:

THE POLLUTED PATUXENT: SUBURBS ARE KILLING RIVER

(By Donald Hirzel)

The Patuxent River is dying.

It was beginning to show the signs of death two centuries ago when George Washington rode across a log bridge spanning the river near what is now Laurel on a visit to Montpelier.

There were only traces of pollution then—the clear waters of the 110-mile river, which starts as a trickle in Montgomery and Howard counties, would become slightly muddy in heavy downpours.

The discoloration came from silt finding its way from poorly plowed farms that sprang up throughout the area.

But the Patuxent was still a strong river and took the abuse that came through the years. That is, until about 15 or 20 years ago.

That was when major urban development began in earnest.

Land was stripped of vegetation to make way for concrete. Sewage treatment plants were built to care for the waste of the growing population. Sand and gravel pits sprouted along the banks of the river.

SILT, SEWAGE CLOG STREAM

Today, the once graceful river is dark brown from silt, reeks of sewage in some areas, and is rapidly filling with mud, narrowing the channel and filling in marshes that were once homes for migratory water fowl and animal life.

Only the upper reaches of the river, above the Triadelphia Reservoir, are still relatively clean, thanks to good farm practices, ground cover and a thin population. There trout still can survive.

From Laurel south, man's influence is readily seen from the muddy water in the Bowie area to the green waters below Upper Marlboro which spell pollution.

As the river broadens in Charles, Calvert and St. Marys counties before joining the Chesapeake Bay at Cedar Point, much of the silt has settled and the tidal area is flushed by the tides.

But experts believe the conditions existing on the middle portions of the river eventually will affect the lower river.

CLEAN-UP NEEDED

Thomas E. Dudley of Rosaryville, in southern Prince Georges County, observed that it "may be too late to save it. We may have to go back and clean it up."

He was speaking at a meeting of the Prince Georges County Planning Board, the Patuxent River Watershed Advisory Committee and the Marlboro-Patuxent Advisory Committee. The agencies met last week to share their experiences in a year of studying ways to save the river.

Studies of the river are nothing new. There have been others, including a "Master Plan for the Patuxent River" made public in 1964.

But not much has really been done, although steps are now being taken.

It was these steps that the committees spoke about at the meeting—more stringent pollution controls, enforcement of a new law to prevent silt from filtering into the river, improved farming practices to prevent drain-off from plowed land, catch-basins to trap water runoff from the concrete and asphalt highways, housing developments and shopping centers.

VEGETATION NEEDED

The committees were told of the need for trees and other vegetation along the watershed and the helpful acquisition of land along the river by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The meeting presented a vision of what the Patuxent can look like, if the people are willing to pay the cost.

They were told by Wes Johnson, of the park and planning commission, who has been working with the Marlboro committee headed by Edward C. Freeman, that the Patuxent can become a heaven for recreation-starved metropolitan Washington.

He painted a picture of a green southeastern Prince Georges County with lakes, parks, forests, even a marina near Upper Marlboro, swimming, fishing, hunting, wildlife preserves.

Four sets of plans have been drawn up for that section alone and will be discussed at civic association meetings over the next few months.

The conservationists say the technology is available to make them come true.

But there are also the realities of getting the cooperation of land developers, sand and gravel operators, farmers, and the taxpayers.

That is the next step in the long-range plans of the conservationists—to get the word to the people and let them make the final decision.

A farmer at the meeting said the river will never be "like it was when Washington made that trip to Montpelier, but it can be a hell of a sight better than it is now. It's up to us."

CRAFTS TRAINING NEGLECTED

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, John Gardner once said that a country which neither respects its poets nor its plumbers will have a philosophy which cannot hold water.

The disrespect which our country has for its workingmen is clearly shown by the fact that the Federal Government is spending \$14 for higher education for every dollar which it spends for vocational education.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert an editorial from the Danville, Ill., Commercial-News which succinctly states the enormous need for greater support for occupational training in our schools.

The article follows:

GUEST EDITORIAL—CRAFTS TRAINING NEGLECTED

No matter how much money the government devoted to education, there would be calls for more. Yet for every \$14 of federal money invested in universities, only \$1 is spent on vocational education.

Vocational education is a forgotten stepchild with no powerful lobby in Washington looking out for its interests.

But conventional education, on which we spend so much money in the belief that it is the answer to poverty, will not eradicate or even reduce poverty, claims one government official.

Poverty would be reduced not by opening new universities but by offering education with a vocational purpose, says Marvin Feldman of the Office of Economic Opportunity, director of the Presidential task force on vocational education and poverty.

He proposes a national system of vo-ed with the federal government supplying funds for the initial cost of buildings and materials. Another method would be performance contracts with private institutions to provide the education for the same amount allowed the school system.

Ideally, he says, vo-ed should begin in the 3d grade and continue thru high education school, culminating in a degree in vocational education.

Businessmen, labor leaders, parents and students must change their attitude that vocational education is something for the misfit, the disciplinary problem or the dull child who does not have the aptitude for college, says Feldman.

Indeed, it might be added that vocational education could be a boon not just for the sons and daughters of poverty but for thousands of middle-class youths who enter college every year not because they want to but because of social pressures and the lack of any alternative.

Strange, for a nation that was built by working people, who made a reality out of the dreams of the political philosophers, a lot of us look down on the person who works with his hands.

Meanwhile, some of them, like energetic plumbers earning \$18,000 a year, chuckle all the way to the bank.

NO LONGER UN-AMERICAN ADMITTING CHINA TO UNITED NATIONS

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I find myself in agreement with conservative Columnists Kevin Phillips and David Lawrence. But within the past week both have advocated admitting mainland China to the United Nations, and in addition Mr. Phillips has come out in favor of U.S. recognition of that country.

These are most sensible and progressive positions. We cannot continue to pretend the world's largest country does not exist. We cannot continue to say China's aggressiveness and repressiveness makes it socially unacceptable, when we ourselves have a far more extensive record of interfering in other countries' affairs, and when a number of our "friends" are equally repressive at home.

President Nixon's policies toward China have been far more intelligent than those of his predecessors, and I commend him for it. I hope his actions will match his words.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert the column by Kevin Phillips entitled "Red China Dialogue," from the Washington Post of February 28, 1970, and the column by David Lawrence entitled "Red China's Chance to Win Worldwide Friendship," from U.S. News & World Report of March 1, 1971:

RED CHINA DIALOGUE

(By Kevin Phillips)

Though conservatives may grumble, President Nixon's policy of seeking a dialogue with Red China—announced in yesterday's State of the World message—is a sound response to international necessity.

Nearest home, Canada and China have just exchanged diplomatic missions. As a result, important markets for prairie province wheat have improved.

Chile's new Marxist government has completed a similar exchange, and South America—Ecuador and Peru—are considering ties with Peking.

Last November, Italy recognized Communist China, Belgium and Austria are expected to act this year. British-Chinese relations are warming up, with trade prospects playing a major role.

In the Middle East, Peking's trade is growing by leaps and bounds. The area receives some \$200 million (25 per cent) of Red China's yearly foreign aid. From Albania, China's European satellite, radio stations boom out Peking propaganda across the Arab world. One focal point is South Yemen, already Peking-oriented, which is a staging ground for guerrillas operating against the British-backed Sultan of Oman. Another is the small crossroads nation of Lebanon, where Peking's trade is mounting and Chinese political activity is becoming more overt.

Peking may be on the verge of a diplomatic breakthrough in the Middle East. Lebanon, Libya, Iran, and Turkey have all indicated that they are weighing an exchange of ambassadors with Red China.

Across from Arabia, on the Horn of Africa, Ethiopia has recently recognized Red China, partly, one suspects, because of the growing strength of the Peking backed Eritrean insurgents. In East Africa, China is building vital railroad and naval facilities in Tanzania, and in West Africa, the tiny nation of Equatorial Guinea, formerly Spanish Guinea is on the way to becoming a black Albania only a few months after establishing relations with Peking. This month, Nigeria, Africa's most populous nation, also recognized Red China.

Russian periodicals complain that China's small navy has ventured into the Indian Ocean. Moreover, China has atomic bombs, plus new medium jet bombers capable of delivering them to nearby parts of Asia.

Asia, logically, is the principal focus of Red Chinese activity, and the Chinese dragon is cutting an evermore impressive swath.

Pakistan, once a close U.S. ally, now buys jet aircraft and armored cars from Red China. When Pakistani President Yahya Khan visited Peking in November to sign a trade pact, he hailed Mao Tse-tung as the "great man of Asia and the great man of the world."

India is friendlier to Russia than to China, but Maoist radicals are causing terror in cities like Calcutta. The small Himalayan states of Nepal, Sikkim, and Blutan, which lie between India and China, are tipping further and further towards Peking.

Neutralist Burma lies in China's shadow. And next-door Thailand, anticipating U.S. departure from Indochina, has toned down its anti-communism within the last few months and begun unofficial contacts with Mao's regime.

During the last few years, Peking has consolidated its hold on both North Vietnam and North Korea, which lie on the military firing line with the United States. Russian influence has been substantially displaced, and analysts now generally believe that Red China is the key to Asian peace.

With growing influence over its Asian periphery, China may be heading toward confrontation with Japan. There is already friction, begun last December, over the oil-rich Senkaku Island in the East China Sea. Many Japanese think that relations with Red China will be the chief item on Tokyo's diplomatic agenda for the 1970s.

Under these circumstances, the United States cannot expect to maintain the useless fiction that Chiang Kai-shek's Taiwanese (Formosa) regime is the government of China. Nor does such a posture serve our increasing need to deal with Peking. International opinion will put Red China in the United Nations this year or next, and the United States must also move in the direction of recognition.

RED CHINA'S CHANCE TO WIN WORLDWIDE FRIENDSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

Red China has the opportunity of a lifetime. It obviously wants to improve relations with various countries so as to increase trade with the non-Communist world. But to separate commercial arrangements from international politics isn't always practical.

At the moment, for instance, the Red Chinese are engaged in negotiations with two Japanese missions—one official and one private—which are visiting Peking to discuss trade and a possible betterment of relations with Japan. Meanwhile, Communist Chinese news agencies keep up their attacks on the Japanese Government and even on Emperor Hirohito.

As the Reuters correspondent in Hong Kong, Ernesto Mendoza, points out, "In the complex world of Peking politics, harsh words may hide a conciliatory gesture and official thinking does not always appear in black and white—there may also be unexpected twists."

Japan remains Red China's biggest trading partner. Recently Peking entered into reciprocal commercial arrangements with Canada, and there is no doubt that the Red Chinese are seeking to widen their export-import contacts on every continent.

What is not realized in Peking, however, is that the foreign policy of Red China has created an impression of irresponsibility.

The Red Chinese claim they are fearful of a rise of militarism in Japan, but the Peking regime has consistently failed to maintain a friendly attitude with the free nations of the world. There have been many incidents which have caused alarm, especially the threat of the use of nuclear weapons by Red China.

Peking's chief problem is to take care of the needs of the more than 800,000,000 people of mainland China, who someday could revolt. The economic situation is, therefore, most important. The free nations are willing to be friendly with Red China if it will turn to a policy of non-intervention in the affairs of other countries, particularly in Asia.

Red China has a chance to bring peace in Indo-China. It has a powerful influence with the Hanoi Government, having supplied for years a large amount of military assistance. The Vietnamization program in South Vietnam and the training and equipping of a force of a million men there now make futile any continuance of North Vietnam's aggressive acts.

Peking could dramatically demonstrate that it really wants peace by persuading the North Vietnamese to call a halt and end the tragic conflict that has been going on for more than a decade in Indo-China.

If Red China helped to settle the Vietnam war, not only would the effects be felt throughout Asia, but a policy of peace would turn the minds of the people of all countries from fears of aggression to activities for the buildup of economic strength. Asia is a relatively undeveloped continent, and Peking could achieve much for the benefit of its own people by working closely with the free nations of the world.

The admission of Red China to the United Nations has been widely discussed. There is no reason why a peacefully inclined government presiding over such a huge population should not be represented in a world organization. The U.N. Charter provides that membership is open to all "peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

So the important question is whether the government in Peking is ready to perform the duties imposed by the Charter, which says:

"All Members, in order to ensure to all

of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter."

This is a pledge which is meaningful, particularly in the troubled world of today. If Red China were to sign the U.N. Charter and obligate itself to carry out the provisions, peace not only in Asia but elsewhere would receive a significant stimulus.

The American people realize that Nationalist China, which has made remarkable progress on Formosa and now holds a seat on the Security Council of the United Nations, is a friend of this country and should not be alienated by the admission of Red China. The Nationalist Republic could retain membership in the United Nations concurrently with Communist China. There are a number of very small nations which are U.N. members.

It is essential, however, that the larger countries shall come within the jurisdiction of the United Nations and, mindful of its principles, work for peace.

The whole world would look upon Red China differently if the Peking regime abandoned its bellicose ways and began to travel the road of peace. It's a great opportunity to win worldwide friendship.

FALSE ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING CONGRESSMAN F. EDWARD HÉBERT IN THE TELEVISION PROGRAM, "THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 there was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an hour-long television program, called "The Selling of the Pentagon," in which I am presented in opprobrious tones.

As regards the false innuendos concerning me in the program, I answered extensively in a local television interview which appeared on the evening of Friday, February 26, and, in part, on the evening of Saturday, February 27. I also issued a press statement on February 27 in reply to a newspaper story, based on the television show, which made false allegations in regard to me. As yet, the corrections I sought to bring to the attention of the press have not appeared in all the places where the false statements appeared.

It may be that falsehood runs like a hare and truth moves like a tortoise.

It may be that I may never be able to get the truth to catch up with all of the false innuendos in this case, but I am going to try.

At the very least, I am going to try to make clear to all Members of Congress that I never take lightly the charge of being the tool of anyone, the Pentagon included.

Let me first also make clear that I, in no way, assume that the news media is out of bounds by criticizing the Pentagon. As a former newspaper editor, I know that no segment of the Government is, or should be, free from severe criticism by the news media. And it

would be hard to find anybody in this town who has issued more public criticism of the Pentagon than I have over the last 30 years.

But presentations which are biased throughout, which are slanted to only use language and items which support that bias, and which clearly make false innuendos about individuals in order to prove the bias—such presentations detract from the media's function of being a true critic of society and make it more difficult for the worthwhile criticism to be presented and accepted.

Now let's look at the record and the facts:

Item No. 1. In the television program, "The Selling of the Pentagon," the script of which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 25, the commentator at one point begins as follows:

Using sympathetic Congressmen, the Pentagon tries to counter what it regards as the anti-military tilt of network reporting. War heroes are made available for the taped home district TV Reports from Pro-Pentagon politicians. Here Representative F. Edward Hébert of Louisiana asks Major James Rowe, a Green Beret and former POW, what keeps the Viet Cong fighting.

There followed a segment from the taped interview I had with Major Rowe, who escaped after many years' captivity by the Vietcong. The segment of my interview with Major Rowe concerned his dismayed reaction to antiwar demonstrations in the United States where he saw the Vietcong flag flying.

Now anyone seeing that on TV—or reading the script—is given several clear inferences which were obviously intended by the program:

First. That the Pentagon "used" Hébert for the program because he was sympathetic.

Second. That, therefore, the program was the Pentagon's idea.

Third. That the program was planned by the Pentagon to counter network TV reporting.

Fourth. That Major Rowe was supplied to me by the Pentagon.

To show you further how these inferences carry over to the people who should know better, one news reporter was so misled as to write in his paper:

The film footage shows Hébert in an Army produced film interviewing a Green Beret officer who had been a prisoner of war.

This story did not imply anything—it just said flat out that the film was an Army-produced film. There are two things important here:

One is how the false inferences of the original program can lead to further flatly stated falsehoods in a follow-on story—the ripple effect of false innuendos. The reporter in this case was kind enough to call me and subsequently admit the error and printed a correction in his paper the following day.

The other important thing here is that neither the news reporter who wrote the story nor others who make the allegations in the program available to a wider audience, saw fit to check the alleged facts before disseminating them further.

Now let me state very clearly and very categorically that all of these allegations are pure falsehoods.

First. The Pentagon did not "use" Hébert to make the taped interview with Major Rowe.

Second. The program was not the Pentagon's idea; it was Hébert's idea.

Third. The program was not planned to counter network TV reporting. It was planned by Hébert for his local TV show in his home district because he thought his constituents should see Major Rowe.

Fourth. Major Rowe was not supplied by the Pentagon. Major Rowe appeared at my request. I asked him to appear. No one in the Defense Department hierarchy, to my knowledge, even knew that Major Rowe was going to be on the program with me prior to his appearance.

The interview with Major Rowe was not an Army-produced film. None of the military services had anything to do with producing the film. The film was made here in the capital and it was paid for by WWL-TV in New Orleans. It was made as one of the regular bimonthly TV programs for New Orleans station WWL-TV in which I appear.

Anyone who states that this program was produced at the Pentagon's suggestion or produced by any of the military services or produced with military funds or produced as an attack on the networks is telling a clear falsehood and misrepresenting the facts. Anyone who then has the real facts brought to their attention and does not present a clarification leaves their honor open to serious question. Let me say that I think it is particularly ironic that Major Rowe was presented here as a tool of the Pentagon. At the time Major Rowe was making public appearances there were stories in the press to the effect that the Department of Defense was curtailing his public appearances because there had been so many complaints about the fact that he was vigorously criticizing certain Members of the U.S. Senate.

Isn't it strange that a reporter would accept the things presented in the TV program and print them as fact without taking the time for one phone call to this old police reporter to see if he had any objections to the alleged facts about himself appearing in the script?

Item No. 2. I stated in a public TV interview on the evening of February 26 that the section of film showing me in the program, "The Selling of the Pentagon," was obtained under false pretenses.

An unidentified spokesman for CBS was quoted by the newspaper as saying my statement was untrue.

Following is a memorandum to me by my press aide, Lou Gehrig Burnett, concerning the request to us from CBS for the film. This memorandum states clearly that James Branon, of CBS, called and talked to Mr. Burnett to request any film he might have that they could use in connection with a documentary on the POW situation.

It also states that in response to several calls from Mr. Branon, Mr. Burnett obtained the names of every Congressman who had ever done a TV or radio interview with an ex-POW. Obviously, Mr. Burnett would not have done that if he was not led to believe the show was about POW's. During these calls Mr.

Branon repeated that the video tape we supplied would be used for a POW special. If Mr. Branon chooses to issue a public statement calling Mr. Burnett a liar, he can do so. Of course, there are laws relating to slander.

The film of Major Rowe and myself was actually provided to CBS in July of 1970. In a letter sent at the time Mr. Burnett said:

Please feel free to use any portion of the film as the Congressman has given his permission to do so.

The subsequent newspaper statements by the unidentified spokesman of CBS apparently attempted to use that statement in the letter to indicate that we authorized use of our film in any program. But it is quite clear from the letter that Mr. Burnett is writing in the context of the request for films concerning the POW matter. He is indicating that any portion of the film could be used for the POW program. He did not say the use of film for any kind of program you wish unrelated to POW's.

In any case, it is perfectly clear that CBS led my staff member, and therefore myself, to believe that they wanted the film for a program on POW's. And that, as far as I am concerned, is obtaining something under false pretenses.

Mr. Burnett's memorandum to me and his letter to CBS on the film follow:

CBS REQUEST FOR USE OF ROWE-HÉBERT INTERVIEW

FEBRUARY 26, 1971.

Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT:

James Branon of CBS in New York called me several weeks ago and said that his network was planning to do a documentary on the POW situation. He was seeking any film we might have in which you interviewed an ex-POW. Branon said the documentary would explore the plight of the POW and his family. Knowing you are very active in aiding POW's and their families, and after checking with you, we obtained a video tape of the interview you had done with Major James Rowe. You had asked Major Rowe to appear on your twice-monthly Congressional Report show which is done exclusively for WWL-TV in New Orleans, and he had agreed. I had the video tape sent to Washington from Louisiana, and I in turn mailed it to CBS.

Branon called me several more times seeking additional information. For example, I obtained for him the names of every Congressman who had ever done a TV or radio interview with an ex-POW. During these calls we discussed the proposed documentary at which time he again said the video tape would be used for a POW Special on CBS. Later, after he had obtained the video tape from us, he called to say that it had been edited and that he didn't think he could use any of it, therefore he was mailing it back to us. I recall telling him at the time that I was sorry to hear he would not have you on this special because you had done so much to publicize the plight of the POW and his family.

In addition, Branon had asked for the names of representatives of the various branches of service with whom he could discuss POW publicity. I gave him the names of the directors of the liaison offices in the Rayburn Building of the Army, Air Force, and Navy.

Later, in another conversation with Branon, I asked him how the documentary was coming along. He said they were having difficulties and he didn't know if they would be able to do it.

LOU G. BURNETT.

JULY 6, 1970.

Mr. BURNETT SEABROOKS,
CBS News Department,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SEABROOKS: I am sending you under separate cover the film of Congressman Hébert and Major Rowe.

It is most important, however, that we get the film back, and I would appreciate your returning it as soon as possible.

I trust it is not necessary to cut the film to obtain what you need because it goes to the Congressman's library and he would like the film to remain intact.

Please feel free to use any portion of the film as the Congressman has given his permission to do so.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

LOU GEHRIG BURNETT,
Press Secretary.

In conclusion, the shoddy handling of the fact in relation to myself, which constituted a brief portion of the program, makes one question the reliability and sincerity of the entire "The Selling of the Pentagon" program. I have, therefore, raised questions with the Department of Defense concerning other allegations made in the program and intend to see that the Members of Congress and the public have an opportunity to judge for themselves where the true facts lie.

GETTING AT ROOT CAUSES—EDUCATION AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point summaries of the final two panel sessions from the fifth annual community leadership conference held last December in the Bronx, N.Y. The subject of the conference was "Safe Streets: A Priority Goal." Certainly any consideration of crime must include a discussion of the root causes and two of the panels at the conference were devoted to this topic, one considering education and one the quality of life. The summaries follow:

PANEL III A

GETTING AT ROOT CAUSES—EDUCATION

Chairman: Mr. Dennis Gardner, Executive Director, Morrisania Community Corporation.
Panelists: Dr. James Allen, Former U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Andrew Donaldson, Superintendent, School District Line.

Mr. Mario Raimo, Bronx Representative, U.F.T.

Mrs. Sylvia Bloom, Community School Board District Ten.

Reporter: Mrs. Abigail B. Endicott

The following is a summary of Dr. Allen's remarks:

Education has two broad responsibilities regarding crime and drug abuse: 1) inculcate in your people respect for law, 2) make educational system responsive to the needs of all the young people who attend them, not just a few.

Stricter laws and enforcement, etc. will help to prevent crime, but will not by themselves fully solve the problem. Ultimate responsibility lies in the attitude of the people, rather than in the force of the law or the fear of penalties. The school has a positive role in establishing this attitude through education and teaching understanding about what is law, & government and what they mean. Teaching should emphasize the rea-

son for law—why we have it and why it is needed. We have not done a good job. There is an appalling general ignorance by the people about government and law.

Law is based on respect of individuals for themselves and for others. Schools must be places where this respect exists. Teachers should respect each other and respect pupils. Pupils should have respect toward other pupils, toward parents and toward the school. There is too much "snob appeal" structured into our educational system. The farther away you get from the classroom, the more you get paid. Teachers should be the most qualified, toughest positions to reach.

Speaking in terms of not just discipline but also in the true meaning of "equality of educational opportunity", respect for law cannot abide where there is no equality of education. Laws, to be respected, must deserve respect, as Mr. Clark said. Better teaching will help, but demonstration of respect by schools will be in providing equal educational opportunity. Students who don't fit the usual pattern of need or of qualification are being neglected. Children of poor, the black, and often the bright students are neglected. If schools are to inculcate respect for law they must break out of rigidity. We must "humanize" the schools. Too many schools are still rigid institutions set up for the convenience of administrators rather than for the needs of the people in the schools. We must not forget these broad goals while we concentrate on special areas of need.

We must see that no child leaves school without having acquired the skill and the desire to read: the "right to read." The "right to read" is a basic right as fundamental as other rights. Yet one of four children leaves school without having acquired this skill. This is "inexcusable" when we spend \$60 billion on education. This is an objective which we can zero in on. There is a repeatedly noticed correlation between crime rate and inability to read.

Education must go beyond the classroom. It must continue out into the broad society. A child spends only 10% of his life in his school in his first 21 years. Education must use the resources and technology of the community to help youngsters learn on their own. The public must support this change financially and philosophically. Education cannot be cheap or done with less than professionals.

Our school system must carry out these two responsibilities 1) inculcate in young people respect for law and 2) make the schools themselves responsible to all. Then we can get at the grass roots of this business of crime that we're talking about today.

The following is a summary of Mr. Donaldson's remarks:

After 10 years of experience as a classroom teacher in Harlem, he knows that unsafe streets go along with drugs. He has thought about it a great deal and has some insight to the problem.

Education affects drugs as follows:

First, there is no problem in the streets when children have drugs. The problem comes when the addicts don't have the drugs. This is a problem of supply level and it is a problem which has to be handled on the District Attorney level. Schools are affected by 1) the pusher; how to get the children to tell officials who he is—they all seem to know, but usually won't tell; 2) the addict, a youngster hooked on drugs can't be handled by the teachers; he needs outside and specialized experts; 3) the experimenter and the friend, a much larger number of people—sometimes more than half of a school population and getting lower in age all the time. It's at the latter level that schools can help.

Very few youngsters become addicts because of another addict. Most become addicts

because of their friends. Schools could do something to prevent this if they would treat the following problems: 1) the childish attitude of adventure; 2) the attitude of parents, and how parents look to their children when they need cocktails and tranquilizers to "loosen up"; 3) the problem of status—a child becomes important if he does something that's dangerous and adventurous; 4) security—many children want to be accepted and as a result of the "generation gap" a child's friends take over in influence; 5) rebellion—many children want to punish or bother their parents.

To get to these problems in the schools we need change. But the school system doesn't want to change, to make our schools answer the needs of the times. We must get to the experimenters and the friends. One way to do this is to take children to see what goes on in drug rehabilitation centers. This can move them like a whole new religious experience. We must also get the pushers. Sometimes we have notified police who pushers were and nothing happened.

Not too concerned with law and order. Children get lessons on law and order every night on T.V. Schools often counter what the child is taught outside. Hitler came to power by law and order, and I remember that when I was in the service, the law required that I sit at the back of the bus. I'm more concerned with what the law is.

Contrary to what Mrs. Bloom implied, we cannot equate safe streets and the irradiation of drugs with crowded schools. It's a problem of morale, a need for a sense of community. People have to mean what they say, believe in it and work at it.

Mario Raimo is the Bronx Representative to the United Federation of Teachers. He is currently working on a research dissertation on the politics of education.

The following is a summary of Mr. Raimo's remarks.

We look to our public institutions to solve our immediate problems. One thing confusing many people is the fact that we have the most extensively educated population of our history, and perhaps in the world, yet despite this record, the social fact indicates that as the level of education increases, nevertheless, there is an increasing problem of crime.

The schools themselves are victims of crime.

We look to schools, as we look to policemen, for other than their basic purposes. We have an expanded view of schools. Health, psychological welfare, social attitudes, and other aspects of the individual are now considered part of the province of the school. Have the schools accepted the proper functions, and if so, how can these functions be carried out?

One of the problems in performing these functions is picking up the clues and signals about what the society wants, e.g., question of discipline. Some people feel a need for more freedom for students. This has been the trend. Young people have much greater freedom now than five years ago, and especially thirty years ago. Other people say that we need tougher teachers and supervisors. It's hard to pick up the signals on what to do, and how to unravel the confusion of opinions. The schools reflect these confusions.

We can't assure parents that students enter a safe environment. There has always been petty crime in the school buildings, but now there is increasing violence outside and around the school buildings, e.g., at some schools it is not safe to go to the bathrooms. In one school 5,000 to 7,000 students will avoid the bathrooms, at physical pain, despite supervisors and police to protect them.

The commitment and the support that's given by the society was a topic in the plenary session. The problem of overcrowding in our schools is simply one of lack of support for educational institutions, just as we don't give adequate support to correctional institutions. This is part of the problem of school disturbances. The overriding majority of stu-

dents are the victims and not the cause of student disruptions, e.g. Clinton High School where 6,900 students have behaved in a reasonable and rational way, is an example. Only a very small number make the schools unsafe and disrupt the schools. Special programs and curriculum reform to retain students in the building must be provided.

Recommends Charles Silberman's "Crisis in the Classroom" in reference to the dehumanization of crowded, massive schools. The narcotics program is an example of a turn in a favorable direction in efforts at new programs.

"Although the schools' functions are undermined by the crime problem which affects the citizen in the street, the schools have a vital role to play in any long term solutions." All of the following will contribute to this role: (a) curriculum reform aimed at developing positive attitudes (Silberman proposals on informal learning), (b) decentralization in practice, parent-community cooperation, (c) stable and safe schools, (d) protection of schools from criminal disruptions, (e) support for remedial and guidance services, (f) prevocational experiences that develop "employable" youth, (g) effective narcotics programs, (h) personnel practices that guarantee "due process" and that reduce staff turnover.

The following is a summary of Mrs. Bloom's remarks:

Mrs. Bloom began her remarks with an expression of overriding concern with what she views as "our overdeveloped technology in which all identity is lost." This loss of identity becomes especially acute for young people. Mrs. Bloom presents herself as a non-professional on the topic, "Education." Yet she is a concerned parent acutely aware of the problems of the young.

The problems of the schools are a microcosm of those of the overall society. The school is just one arena in which the learning process for a young person occurs. Beginning with the infant and his education in the home, the individual becomes the object of a variety of stimuli—school, the family, and peer groups. Often the child brings the problems of one environment into another; the unpopular child may have his problems with his peer group affect his performance in the classroom.

The education of the child is also strongly affected by the structure of our technological society. In our consumption-oriented society the parents in the family must make a determined effort to gain as much pecuniary worth as possible. The mother forgoes her traditional role as tender of the children and goes out into the business world. From breakfast to dinner the child's supervision comes essentially from the teacher and even when the parents return from work they are often too tired to assume the traditional parental role. Mrs. Bloom is amazed at the limited amount of turbulence considering the lack of supervision.

Another phase of the problems involving the educational system and its overall relationship with society involves the welfare system. This is becoming an increasingly serious threat to the educational system. In many welfare families the structure of the laws regarding the distribution of funds tend to force the father out of the household. Since the Aid to Dependent Children program gives money only to those families where there is no male parent in the house, many families have been broken up. Here we see a contributing reason for the general lack of respect which welfare children have toward the government.

Usually, the mother is not able to obtain a job because of obligations in the household or lack of marketable skills. The child is denied a home atmosphere conducive to learning, thus further retarding his progress. A vicious circle is started which leads to anti-social activities.

There are also internal conditions which are undermining our educational system. First, and foremost, is lack of facilities. More specialized personnel, particularly in the area of guidance are needed.

"Yes, our educational system is failing. But it behooves us to see the beam despite the mote in our own eye. We are failing our educational system. Unless we do something about our own thinking, the educational system will continue to go down hill until we find ourself with a system devoid of education—and we will have failed our children completely."

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Question: (Persons from a Rudolf Steiner School) There are some private schools in our city that are operating with a shortage of staff and equipment and yet the children are receiving a good education and their parents are pleased with their development. Couldn't public schools learn something from private schools?

Answer: No comment.

Question: What can we do to get the U.S. out of the Vietnam war and see that money is committed to the needs of our society?

Answer—Mr. Donaldson: We could learn something from the woman who spoke about the war. Many youngsters learn about drugs and violence in the war. They come home, find frustration and retaliate. This shows up the need for change and a revamping of our educational system. The classroom now is a game—the teacher tries to think of questions that will make students think; some students raise their hands to see if they can make the teacher think they know the answer. We're not really getting any dialogue, not really getting to the needs of the child. Not letting him change courses and not getting to his needs creates a "hitback" attitude. The child wants to rebel.

Question (to Mr. Donaldson): How do we break the "country club" atmosphere and the power structure of our educational system?

Answer—Mr. Donaldson: I don't think we need funds. I don't even think we have a country club atmosphere—we have a military atmosphere. We have an entrenched and proliferating bureaucracy, a morass of checks and balances. What we need is a change in attitudes.

Question: Why doesn't the State control the city educational system, when it controls all the other schools in the State?

Answer—Dr. Allen: There are 900 Boards of Education and superintendents in the State; so, except for size, New York is no different from the rest of the State. The school system in New York City is so large that people lose contact with the school, e.g. New Yorkers don't vote on school tax and they lose touch with what's going on. The decentralization program is now trying to get schools closer to people who are supposed to be interested in them.

Answer—Mr. Gardner: Because we don't have State recognition there has been a problem for minority groups in New York.

Answer—Mr. Raimo: There is a kind of military system in the schools, not only for the students but for the teachers as well, e.g. they are told what books to read, etc. Composition of staff needs more balanced ethnic, religious and racial distribution. There has been a recent grant of \$½ million to recruit teachers over the country. We have recruited 1,000 people to work in N.Y.C. schools beginning in September. We hope that colleges and our own schools will produce young minority group people who will be qualified to teach. Often, we can't find such people. There is a small number of black and Puerto Rican teachers often because people from these groups are prevented from going on from lower schools. I think this will change in the next few years. When the supply becomes available from colleges, and with a conscientious effort by the Board of Educa-

tion, we may be satisfying the need for minority group teachers.

Question (to Dr. Allen): How can schools be changed to overcome the effects of crowding in children from broken homes and poor backgrounds?

Answer: We need pre-school, early childhood care on not just education, but also on health and welfare programs to fit their needs right then and there. This is an important priority.

Question: Why don't the UFT, the CSA and other educational organizations move for the kind of change that will confront the crisis in leadership and curriculum? Parents are not interested in lowering standards.

Answer—Mr. Raimo: The UFT and CSA are unions, just like any other; they do not run the schools. All we can point to are specific programs and attempts to change. The UFT arose not as part of the establishment but to cause the establishment to change. Looking to MES schools and efforts to restructure the curriculums, we are concerned.

Donaldson: Questions whether we are a profession. If we are, we're the only profession that takes the problems and tries to get rid of them by acting as if they don't exist. There is nothing wrong with having the youngster from a broken home in our schools. This should be the best opportunity for the schools to take the credit for educating. Children from middle class homes are educated at home, yet schools have been taking credit for the way they turn out. Children from broken homes are not inherently disruptive children; they are disrupted lives. In many cases it's better not to have a father in the house if he's just a drunk. Mr. Donaldson has seen children in the Caribbean and in Puerto Rico with not enough equipment or teachers, yet they are learning. The numbers game—re equipment and teachers—is irrelevant (even in terms of employment for the parents). What we need is attitudinal training and change.

PANEL III B

GETTING AT ROOT CAUSES—QUALITY OF LIFE

Chairman: Honorable Robert Abrams, Bronx Borough President.

Panelists:

Hon. Herman Badillo, U.S. Representative, N.Y.C. 21st C.D.

Hon. Jerome Kretchmer, Administrator, N.Y.C. Environmental Protection Administration.

Hon. Albert Walsh, Administrator, N.Y.C. Housing and Development Administration.

Mrs. Delores Smith, Deputy Training Director, Martin Luther King Health Center.

Reporter: Mrs. Abigail B. Endicott.

Herman Badillo is the first Puerto Rican American to be elected to Congress. He was formerly President of the Borough of the Bronx, and Commissioner of the Department of Relocation. Mr. Badillo is a Certified Public Accountant and an Attorney at Law. The following is a summary of Mr. Badillo's remarks:

We will not have any livable cities in the future unless the problems of the cities are recognized as national priorities. City problems cannot be solved by the mayors and city commissioners alone because the cities simply do not have the resources required to deal with the problems. On the other hand, we cannot effectively succeed in obtaining help from the federal government unless all of the groups in the city work together.

One of the root causes of the urban crisis is discrimination, particularly against the black man. The experience of the Puerto Rican community in New York City dramatizes this. The white Puerto Rican learns to speak English. He is treated as a white man and generally receives the opportunity to move ahead. If a black Puerto Rican learns to speak English, he is treated as a black man and often does not receive the opportunity to move ahead. A mixed Puerto Rican is

sometimes treated as a white man and sometimes treated as a black man, and his opportunities to advance depend upon how he is perceived by the rest of the New York City society.

In New York City we should strive to learn from the experience of the Puerto Rican community. Puerto Rico has fewer resources financially and otherwise than New York. Yet its people in Puerto Rico work better together. This is because Puerto Rico has been successful in eliminating institutional racial discrimination. Individual discrimination exists, but institutional discrimination has been eliminated for the most part and therefore all Puerto Ricans feel that they have a chance to be a part of the society.

This does not exist in New York City. We have institutional discrimination in every aspect of life in New York City—the hospitals, the schools and the police department. We must develop programs to eliminate institutional discrimination. Only when this is done will we be able to unite all people in the City and improve the quality of our lives.

Jerome Kretchmer is currently Administrator for the New York City Environmental Protection Administration. The following is a summary of Mr. Kretchmer's remarks:

In delivering services, I am responsible on a day-to-day basis for the environment of the city. The environment of the city is more than everyone sees. The most basic element of the environment is the subway. Unless it changes we can't do anything to improve the quality of life in this town. I haven't met one person who gets off the subway in a good mood.

Housing, too, is a basic element of the environment. No matter how clean the streets and air are, if housing and subways are bad, there is little I can do for the "environment."

Things that everyone faces everyday are so crucial. Crime and safety in the streets are such superficial issues. These things will disappear if the social order and the environment can be changed.

The quality of life in the city is different for different people. In the slums there are no superintendents, landlords and porters to keep the streets clean. Slums breed more slums. In Queens, where there is one-family housing, the refuse is collected only twice a week because the people themselves keep the streets clean. Problems of the city are not all the same; they are different in different communities. Garbage is collected eight times a week in South Bronx and this still doesn't begin to deal with the problem. It's "like spitting in the streets."

We will control air and water pollution. It's the sanitation problems, the filthy streets, et cetera that we must solve. The disposal of garbage is the most political question in the Bronx. "The quality of life deals with our capacity to deal with our problems." Like the creation of garbage. This society has taken more from the earth in the last 200 years than man did in all the rest of creation. This way of living is going to evaporate. We'll have to give up something. The quality of life will be different because we can't remain the same wasteful society. We will have to share our resources so that everyone has enough. We're like those astronauts who were running out of air, water and food and had to come home without landing on the moon. We are running out of resources, but "what's going to be our rescue helicopter?"

Albert Walsh, as Administrator of the Housing and Development Administration of New York City is responsible for directing all city activities in the housing and development fields, including urban renewal, middle-income housing, code enforcement, rent control, rehabilitation, demolition and the municipal loan program, as well as residential and commercial relocation. The following is a summary of Mr. Walsh's remarks:

Housing includes neighborhoods. A neighborhood is a man's basic environment.

In the Bronx there are a large number of dilapidated housing units. Many were cheap, inferior housing when they were built. This housing must be demolished. Some were sound structures, however, and one wonders why this housing has deteriorated. There is no sure answer.

As Mr. Badillo said, some of the problems of the city are not solvable by mayors and commissioners. Right now the city is very close to the maximum in funds for housing and rehabilitation. The State, surprisingly, has no rehabilitation program and the Federal government has only limited funds for this purpose.

We must have rentals that our families can pay. This now means that we need rent subsidy under municipal loans programs. By June 30 \$25-30 million will come to aid us for rent subsidy and rehabilitation.

Congress has delayed six months in granting an appropriation to HUD for programs and rehabilitation. We have had no new annual authorizations. A bill that just passed the House reduced the Senate authorization for 1971, even after Congress itself had said in 1968 that a higher amount should be authorized.

Many local agencies have mapped off particular areas to prevent mortgages and finance loans. Many houses have been abandoned because of the inability of landlords to get renewed financing after mortgaging. The city has called on the Federal government for mortgage aid.

Mr. Walsh gave further information about the numbers of units under construction and rehabilitation in the city.

Mrs. Delores Smith is at present Assistant Director of Training at the Martin Luther King Health Center in the Bronx. The following is a summary of Mrs. Smith's remarks:

I, too, have something to say about improving the quality of life, especially in low income neighborhoods. I know about the training of people from a limited income area. Training which provides them with interesting and meaningful careers, but more importantly, training which provides them with the skills necessary to secure for themselves the services they and their neighbors need.

"My talk today will cover the training capabilities that have been developed at the center and will suggest that these capabilities can be developed in other areas such as housing, sanitation and day care.

"At the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Health Center in the South Bronx we have been providing medical and training services to a geographically defined population of 45,000 people for four years. The center is funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and is sponsored locally by Montefiore Hospital.

"The training of community residents to take an active part in the provision and securing of health services has been an integral part of the program since its inception. . . . Medical services at the center are provided by a 'Primary Health Care Team' . . . Each 'team' is responsible for the care of all the people living in a certain area. The Family Health Worker is a member of the community that's serviced by the health center. . . . She is trained to give some nursing care and to act as a patient advocate. She is trained to use the various agencies, e.g., housing, welfare and sanitation, that provide services to the community. She is taught how to deal with the agencies to get service for herself and her patients.

"Once she has completed this training, the family health worker . . . is both an employee of the center and a member of the community the center serves." Acting as the patient's advocate, she can make the center more sensitive to "the needs and the life styles of the people in the community."

"There are many more similar efforts being made in other areas. . . . Our goal is to be able to train community residents to fill every job necessary to provide the services the community needs—physicians, nurses, administrators, lawyers, technicians, planners, community organizers, teachers—everything."

"What we have done at the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Health Center that is really important . . . has been to develop a capability to train the residents of a community to provide for themselves. If we are successful, they will no longer be dependent on people outside the community, they will have not only the technical skills, but the 'life view' to build their own community. A creative life view in which they realize their own abilities, in which they see themselves as able to provide for their own needs. . . . They will be able to build their own community the way they and their neighbors want it."

Question: (To Mr. Badillo) Lobbyists can turn representatives away from problems that concern the masses of people. What should constituents do to offset the lobbyists?

Answer: (Mr. Badillo) We must lobby, too. Also, Congressmen must have local offices where they can meet with the local people. Every group within the community is trying to get its own needs, often in opposition to other groups. Congressmen must be aware of the total community needs.

Question: (To Mr. Badillo) How do you select the groups that are truly representative of the community?

Answer: Every group says it represents the community. No person or group can match exactly what the community wants. Public officials have to reach a point where they make a decision. Some representatives take polls of what the people want and act accordingly. I can't do this, and put the majority view through, because too many views conflict. At some point character and judgment must come in. You need a person to make a decision.

Mr. Abrams: Supports this view. It's important for the representative to get the views of all the people so that he can weigh their views.

Question: (To Mr. Badillo) What do you think of Mr. Nixon's welfare reform bill?

Answer: It is not sufficient for the needs of the people. Furthermore, it does not cover 45% of the people in Puerto Rico, despite the fact that they are full U.S. citizens. For this reason I would vote against it.

Question: When there are so many people who need funds, how can you justify putting families up in hotels at \$600 a week?

Answer: (Mr. Walsh) The fact that families are put up in hotels at \$600 a month reflects the dire need for housing. They are put in hotels because no other place could be found to house them. A new system is being devised to provide hotel service for such families at a greatly reduced price.

Question: Would the panelists be in favor of electing planning boards and health boards to bring the community closer to the people, as we have elected school boards?

Answer: (Mr. Kretchmer) Favors community control. But the question remains as to whether election is the best method. Election of the school board in his community was not satisfactory because only 11% of the people voted. To push for immediate election of boards to run city services would be a mistake. Instead of wasting time on the election process, we should spend time to provide more meaningful neighborhood government. Elections are a lot of wasted effort.

Mr. Abrams: Three specific proposals have been put forth recently for reforming the local government system: (1) Mayor Lindsey's Little Mayor's Office; (2) Abrams' own plan for decentralizing city services on the borough level, with directors appointed by the borough presidents; (3) a proposal for creation of a municipal district in 40 com-

munities, dividing the city into more districts, each with a director.

The dialogue is ensuing. Community board meetings should be listened to. Legislation will be drafted, there may be a referendum put before the people and people should make their views known and be aware of the issues.

Question: What can be done about dogs in the streets?

Answer: (Mr. Kretchmer) One of his favorite issues. People walking dogs in the streets show disrespect for the city. It is not just aesthetically displeasing but it has become a health problem because the water in the streets washes into our rivers. One solution is changing the system of enforcing sanitation laws. Many violators are not punished because their violations are not worth the trouble of enforcement officers. He is proposing an environmental court to handle summons on computers to deal with repetitive offenders. High fines may be effective. In Hong Kong if a person litters the sidewalk, he can pay a fine of \$160. Such a severe system of fines could be effective.

Question: On holidays the Department of Sanitation doesn't pick up garbage. Couldn't building superintendents be notified not to place the garbage on the street on a holiday?

Answer: Notices are sent out but there is no way to enforce compliance. Superintendents just don't want to come in late on holidays to put the garbage out so that it can be picked up the next day. Nobody has ever been successful in anti-litter campaigns in New York City. We are about to start another massive advertising campaign to figure out ways to deal with garbage as a social problem.

Question: Isn't there a problem of getting private money into multiple dwelling housing in New York when rent control is so inhibitive?

Answer: (Mr. Walsh) 70% of the families in New York cannot afford the rents of private housing industries. One possible alternative is a massive rent subsidy program. The Senior Citizen exemption from the current rent increase means that the building doesn't get the amount of revenue that rent control itself says is necessary to maintain the building properly. There is a proposal now in the legislature to subsidize those increases. We will need in this country some kind of system to make sure people have decent shelter, clothing and food.

Question: Has use of refuse compactors ever been considered?

Answer: (Mr. Kretchmer) Local Law 14 now requires compactors or upgraded incinerators. But in some areas of such great importance, our technology hasn't done anything for us. The technology is either not concerned with our problems or has fallen apart. If the American economy, technology and ingenuity were put into our quality of life instead of into how many cars we produce, we really would have the kind of environment we want.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 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?

REPRESSION BY DEFAULT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert L. Ketter, the new president of the State University of New York at Buffalo, made an outstanding inaugural address on February 15, 1971.

He pointed out that if our institutions of higher learning do not put their own houses in order, the political establishment, in response to public pressure, will do it.

Buffalo State is the largest graduate center in the State University system in New York. I am sure under Dr. Ketter, Buffalo State will meet its responsibilities to develop programs with broad educational value rather than become "a cutting edge for social change."

The address follows:

REPRESSION BY DEFAULT

(By Robert L. Ketter, President, State University of New York at Buffalo)

Chancellor Boyer, Mr. Baird, members of the Council of State University of New York at Buffalo, members of the Board of Trustees of State University of New York, Distinguished Visitors, Delegates, members of the University faculty and student body, Reverend Clergy, Alumni, Ladies and Gentlemen.

This moment revives for me a feeling I experienced when I was first appointed to office and which I am sure all of my predecessors shared, for I am standing now, as they did, at the crossroads between tradition and innovation, between the imperative to preserve an inheritance from the past and the sense of the opportunity to give a shape to the future.

For each of my predecessors the interplay between tradition and innovation has had a unique meaning, since the point at which they meet shifts from generation to generation. In my opinion, the area of crucial concern here and now is the relation between academic freedom and academic responsibility. Therefore, on this occasion, I want to make that relationship the focus of my remarks.

I

In an article which appeared last August in one of the national dailies, it was reported that thirty-two states had enacted legislation designed specifically to control campus disorders. There has not yet been sufficient time to analyze fully the implications of these measures; nevertheless, I would submit that such laws are repressive at worst and at best, they are regressive, for they are certain to erode the institutional autonomy which is a prerequisite for true academic freedom.

Traditionally, universities have opposed any attempts to circumscribe their autonomy, reasoning that an attack against the conditions under which academic freedom exists is in fact an attack against academic freedom itself. In general, their opposition has not been misplaced; for the privilege of autonomy has rarely been granted without a struggle, and even then, society has demonstrated a reluctant acquiescence rather than a positive commitment to the concept.

Unfortunately, our concentration on preventing external interference has deflected our attention away from internal responsibilities. We have looked outward at the expense of looking inward, and now find ourselves faced with an uncomfortable paradox: our very preoccupation with external threat has helped to bring that threat about.

Nor has the internal neglect resulted only from our struggle for autonomy and academic freedom. It also has come out of arrogance and fear, an arrogance which has placed us above responsibility, and a fear which has paralyzed our will to adhere to the demands of responsibility even when we have perceived them.

Lewis Mayhew and numerous other educators have warned us of the gravity of the crisis that these attitudes have created. If the university does not put its own house in order, the political establishment, in response to public pressure, will attempt to do so. We will have squandered our inheritance of both autonomy and freedom.

We cannot continue to invite repression by default. It is imperative that we, ourselves, define our responsibilities and determine to meet them. This is one of the primary opportunities the future holds for each of us.

II

The mission of a university is to contribute to the welfare of society—through education. This contribution has traditionally been made in the areas of teaching, research and public service. To properly serve in these areas the university has required that it be given the autonomy which insures free inquiry into the truth of all phenomena, and the free dispensation of the results of that inquiry.

Samuel Capen, Chancellor of this University from 1922 to 1950, wrote that what we have asked is "to be protected against every form of reprisal" that the truth might provoke. This is to be given a uniquely privileged status, one which almost implies absolute freedom. Judge Learned Hand pointed to the danger in this and other such extreme interpretations: "A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom," he said, "soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few. . . ."

The academic profession has recognized the validity of this warning and has sought to avoid the abuse of its freedom by self-imposed precepts: a reliance on scholarship rather than power, intellectual exchange rather than dogma, and above all humanity in its relations to others.

But academic freedom is now threatened. It is true that the university is one of many social institutions confronted today by a loss of confidence. It is also true that dissatisfaction with the university has been heightened by changes in other sectors of society. But we are still faced ultimately with the realization that the atmosphere of freedom on campus has been invaded. It has been invaded by those whose impatience and ill-conceived goals demand the destruction of the university as the only solution to the problems of an institution which reflects many of society's deficiencies and injustices. It has been invaded, too, by those who wish to suppress expression of unpopular views, who do not distinguish between violent revolt and peaceful dissent. The university has been peculiarly vulnerable to these invasions because its commitment to freedom and to the complexities of truth has often paralyzed its ability to act.

In reviewing recent educational history, it must be concluded that while less visible, no doubt because it was less volatile, serious abuses of academic freedom began to afflict universities in their early years of burgeoning affluence following World War II. These abuses were caused by arrogance, an arrogance which has done much to provoke the disorder which many have cited as the justification for the present threats to our autonomy. This haughtiness has been manifested in the imposition of an autocratic lecture system which too frequently has denied students the freedom of inquiry which we have claimed for ourselves. We have expected our own conclusions, expounded at length, to be returned dutifully at the end of the term. We have thus displayed in ourselves

the closed minds which we have been so quick to condemn in others.

Our research, and sometimes our pretensions to research, have interfered with our teaching. Light courses loads have been used as opportunities not to devote more time to individual students, but to pursue our own interests, whether or not these interests are of benefit to those whom we teach. Our offices are more often closed than open to students and much of our teaching has been left to the least experienced. Our research interests have too often been dictated by available funds which have led to an eager relinquishing of autonomy and self-direction. The excess of wealth that has mushroomed our research has been matched by our hubristic claims that have created unrealistic expectations among the students and in the community.

Not everyone is guilty, but to whatever extent these charges are applicable to institutions and individuals—to the University of Buffalo, to you and to me—then to that extent the institutions and the individuals have abrogated their responsibility to the purpose of higher education. This denial, this arrogance of self-interest, must be accorded its own proper role as a factor in the erosion of confidence in the academic profession. For it is a pervasive sense of disenchantment, not alone a reaction to campus disorder, which has created the current threat to autonomy and academic freedom.

III

There are many who now recommend that research institutes, separate from the universities, be created; that universities no longer act as certification boards for employers in business and in the professions; and that the public demand for the services of higher education be limited. These recommendations—which come from within the university as well as from without—suggest that there is a widespread belief that the university has over-extended itself, that it has attempted to fill too many roles.

These proposals may have some merit, but I do not believe that we are going to restore the trust we have lost simply by proposing remedies dependent upon elements outside the university. The teaching, research and service functions have been part of the role of universities since their creation in medieval times, and I do not foresee a time when one or another of them will be abandoned; they are too interrelated.

I believe first we must recognize that teaching is primary, and that research and service are valuable to the university in the degree to which they facilitate the former. It is through teaching that the university and the individual in the university will make their broadest contribution to the welfare of society. The teacher must never allow the pursuit of his own interests to lead to neglect of the intellectual growth of his students.

As the largest graduate center in the State University of New York, this institution at Buffalo has a particular obligation to research. But, if we insist that our activities in both the pure and applied fields are to be carefully selected to enhance the teaching process, then we will maintain our integrity as a true institution of learning. Realistically, this selection will have to be made among interests which individuals, businesses, foundations, and governments are willing to finance. It would be foolish to argue that social utility is not a powerful institutional influence. Nevertheless, careful selection among our options can preserve our right to define our own priorities while simultaneously serving societal advancement.

Public service, apart from the service inherent in teaching and research, has occupied during the last several years an in-

creasing amount of time and resources within the university. It is obvious by now, however, that the university cannot be honed into a cutting edge for social change. That role would require attributes that are antithetical to the objectivity demanded by scholarship. Therefore, in exercising this function we must make sure that our programs of service have a broad educational value, and that an advocacy of special interests does not usurp the critical stance that the university at all times must maintain.

IV

Can the responsibilities of the university community be observed without a formal and enforceable code of ethics? It is true that our universities have become more legalistic in nature as a result of campus disorders. Nevertheless, the disciplinary codes and due process measures that have been drawn up to deal with these problems have not stilled the public outcry for yet more stringent regulations.

Reacting to this external pressure and out of a genuine concern for the viability of freedom on the campus, many educators have suggested the need for a well-defined code which includes an enforcement mechanism. The Association of American University Professors recently released a statement on freedom and responsibility; the American Association of State Colleges and Universities has issued its own statement on "academic freedom, responsibility, and tenure"; and at both Berkeley and Stanford the faculties have been considering the strong enforcement of "codes."

I feel very strongly that this concern for professional ethics is healthy, for all too often in the past we have emphasized freedom without sufficient regard for responsibility. It is my personal hope, however, that California is not, as it has been labeled, "the nation's weather vane." I do not share the view of those persons who feel that the consensual and uncodified guidelines for academic freedom and academic responsibility are too ill-defined to be useful; and I do not want the University placed in the position of having to create a formal code and enforcement procedures as a means of avoiding that creation by others.

If this possibility can be averted, it will be done so only through institutional and individual commitment to self-discipline. It is this quality which enables us to sublimate our self-interests to the advancement of the human good and to thereby fulfill the purpose of higher education and of this University. The quality is intrinsic to scholarship; it is both our defense and our freedom. The time has now come to reclaim it.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleagues who have taken this day to salute an organization of Americans who have courageously borne the marks of our past wars.

I refer to the Disabled American Veterans, which now includes nearly 300,000 members in its 51st year of existence.

We have erected countless monuments of tribute to those who lost their lives carrying out our country's battles. But

because of their assimilation into civilian life, veterans disabled by those battles may not be so prominent in our minds. The work of the Disabled American Veterans of returning its members to productive civilian life deserves prominence, however, today and always.

Like one of our greatest Commanders in Chief, Abraham Lincoln, I believe what we say today will soon be forgotten. But the scars of battle borne by those maimed veterans cannot be obliterated. Disabled American Veterans, as an organization, will thus continue to have a great historic role to carry out in America.

The DAV's program is training and assistance to disabled veterans. I believe this to be one of the highest levels of citizenship in our Nation—which fought its first battles to establish itself as a Nation of freedom and opportunity.

FREE CHINA ON LAOS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes it is helpful to see ourselves and what we do through the eyes of other peoples, to get their opinion of certain facets of U.S. foreign policy. This is not to say that we should tailor our policies to the desires of other nations, far from it, but rather that we should reflect on the other fellow's point of view in order to see if perhaps we might not have overlooked something in our own assessment.

Toward this end, I insert some comments from the press of Free China on the recent allied thrust into enemy held areas of Laos. These comments appeared in the February 21, 1971, edition of the Free China Weekly:

CHINESE PRESS OPINION: VIETNAMIZATION AND ASIANIZATION

United Daily News: Expansion of Vietnamization into Asianization is imperative to safeguard Indochina's peace and security.

Asian Communism is international. Its threat must be combatted by international efforts. All Asian democracies should render support and assistance to South Vietnam for strikes against Communist bases in Laos.

To protect American lives in the course of further troop withdrawals, the United States must assist the South Vietnamese offensive in Laos by any and all means.

The Chinese Communists have not forgotten the bitter lessons learned in the Korean War. They are adopting "indirect aggression" as their ultimate strategy and avoiding open warfare throughout Southeast Asia. The Chinese Reds are instigating Communists in all the Asian countries to launch "people's warfare" and bring about a "united front" of armed revolt.

The primary goal of Peiping's strategy is to compel U.S. forces to withdraw from Vietnam. Peiping can ignore the cutting of the Ho Chi Minh trail by South Vietnamese forces. The Chinese Reds know the Viet Cong and Pathet Lao can renew aggression when U.S. forces are gone from Vietnam.

New Life Daily News: Indochina's peace and security depend on the success of the

U.S. and South Vietnamese offensive against the Communists in Laos.

U.S. and South Vietnamese operations against the Communists in Laos is the first large-scale offensive of the Vietnam war. This move is important strategically because it seeks to combine Indochina's three battlefields into one. The morale and anti-Communist solidarity of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos will be greatly strengthened.

Peiping has repeatedly protested against the Allied offensive in Laos and pledged to continue supporting Communists in the three Indochina nations. Peiping is trying to stimulate the emotions of U.S. anti-war elements and appeasers and arouse resistance to the Nixon administration.

The Chinese Communists are expanding the Indochina war. Chou En-lai's statement that "war has no boundaries" is a threat intended to test the reaction of the United States. Mainland China is still in a state of turmoil and Mao Tse-tung dares not become openly involved.

Washington must not forget the lesson learned in Cambodia last year. Full support should be given the South Vietnamese offensive in Laos, including the bombing of North Vietnam if necessary.

Central Daily News: The new military drive into Laos is much more important than last year's military operations in Cambodia by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces.

The campaign in Laos will help prevent Communist aggression and provide more time for Vietnamization. Communist supply lines to Cambodia and South Vietnam will be cut.

Cutting of the Ho Chi Minh trail is a big blow to Hanoi. The South Vietnamese can do it again if the situation requires. Hanoi knows this route is no longer dependable.

China News: The cutting of the Ho Chi Minh trail and the successful defense of Cambodia would shorten the Indochina war.

American doves have so far made less noise than expected about the South Vietnamese advance into Laos.

This could be because the opposition is off to a slow start. More protests can be expected in time.

It also may be that some peace advocates recognize the necessity for doing something about the Communist build-up in Laos if the Vietnam war is ever to be ended.

Almost all North Vietnamese reinforcements and supplies now move into Cambodia and South Vietnam via the Ho Chi Minh trail running down the spine of Laos.

Kompong Som, the Cambodian port on the Gulf of Siam, is no longer open to Communist use.

That leaves only the Ho Chi Minh trail. Infiltration across the Demilitarized Zone and along South Vietnam's eastern and southern coasts is of minor consequence.

If the North Vietnamese cannot get at South Vietnam, the final phase of the war becomes an exercise of cleaning up the Viet Cong and remnant Hanoi forces.

South Vietnamese are already strong enough for that. This is manifest in the U.S. decision to back up the South Vietnamese army in Laos.

Should Saigon's forces fall, the future of Vietnamization would be placed in jeopardy. Free Vietnamese morale would be seriously and perhaps fatally undermined.

President Nixon and the Pentagon obviously believe the danger is slight. They are confident that with American air support but without American ground combat forces, the South Vietnamese are more than a match for the North Vietnamese regulars they will meet in Laos.

"This is, then, the supreme test of Vietnamization. The Vietnam war is coming down to its final denouncement."

FORTY AMPHETAMINE DOSES A YEAR FOR EVERY MAN, WOMAN, AND CHILD IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last year I was one of those who sponsored the amendment which would have brought about restrictions on the number of amphetamines produced annually in this country. I continue to believe that there is absolutely no justification for four major drug manufacturers to spew forth no less than 8 billion bennies, dexies, goof balls, and pep pills—as they are commonly called—each year, while the actual medical need is for a small fraction of that number. As one who has consistently supported broad and far-reaching legislation to curtail the rampant spread of drug abuse in this country, I consider the continuing lack of restriction in this area to be a potential source for still more Americans—particularly the young—to be damaged by misuse of drugs.

Believing that the amphetamine issue can and should be again raised in the 92d Congress, I would like to offer for my colleagues' consideration a recent editorial broadcast on WCBS-TV New York. The station's spokesman outlines the issue very clearly and urges the adoption of legislation to plug this hole in the antidrug dam. I certainly concur with this editorial, the text of which follows:

WCBS-TV EDITORIAL

TOO MANY AMPHETAMINES

This may come as an unpleasant surprise to many people—especially parents of teenagers frightened by our ever-growing drug epidemic—but there are dangerous drugs legally manufactured in this country that are never used for medical purposes at all. They go, instead, to illicitly produce the ups and downs, the thrills and kicks of drug-abusers.

Take amphetamines for example. Amphetamines—or speed, bennies, pep pills, as they are known in the streets—are produced in such incredible numbers in this country that, in more ways than one, the figure is mind-boggling. Testimony before the House Select Committee on Crime showed that though the legitimate medical requirement for amphetamines is under a billion pills a year, there are some 8 billion pills produced. That's enough for every man, woman and child in the country to have 40 amphetamine doses a year.

It doesn't take much guesswork to know where all the extra billions of pills are going. Most wind up in the hands of youngsters, too often with the disastrous psychological reactions and brain damage that can result.

Crime Committee hearings described one manufacturer, now out of business, that shipped over a million amphetamines to a consignee in Mexico. Federal agents investigating the sale found the consignee's address was actually the 11th hole of a Tijuana golf course.

Despite abuses such as this, when the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Bill was passed by Congress last year, drug manufacturers were able to successfully lobby against ef-

forts to limit the manufacture of amphetamines.

In our opinion, limitations on these and other such widely abused drugs should be written into law. Perhaps now, they will be. The United States, and 63 other nations, have just signed a treaty, whereby each agrees to establish drug quotas as well as licensing and reporting devices. The Congress should move quickly to ratify the treaty and work out details of the necessary legislation.

The profits of drug companies—even those who have been helpful in backing drug abuse legislation—cannot be measured against the damage done our young people by the appalling number of unnecessary drugs that this country manufactures.

REPEAL OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I appeared before the House Armed Services Committee to present my views on the grave and critical question of the draft. I indicated there my profound conviction that all forms of military conscription must be dismantled, and that any proposal which calls for less than that—to reform the draft rather than to abolish it—is a snare and a fraud upon the public.

Our country can no longer ignore the injustices and immorality of a system that takes men against their will and then compounds the injustice by favoring the privileged and the affluent. Nor can we continue to supply unlimited manpower to Indochina and thus enable the prolongation of a generals' war in Southeast Asia. In my testimony I expressed support for Senate Joint Resolution 20, a resolution sponsored by Senators HATFIELD, MCGOVERN, CHURCH, and CRANSTON, which calls for repeal of the Military Selective Service Act by December 31, 1971. I have introduced a similar resolution, House Joint Resolution 345, in the House.

The text of House Joint Resolution 345 and of my testimony before the Armed Services Committee follow:

H.J. RES. 345

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, as amended, is repealed effective December 31, 1971.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE BELLA S. ABZUG BEFORE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to present my views on the draft to the House Armed Services Committee as you receive testimony on House bills 2476, 3496, 3497 and 3498.

Let me quickly summarize views that I will expand upon in a moment. I am unalterably opposed to military conscription and believe it should be dismantled. I regard draft reform as a snare and delusion. Changes in a system of involuntary servitude can never correct the basic injustice perpetrated by a form of slavery. Moreover, the

draft has made possible the escalation and continuation of the war in Indochina. As an important step toward ending that wretched war, the President's power to induct men into the armed forces must not be extended beyond June 30.

The draft has brought untold misery to many of my constituents, the less privileged members of society, including a high percentage of Puerto Ricans, who suffer most from the injustices of conscription. I should like to speak of their condition, and also emphasize the deep and passionate concern that most women feel about the draft.

In the first place, I view any form of compulsory "service" as wrong and, in fact, a misuse of the word service. Conscription, no matter how worthy the avowed purpose, no matter in what sophisticated packaging it is wrapped, is involuntary servitude. To keep using the word "service" to describe actual slavery is a mockery.

Therefore, I do not advocate any type of draft reform. I view attempts to make the draft allegedly more equitable as both romantic and pernicious—romantic because the achievement of equity within a conscription system is impossible, and pernicious since by instituting minor changes and holding out false hopes these attempts tend to make the draft more palatable to the public.

Even such widely heralded "reform" as the lottery has not for one minute altered the fact that some men are taken, and that among them some are killed, wounded and mutilated, while others remain free to go about their business because they drew a lucky number.

I share with millions of my fellow Americans deep distress at the strife and discord that the draft is producing so widely throughout our country. Until very recently the draft was conscripting thousands of young men, too young to vote. The draft is still exploiting the labor of all young men, especially those who are politically and economically least powerful. Many of my constituents are in this group. Large numbers of the young people in my district are poor, and many are Puerto Rican or black and jobless. Students are deferred. Those in essential occupations are deferred. My constituents, not deferred, are drafted in their stead.

I have witnessed at first hand the increasing alienation of many young people as conscription forces them to choose among evils—either going to Vietnam to fight in a war they loathe, fleeing the country, or going to jail.

In my district the revulsion against military conscription is considerable, and in the course of my election campaign it was made clear to me that the people there want an end to the draft, an end to the war and attention to their very pressing needs for better housing, jobs, etc.

Such measures as the abolition of student deferments and the setting of a national call are not sufficient to deal with the injustice of conscription. If student deferments are ended, some of my constituents will be drafted, sent to foreign battlefields to kill and to be killed, while other young men will remain scot free. As long as one American boy is forced against his will both to face death and to mete it out to others, then basic injustice and the cruelest form of slavery continue to operate in our society.

Secondly, I object to any and all draft laws because of the practical impact that peace time conscription has had upon U.S. foreign policy. The draft has greatly weakened democratic control over foreign policy. It has provided the manpower for large-scale military interventions overseas without approval by Congress and the people. The existence of an unlimited supply of conscripts encourages the government to resort to military solutions and thwarts the development of a constructive foreign policy. The Vietnam

war might have been avoided had Congress been required to approve a reinstatement of the draft for specific purpose of furnishing fighting men for Vietnam instead of being called on to approve an ambiguous and relatively harmless looking Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Conscription thus becomes the key element in enabling administrations, whether Democrat or Republican, unilaterally to commit the nation to war, even when that involvement proves to be dangerous to the national interest and the health of the economy.

Conscription guarantees to the military and to the White House the "flexibility" which by their own admission they covet. Ready access to a limitless reservoir of manpower enables them rapidly to expand the size of the army by administrative fiat and thus to wage undeclared war. There is no need to consult Congress, no need to go to the people.

The key role which the draft plays in making possible the continuation of the immoral and unpopular war in Indochina is underlined by the very introduction of H.R. 2476. The drafting of men, we are told, must continue for at least two more years. Testimony has been given to this Committee to prove that without a conscription system to furnish men to the armed forces, even the gradual withdrawal of American forces from Indochina cannot be implemented as presently planned. Selective Service Director, Curtis Tarr, recently visited Saigon for a firsthand view of the situation, and expressed the judgment that we must have the draft to continue fighting in Vietnam. Defense Department spokesmen testified recently that the draft must be continued for two years to meet the manpower needs of the armed forces, including the necessary deployment in Indochina.

According to figures given to me by the Defense Department, as of February 11, 1971 the Army alone was sending 19,000 replacements a month to Vietnam. The percentage of draftees who go to Vietnam is not recorded as they depart from the United States but approximately 37 percent of American troops in Vietnam are draftees and that percentage has remained steady for a number of months. Overall, 11 percent of Army personnel are draftees, so that apparently a disproportionate number of draftees is being sent to Vietnam.

The casualty figures are also illuminating. For the first quarter of 1970, for example, of those killed in action, 65 percent were drafted men. Of those wounded in action for the first seven months of 1970, 58 percent were draftees. For the total period from January, 1961 to March 31, 1970, 49.3 percent of those killed in action were draftees. The full meaning of this last figure becomes clear when it is noted that for a number of years as the war was winding up, no draftees were in Vietnam.

Clearly, without the forced involvement of conscripts, Administration and Defense Department plans for waging war in Southeast Asia would have to undergo considerable revision.

I believe that this abominable war must end. The majority of the American people have made it clear through public opinion polls that they want the war to end. Thus far, every effort to do so has failed. The Cooper-Church Amendment is being openly flouted. The war is not winding down; with the invasion of Laos, it is expanding. In the final analysis, manpower is warpower. Cutting off the manpower will necessitate a radical change in so-called withdrawal time-tables. Cutting off the manpower will ultimately result in ending the war.

I therefore strongly advocate ending the draft in order to end the war. I express my support for Senate Joint Resolution 20, sponsored by Senators Hatfield, McGovern, Church and Cranston, a resolution that would totally abolish the Selective Service

System by December 31st of this year. I have introduced a similar Resolution, H.R. 345, in the House.

As a minimum step, should Senate Joint Resolution 20 not be enacted by the U.S. Senate, I strongly advocate that the President's induction power not be extended beyond June 30, this year. Deep concern has been increasingly expressed in Congress because the control that it once exercised over foreign policy has virtually disappeared. If Congress wishes to reassert its influence over foreign policy, one practical step would be to close the door on the conscription of manpower at the behest of the President.

Moreover, I firmly believe that the time to put an end to the President's induction power is this year. To wait for such action until 1973—after the national elections—means in all probability never to take action. Today with the draft still conscripting young men to fight in Vietnam, feeling runs deep throughout the land. If, however, draft calls are gradually reduced to zero by 1973, that feeling will abate, and today's demands for an end to conscription will fade. In 1973, it will be easy quietly to extend the presidential induction power—perhaps indefinitely. That, I believe, is what the Pentagon and the Administration have been counting on all along. For the welfare of our country, for the preservation of genuine freedom in America, and for the peace of the world, we must not allow that to happen.

Coupled, of course, with the need for draftees to fill the ranks in Indochina is the manpower problem posed by the fact that approximately one million American men are posted in garrisons overseas. To man these far flung military outposts, we must conscript young men, at least so we are told. Clearly, to many of the world's peoples our overseas military bases—thousands of miles from our shores—often much closer to the borders of potential enemy nations than to our own, are highly provocative. Far from promoting peace, they create suspicion and hostility. Far from providing security, these bases make for fear and animosity. I urge that we bring the men home from these military outposts. As we do, our alleged need of conscription to provide manpower for these bases disappears.

Although not an advocate of a volunteer army, I recognize the fact that if the draft is repealed within the next few months, we will then have an army without draftees—obviously, an army of volunteers. I would make three comments about the existence of such armed forces:

First, a volunteer army is obviously a lesser evil than conscription. Secondly, such an army should not be a permanent feature of American life, but a transitional part of our society. I view the end of conscription and the resulting volunteer army, not as an end in itself, but as a step taken toward a world of law and order. To me the end of conscription, the resulting disappearance of a limitless source of manpower for military adventurism, and increased Congressional control over foreign policy would minimize the drives in some quarters for the U.S. to be a world policeman. The end of the draft would make far more likely the constructive participation of this great nation in building a world of genuine community. The causes of tension and mistrust would be greatly reduced if we adopted a far less threatening posture than that which we present to so much of mankind today.

In the third place, I support such pay raises as those included in H.R. 3496, 3497, and 3498, especially as they apply to first-term recruits. Draftees are presently grossly underpaid as compared to the wages they would receive in civilian life. One economist has estimated that, in effect, each draftee is "taxed" \$3600 per year in addition to having his body conscripted. To provide for pay raises as set forth in these bills is simply to approach

equity in place of the gross unfairness of the present situation.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that women feel deeply and strongly about the necessity to end the draft, which is taking their sons, husbands, and brothers for an illegal and immoral war.

As Josephine Lee Davis, Associate Director of the National Council to Repeal the Draft has said: "Women, committed to life support and increasingly conscious of the insidious subtlety of compulsion, are natural enemies of conscription—a system which disregards the value of human life and uses people indifferently and capriciously to destroy other human beings."

HOW AMERICANS FEEL ABOUT POLITICAL ADVERTISING

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, political advertising has become an issue in itself of late. While limits are being contemplated, campaign expenditures nevertheless increase. As the prime producers of such advertising, we in the House would do well to familiarize ourselves with the views of those who must consume the product. The following is an excerpt from an extended report prepared by a distinguished expert in the field. He is Mr. Albert P. Weisman, of Foote, Cone & Belding Advertising, Inc. The report, entitled "A Report on the Public's Reaction to Political Advertising," is based on interviews conducted after last November's elections.

The report follows:

A REPORT ON THE PUBLIC'S REACTION TO POLITICAL ADVERTISING—NOVEMBER 11TH WAVE RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

There has been much discussion in the media about the influence of political advertising on television. Legislation which would limit campaign spending on TV was recently vetoed by President Nixon. In order to get an idea of public opinion on this controversial subject, several questions were included on the November Wave of the FC&B's Monthly Information Service. Specially, we wished to get some idea of the extent to which people felt political advertising on TV was influential in the last election, and if they felt such advertising should be restricted or controlled. The exact wordings of the question have been appended to this report.

The original intent of this research was to provide these limited measures only, but analysis of the data has revealed that there are many more questions that need answers before we can begin to understand public opinion on the issue of political advertising. The findings from this study must be supplemented by knowledge of why people felt advertising influenced voting behavior, what kinds of people they thought were swayed by the TV efforts, whether they think these sources and kinds of influence are good or bad, and why. Furthermore, it is apparent that people's responses were very much affected by the specific local campaigns to which they were exposed in 1970—the influence of which cannot be sensitively evaluated in a nationally oriented study.

Methodology

The Monthly Information Service is conducted by FC&B for the purpose of efficiently obtaining information from and about peo-

ple. Each month personal in-home interviews are conducted throughout the United States with adults 21 and over. A minimum of 1,500 interviews are completed, about equally divided between men and women. Because of the way in which the sample has been designed and the large number of interviews conducted, results obtained from the FC&B Monthly Information Service can be used as a fairly accurate estimate of the attitudes/behavior of the entire U.S. population 21 and older. (A detailed description of the sample design has been appended.)

Interviewing for this wave was conducted in over 300 areas across the country, from November 11 through November 17, 1970. A total of 1,609 people were interviewed, 777 men and 832 women. The actual fieldwork was supervised by The Gallup Organization, Inc. All computer runs and analysis of the data have been performed by FC&B's research department.

HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS

1. The overwhelming majority of adults believe that political advertising on television had some influence in affecting people's voting behavior in the last election; seven out of every ten feel that advertising was at least "somewhat influential," with half feeling that it was highly influential.

2. Generally speaking, people more likely to be aware of and interested in the political process are the most likely to believe that TV advertising had an influential effect. Specifically, people between 21 and 45, better educated, with higher occupational status, and in middle income groups are most convinced that political advertising had an influence. Men, residents in larger cities, and those from upper income families were somewhat polarized in their responses—that is, they feel that TV advertising was either highly influential or that it had little or no influence.

3. For the country as a whole, belief in the influence of political advertising varies only slightly by party affiliation, with Republicans and Independents somewhat more likely than Democrats to feel that political advertising was highly influential. This pattern is not surprising, since it has been observed that party affiliation has become less useful in predicting political opinions in general, and voting.

4. Almost three-quarters of adults go along with the desire for some kind of restriction or control of political advertising on TV, with 65% in favor of controlling the advertising itself and 9% who feel that only the length of the campaign should be restricted. Four out of ten of those who favor some political restriction articulate no specific complaint, but merely believe that restriction of this advertising is a good idea.

5. The most frequently specified concern is that all candidates should have equal time and money (24% of all adults); this was a more prevalent feeling among men, people 25-34, college educated, in professional occupations, middle income, and from large cities—a profile essentially similar to those believing that advertising had the greatest effect. This suggests that if people feel that a disproportionate amount of advertising for one candidate was influential in affecting the electoral outcome, then there is a direct correlation between belief in the influence of advertising and belief that it should be restricted.

People from the East expressed somewhat greater concern about control over political advertising expenditures, but this seemed to be a more specific feeling about the type of restrictions, rather than more desire for restriction.

6. The Western region appears to represent a different situation. People here are much more likely to feel that advertising was extremely influential and to believe that the content of the advertising should be re-

stricted—suggesting that they feel that advertising style rather than, or in addition to, amount is related to perceived influence.

7. Because there are several kinds of objections to political advertising, there is no direct correlation between perceived influence and desire to have it restricted. The pattern that seems to emerge suggests that people who think it is extremely influential want restrictions on those areas yielding unfair influence—extra money, or untrue or dishonorable content—and those who think that it is not influential want it restricted because it is a nuisance.

"Z" HERO A VICTIM OF GREEK JUNTA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, lest there be any lingering doubt in the minds of any of my colleagues about the antidemocratic and totalitarian nature of the Greek military junta—which remains in existence mainly by virtue of tourism and U.S. aid—I would bring to their attention the following article from the Christian Science Monitor on the unlawful arrest and imprisonment of Judge Christos Sartzetakis, the young judge whose courageous investigation of the murder of Deputy Gregoire Lambrakis was presented to an American audience in the movie "Z." Following the Sartzetakis story is a tough-minded and accurate portrayal by Washington Post columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak of the manner in which the junta has maneuvered the United States into its corner. The Sartzetakis article, in juxtaposition with the Washington Post column, is enough to set any sane man's teeth on edge.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 1, 1971]

GREEKS ARREST THE REAL "Z"

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Fact can be stranger than film. The real-life hero of the moving picture "Z," which has been very popular in the United States, has been arrested in the middle of the night by the Greek military junta.

He is now in Athens held in a police building close to the Embassy of the United States, which is having second thoughts about its support for the military rulers of that country.

The "investigating judge," who was appointed under Greek law to look into the murder of a liberal Greek political leader at a peace rally, was in real life a young judge, Christos Sartzetakis. His role in the closely documented film was played by the French actor Jean-Louis Trintignant. The role of the murdered left-wing Deputy Gregoire Lambrakis was played by Yves Montand.

Word has now reached Washington that Judge Sartzetakis was taken into custody without any legal preliminaries, when on a visit to his family in Salonika, on the night before Christmas.

SYMBOL OF RESISTANCE

He had become an international as well as a national symbol of resistance to arbitrary police power. After his dramatic breaking open of the Lambrakis case, with his finding that the police themselves instigated

the crime and that "higher-ups" were trying to cover it up, leaders of the police were arrested and tried.

Administrative penalties were imposed on the then Greek solicitor general who later became "civil president" of the first Cabinet, established by the present military junta when it seized power. The solicitor general's penalties were then revoked.

The youthful judge responsible for the exposure and trial of the police then personally led a militant defense, before the Greek Council of State, against a take-over of the independent judicial system by the junta.

Sartzetakis, whose fate is now unknown, rigorously held to his independence as a judge from political pressures during this period when he challenged the military leaders. He refused to join any resistance movement against the government. When ordered to return from legal studies in Paris, at a time when he could have remained in exile, he voluntarily returned to Athens to face whatever would be done with him.

He was dismissed from his post for a period, and then on Christmas eve the government imprisoned him, without public charges so far as is known here.

JUNTA MOVED ON COURTS

It was a year after the junta seized power in a coup d'etat, and five years after the Lambrakis affair, that the new military government moved against the court system of Greece, which was blocking its progress toward a police state. The junta suspended for three days the article of the Greek Constitution which protects judges from dismissal. It then fired some 30 judges, including Judge Sartzetakis.

The order of dismissal in his case accused him of acting with "partiality, moved by his political convictions" in his work as a judge.

Along with other judges, and in the face of growing evidence of government by terror in Greece, Mr. Sartzetakis appealed his dismissal directly to the Greek Council of State. He argued at length before the council that the government was required to respect the Constitution, and particularly the inviolability of judges. In his argument he said, "I am particularly proud," referring specifically to his work as judge-investigator in the Lambrakis case.

The Council of State rejected the plea of another of the dismissed judges and Judge Sartzetakis sent a second appeal, asking the council to have the courage to reconsider its position and enforce the law. In it, he told of being repeatedly threatened during his judicial career both by "instructions" and by "criminal menaces against my physical existence."

LEGAL PRINCIPLES DEFENDED

He said the authors of these agreed on legal principles but said it was "absolutely forbidden . . . to apply them when it would compromise the authorities" or compromise ideas that the authorities considered socially desirable.

Judge Sartzetakis said he was not dismissed because of a fault. "On the contrary," it was for "having been a judge in the full sense of the word. If I may be pardoned for saying so, I acted with pride but without presumption. I have known no other truth but that which, on each occasion, was dictated by the imperative of the law, that deity without face, and the voice of my conscience.

"My conscience has remained, as far as humanly possible, free of all exterior influence and of all human passion. Of passion I had only one: to lift myself to the level where justice has been placed by the universal conscience . . . when surrounded by the turbulence of rivalries and the exasperation caused by social tensions."

The Council of State reversed its position, ordered the reinstatement of the judges, and the junta refused to execute the orders of

the council. It later issued a new law to suit its own purposes and Judge Sartzetakis was without work and funds, barred from any professional activity. He refused all offers of aid in order to "remain independent" and lived modestly until his arrest.

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

THE GREEK SNOW JOB

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

In subduing congressional protests over resumption of military aid to Greece, the State Department painted a totally misleading picture of approval by Greek opposition leaders who are now making clear just how deeply they regret this momentous step by Washington.

The State Department, justifying renewed military aid to the Greek military dictatorship, quietly told Congress that even militant anti-junta politicians favored the step, partly for national security and partly because the junta was moving toward restoration of democratic procedures including free elections.

The fact that these contentions are now being repudiated by Greek democrats fits the secret record of collusion between Athens and Washington since the coup d'etat by the Greek colonels in April, 1967, relieved only now by high-level misgivings in Foggy Bottom.

The clearest repudiation of the State Department's selling job on Greek aid is a confidential letter to Greek exile circles in the U.S. from Constantine Mitsotakis, a leader in the moderate wing of the late George Papandreou's Center Union Party. Now exiled in Paris, Mitsotakis is probably the Center Union leader closest to King Constantine, in self-exile in Rome.

His letter calls on Greece's ousted political leaders "to clearly demonstrate our opposition to this decision of the American government" to resume arms aid, suspended after the 1967 coup. Moreover, Mitsotakis is backed by the nine most prominent exile leaders covering a wide political spectrum.

Their anger dramatically underlines testimony before a Senate Armed Services subcommittee on the resumption of aid. Christian Chapman, a middle-level State Department official, stated last August that "within the last month the leadership of the former democratic parties (in Greece) have told us directly that they were concerned about the security of their country" and therefore favored lifting the arm's embargo.

His testimony was based on private conversations held by Roger Davies, deputy assistant secretary of state, with self-designated leaders of the anti-junta opposition in Athens. One of those bogus leaders was Spiros Markezinis, an extreme rightist, who actually has close ties to the junta.

What infuriated legitimate anti-junta politicians was that in announcing the aid resumption Sept. 22, the State Department sold it to a skeptical U.S. Congress on the basis that the junta was vigorously moving toward parliamentary government.

Even before the arms embargo was lifted, Sen. J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, gave Davies rough treatment in a committee hearing. After Davies testified the junta was really reforming, Fulbright snapped that this was "so utterly contrary to the facts as they exist (that it) cannot help but raise a question in our minds as to whether you are playing with us."

But when the State Department in later testimony claimed backing from anti-junta leaders for the aid resumption, Fulbright and other U.S. senators had to hold their fire. In short, they were sandbagged.

Since then, the folly of the Nixon administration's decision has been coming home to roost. In a little-noticed remark on "Face

the Nation" Feb. 14, Davies' boss, Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco, employing typical diplomatic understatement, said: "Candidly, we have been disappointed in the fact that there hasn't been more progress towards the establishment of parliamentary government" in Greece.

That was the first public signal that some Nixon administration officials are having second thoughts about the aid resumption, which dissipated the major U.S. lever for democratic reforms in Greece.

Simultaneously, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will soon take up a report on Greece expected to be highly critical of the junta's refusal to schedule elections, free all political prisoners and end dictatorial rule. That report, drafted by two committee investigators who went to Athens, will presumably tell the truth about the anger of anti-junta political leaders over being used as a foil to justify arms aid.

Convinced that the resumption of aid not only solidified the junta and undercut their own efforts to restore parliamentary government, these legitimate opposition politicians are mortified at being used by the State Department to achieve this triumph for the colonels.

OPERATION HELPING HAND

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1969, while serving as commander U.S. naval forces, Vietnam, Adm. E. R. Zumwalt, Jr., instituted Operation Helping Hand, a program designed to upgrade the standard of living of the Vietnamese Navy men, their dependents, widows, and orphans, and to make rehabilitation a reality for disabled navy veterans.

The program provides for basic housing and a minimum protein dietary supplement to Vietnamese Navy families and a prototype dependent community for wounded navy veterans, widows, and orphans in the vicinity of the GVN Rehabilitation and Vocational Training Center at Cat Lai, near Saigon. Since then, material from Project Handclasp, USAID, CARE and numerous other sources, together with an enormous amount of work by individual American and Vietnamese Navy men have made the program flourish.

However, financial support is desperately needed to purchase additional building materials, livestock, feed, vaccine, and fishing equipment, and to pay for salaries of school teachers where classrooms are being built at newly established Navy bases.

In some cities, Navy League councils and Fleet Reserve Association branches have organized local fund drives. Naval Reservists are encouraged to assist these organizations in promoting this program.

Operation Helping Hand is a good cause. It is a cause which helps here at home by strengthening staunch U.S. allies in Vietnam. Operation Helping Hand deserves the goodwill and support of all Americans and particularly those with close naval ties.

TRIBUTE TO POLICE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Charlotte E. Michael, 2933 Fairlee Drive, Fairfax, Va., has composed two poems that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. During these times, I do not believe we can do too much in supporting our policemen and giving them all the recognition possible. Most certainly reaffirming our allegiance to our country is always in order.

I include the poems as follows:

TO BE A POLICEMAN

(By Charlotte E. Michael)

To be a Policeman many things are required: You must be a lawyer, a doctor, an advisor and a quick thinker. If you come up with the wrong answer, to the public you're quite a stinker.

We hear much complaining about the taxes for the policeman's salary, but when these people go on vacation they want their home watched as though it were an art gallery! This is part of your job and you take it all in stride, so whatever you do . . . do it with pride.

Times have changed and so has the policeman's work, with better pay and education, you're no longer considered just another jerk. Things are quite different now—but you have come out on top—and we don't hear this phrase as frequently—"just another dumb cop."

Personality, poise, respect, and cool head you must maintain. You must be able to communicate and every day you try; that's why it's so sad to think of all the young widows who sit home and cry—but they know that their man in the course of his duty had to die. Is there an answer to this question, Why?

This is being written to honor all of our fine Policemen and the work that they have done; and for every single complainer, there are ten that you have won. This profession you have chosen—you are dedicated and true—and I pray that God will bless each and every one of you.

GOD AND COUNTRY

(By Charlotte E. Michael)

God, we thank you for our Country—the most blessed nation in the world; where we have our freedom to worship as we desire—where we see fewer people go hungry—as in the past; and has been so, thus far.

We know America has many faults, but too our Country we must be true . . . for this great land of ours was wrought by God's hand—we thank you God—and may every Christian take a firmer stand!

As we read the papers and hear the news . . . we see the Scriptures unfold, and we know that our future has been foretold! I am thankful for the red, white and blue . . . may we work diligently until the end, dear Lord, for you.

On our seals we read "IN GOD WE TRUST" . . . this is a faithful saying . . . and indeed we MUST! Four little words stamped on many documents—and then forgot—I can't help but think of Sodom and Gomorrah and the mission of Lot!

So "Old Glory" as you float in the breeze . . . We respect you . . . and God has brought us through many a tight squeeze! We know, God, that you make no mistakes . . . but we make many . . . then we can rejoice, because Jesus who walked this earth didn't make any!

ALLEGHENY COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SALUTE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT CAMPAIGN

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in a bipartisan show of concern for our environment, the Allegheny County Commissioners issued a resolution commending the actions of Senator EDMUND MUSKIE in this regard.

I would like to add my support to this crusade for a cleaner environment to that of the Allegheny County Commissioners, Leonard Staisey, Thomas Foerster, and Dr. William Hunt.

The following is the commissioners' resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PA.

Whereas, the land on which we live, the air we breathe and the sky which gives us sun and rain are Divine gifts; and

Whereas, man has been endowed by his Creator to be steward of the world in which he lives; and

Whereas, mankind has accepted these gifts without proper gratitude, and thoughtlessly poisoned the very elements which sustain life; and

Whereas, United States Senator Edmund S. Muskie of our Sister State of Maine has awakened the nation to the ravages inflicted on man's environment; and

Whereas, this great Senator, in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, strives to stem the desolation that covers much of the face of the land; and

Whereas, Senator Muskie has played a key role in the passage of pioneering legislation to cleanse the nation's air, land and water; and

Whereas, he has summoned executive and administrative leadership that is prepared to commit the necessary resources and willing to enforce the necessary laws; and

Whereas, Senator Muskie reminds us that the right to use the goods of the earth must be tempered with responsibility, and has called for inhabitants of this blessed land to combine understanding, vision, determination and positive action in applying modern technology to save mankind.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that this Allegheny County Board of County Commissioners and all the citizens of Allegheny County pledge to aid Senator Muskie in his efforts to save God's good earth—and ours.

Resolved and enacted this 18th day of February 1971.

COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

Attest:

T. B. CARPENTER,
Chief Clerk.

CERTIFICATE

I, Thomas B. Carpenter, Chief Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Allegheny, Pennsylvania, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of a certain Resolution duly adopted by said Board at a regular meeting thereof duly held on the 18th day of February 1971, as the same appears in the minutes of said meeting duly recorded in said Board's Minute Book Vol. 52.

Witness my hand and the seal of said County of Allegheny hereto affixed this 18th day of February 1971.

T. B. CARPENTER,
Chief Clerk.

PROJECT DARE HAS MADE GREAT STRIDES

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the remarkable leadership demonstrated by Project DARE, a group of volunteers which is working to make young people and their parents aware of the dangers of drugs.

Project DARE has made great strides in attracting youth to many exciting recreational pursuits which do not involve recourse to drugs.

Under the leadership of Dr. J. Thomas Ungerleider the project has provided a valuable service to the people of the Los Angeles area and has set a high standard for volunteer efforts in the field of drug abuse.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article written in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner on November 29, 1970:

ANTI-DRUG PROJECT OVERCOMES ALL ODDS

Following Dr. Ungerleider in speeches across the country, DARE students have frequently uprooted the misconceptions of parents by proving there is not necessarily a parallel between drug use and hair or dress. From this point the students can explain to parents that serious drug use is the product of emotional stress rooted mostly in the family unit. Surprisingly, DARE students have often persuaded unlikely looking local drug users to admit their indulgence before the audience; a shock which leaves parents conducive to frank discussions to discover where such problems really lie and how best to deal with them.

Healthy response to his speeches and the work of project students led Ungerleider in 1968 to the idea of an educational film which could be shown in schools around the country. The final product, "Beyond LSD," took the same characteristic straight-forward approach toward parents and children. The film won the Columbus (Ohio) National Educational Film Festival in 1968 and is still in demand.

DARE students also originated the idea of an exhibit called "The Happening" which could be (and has been) presented in several cities across the country. The Happening, aimed mostly at parents, included excerpts from hard rock music with references to drugs. Parents were surprised that as often as not the references, in fact, cast scorn on drug users. Other far out lyrics, they discovered, had a meaning entirely different from their predilections.

The Happening exhibit received the Rush Gold Medal Award—first place—for all scientific exhibits at the 125th Anniversary Meeting of the American Psychiatric Assoc. in 1969, Miami, Fla.

Highlighting DARE honors was selection of their film and exhibit by Canada to represent preventive drug education in the United States at Expo 70, last summer.

DARE's and Ungerleider's work continues. Disciplined thought is the cornerstone of approach. DARE doesn't exonerate the drug user nor does it blame the parents. It only asks that young people dare to study the facts available and parents dare to study themselves and the facts about today's youth. Their theory is simple: People can make it without a crutch whether the crutch is tobacco or marijuana; aspirin or acid.

For a number of practical reasons, Project

DARE at UCLA should have failed. At best, it should be only a mediocre program . . . not notably efficient, not notably prolific, not notably influential.

When Dr. J. Thomas Ungerleider, drug research director at the university's Neuropsychiatric Institute, formulated Project DARE in 1965, he had the richest of intentions—a program aimed diversely at the community level, complementing his own research—but he took a calculated professional gamble.

There was no money, people or space for the project in the beginning. Ungerleider, himself, was just developing a nationwide reputation through psychiatry, writings and speeches as one of the most knowledgeable experts in the field of drug abuse research and education. The risk: If the project failed, it might discredit his professional approach or, worse, if the project was shaky, he might come under heavy fire for breeding a community program that was unstable and failed morally those who relied upon it.

Though the university does not provide money or people for DARE, it did allow Ungerleider to hire an assistant who could also oversee the project. Fran Burnford, an educational therapist, found her office was in the hall on the institute's second floor.

Then came the recruitment of a couple dozen youths. They would have to be volunteers; there was no money to pay them though they would be asked to give up their off time in the same vein as a parttime job with work on Saturdays. Moreover, the youths had to be the certain type consistent with Ungerleider's plan: long hair, mod, intelligent, good grades, but no drug use. The youths were found and accepted the challenge.

Meanwhile the first stages of the project were underway, there was no turning back. Token contributions got the project rolling. It all had to come through. And it did.

But today, the obstacles still seem overwhelming. A grant of \$18,000 from the California Council on Criminal Justice does give the project some solvency. And incredibly, the original 30 youths are still with the project, and now—after 3 years—earn \$2 an hour for their work.

But new obstacles have replaced old ones. For example, DARE is now confronted with some 40,000 requests monthly for recommendations and material. All requests must be answered. An average of five films a week must be previewed and rated for consultants.

The list of consultants has lengthened proportionately with DARE's success yet there is no money to increase manpower.

DARE members, themselves, are being pressured to produce more programs and test their good record with more extensive experiments in the community. One response to this demand is DARE's new therapy sessions with troubled, drug-using youths. DARE participants must attend these sessions to provide the strength of the healthy, drug-free ego.

Miss Burnford was given a small covey at the institute, but there is only room enough for a mini-desk, an interviewer and the mail. There is no secretary so she has a dual specialty. File cabinets are still in the hall and DARE personnel still work at home.

more aware of its effect on the Vietnam war. Kenneth Crawford in the Washington Post emphasizes the importance of the press and its inherent ability to sway a country. He cites a former editor who describes George Washington's crossing of the Delaware in terms of today's TV coverage. He then makes the point that, if the American troops believe they are not appreciated, it is not solely the fault of the public; if the public is discouraged, it is not solely the fault of the military. Behind each move in the Vietnam war has been the press—analytical, often brave, and even more often naive. I suggest Mr. Crawford's column to my colleagues and to his, as well, for it is an in-depth appraisal of the impact of the American press:

HO CHI MINH AS HERO: ON PRESS COVERAGE OF THE VIETNAM WAR
(By Kenneth Crawford)

How would the modern media have reported George Washington's crossing of the Delaware at McKonkey's Ferry on Christmas, 1776? J. Russell Wiggins, former editor of The Washington Post, asked this important question—and answered it—in a speech to the Washington Association of New Jersey on Washington's arbitrary new birthday, February 15.

Television camera men would have focused their zoom lenses on the rag-wrapped feet of Washington's troopers. When it was over, microphones would have been thrust under the noses of stripling recruits to catch their answers to the question: "How do you feel about some of your buddies being lost in this sneaky operation?" The writing war correspondents would have salted their dispatches with suggestions that the whole bloody venture was ill-conceived by an incompetent commander, ill-excused by a badly trained and equipped army and predestined to fail.

New York editorial writers would have followed up with lamentations about the plight of Trenton's civilian population, driven from its snug houses into the cold on a sacred holiday, caught in the crossfire between Hessian defenders and attacking colonials, and forced into a fight against its will over a questionable cause: something about taxation without representation. Washington, instead of attacking, should have been negotiating. His occupation of Trenton and quick withdrawal showed that he was still engaged in search-and-destroy operations—"following the will-o-the-wisp of military victory," as Wiggins thought the editorial writers would have put it.

Wiggins fantasy was, of course, a wry comment on the way the media of the 60s and the start of the 70s have dealt with the war in Vietnam. This war is the first in which American media, measured by weight of viewership, readership and influence, have been kinder to the nation's enemies than to its friends. This has been partly inadvertent, partly not. In any case, Ho Chi Minh has come off as this war's greatest hero, the Vietcong as its most admired fighters, American and South Vietnamese leaders as its most mistrusted participants, American GIs as its least appreciated warriors, especially since My Lai, which has been made the basis for unjust generalization, and South Vietnamese soldiers as invariably unreliable, also unjust.

All this is something new for Americans. They have always before tended to be home-team rooters. In British pubs Rommel may have been the favorite hero of the second world war but Americans stood by their own even when correspondents on the scene in North Africa intimated, insofar as intimation could be slipped through the censorship, that the "Darlan deal" and mistreatment of

De Gaulle were compromising the morality of the allied war effort.

Wars have never been pretty but their ugliness has never before been conveyed to American households in living color, as it has this time, and always from our side because the other side is out of reach of cameras and correspondents. But it is more than that. War correspondents have often been instant experts and critics and they seem even more so this time. They have to be youthful to stand the physical rigors and brave to take the chances they must run in Vietnam. More than 30 of them have been killed. They are admirable in action but sometimes wrong in their strategic and tactical judgments and simplistic in their politics.

Prize committees, Pulitzer included, have rewarded the most captious. The self-styled "cowboys" who constituted themselves a sort of get-rid-of-Diem committee in the early days of the war made a point of being on hand for every bonze immolation and of representing the Saigon disorders as a sort of holy way between the ruling Catholics and the subject Buddhists. Reputations were forged in the bonze fires.

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

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

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

PRESS COVERAGE OF THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the news media is becoming increasingly

WELFARE STATISM GOES POORLY IN SWEDEN

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, before we let the welfare-staters take us too far down the statism road here in the United States, maybe we had better look outside our borders to see how poorly

some of these welfare states have been doing. Let me mention just one—Sweden—she has not been doing too well and she is supposed to be the "shining example." Her troubles have been reported from time to time. The latest article to appear just yesterday in the Wall Street Journal. The article follows:

WELFARE GONE MAD

"The organized welfare state has gone mad." So observed Gunnar Myrdal, the noted economist, in commenting on the rash of white-collar strikes that has been disrupting Sweden for the past several weeks.

The strikes and/or lockouts involves civil servants, army officers, teachers and judges. They are demanding huge pay increases to compensate for inflation and taxes—Sweden's are among the highest in the world. The inflation and the taxes are part of the price for the country's comprehensive welfare state.

At the same time these mostly well-educated, relatively well-heeled strikers are angry at the pay raises that have gone to industrial workers in recent years. In the words of a New York Times dispatch, they "are worried that the government's promise to narrow the wage gap between workers will keep the white-collar college graduates locked in financially and, perhaps more important, without the class status, the privileges and the relative salary positions that once separated a professor from an industrial worker."

Now this spectacle is not without its ironic overtones. For a long time our liberal friends here at home have disparaged the United States by reference to Sweden, with its rather high standard of living coupled with an almost total absence of poverty and racial conflict. (Of course the nation is ethnically homogeneous by comparison with the U.S., and there have been problems, like an acute housing shortage, even before the present troubles.)

So those who advocate a full-blown welfare state for America should mark well the chaos such a state, with all its government "planning," is capable of creating.

True, the U.S. is still quite a way from Swedish-style welfarism. Yet we do have persistent inflation, our taxes are oppressive and only a naive person would suppose that the total tax burden will do anything but grow in the years ahead. And in the sense of our monstrously swelling rolls of people on public relief, we are rapidly becoming something of a welfare state.

For all its neatness, for all its seeming logic, the welfare-state concept has always been a delusion. The human animal is not so simply motivated and manipulated. The imperfections of our individual-oriented society are manifest; they are far preferable to the deadening—and finally divisive—sway of statism.

PURDUE TOPS IN ENGINEER GRADUATES AGAIN

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important contributors to the quality of life in America is the engineer. Without engineers, we would be without automobiles, without airplanes, without highways, without bridges, without power, without labor-saving appliances. Just about every modern convenience that we take so much for granted and

which makes us the envy of every nation on earth is, to some extent, the product of engineering.

If the engineer has made his contribution, then it is reasonable to also show our deep gratitude to the school that trained him. There are, of course, many fine schools of engineering in the United States, but none, however, outranks Purdue University in quality and quantity.

This year, as the year before, Purdue has granted more engineering degrees than any other school. We in Indiana are proud of this illustrious record.

A recent story in Purdue's hometown newspaper, the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal & Courier, has brought this fact to light. I would like to bring this proud fact to the attention of my colleagues and to the Nation and ask to insert that story at this point in the RECORD.

The story follows:

PURDUE TOPS IN ENGINEER GRADS AGAIN

Purdue University continued its national leadership in granting the highest number of engineering degrees during the 1969-70 academic year, according to official figures released this week.

Purdue once again produced the largest number of bachelor's degrees (910) as it did in 1969, the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) reported.

The Schools of Engineering ranked eighth in master's degrees and fifth in doctoral degrees for a total of 1,385 diplomas given in eight disciplines.

This figure, also tops in the nation, represents more than two per cent of the total number of degrees granted—62,134.

Purdue's School of Technology also ranked first with 403 bachelor of technology degrees granted, placing the University of Dayton's 149 at a distant second. The Purdue school ranked third with 610 two-year degrees granted.

Across the country there were more doctor's degrees granted than ever before, continuing the trend started in 1957. At the B.S. level, the total was about 3,000 more than during 1968-69 but still below the number reached in 1949-50. There was a slight increase over the 1968-69 master's level.

Engineering Education, the journal of ASEE, indicated that graduating classes through 1973 will probably be smaller than the 1970 class.

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF POLISH SOCIETIES

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) duPONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. duPONT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to insert into the RECORD a resolution that was recently adopted by the Council of Polish Societies in the State of Delaware. This resolution was sent to me by Mrs. Angela C. Turochy, president of the council and Mrs. Rosalie S. Obara, secretary.

I think that the spirit of this resolution and the observations made about communism in Poland are worth noting in an era when many people are questioning why this country is still maintaining its vigil against the Communists.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF POLISH SOCIETIES AND CLUBS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE

We, delegates of Polish organizations representing about 10,000 Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the annual meeting of the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of Polish American Congress, held on January 29, 1971, at the Pulaski Legion Hall, Linden and Jackson Streets, Wilmington, Delaware, do hereby resolve:

That because the Communist regime in Poland perpetrated acts of oppression and murder against Polish workers during recent strikes and mass protests against announced price increases of basic commodities which make it impossible for an average wage earner to provide minimum sustenance for his family.

That because of the economic system imposed on Poland by Soviet Russia, Poland's standard of living is among the lowest in Europe.

That because the Communist regime in Poland is but an agent and an instrument of Russian imperialism, forcing Poland to supply considerable aid to North Vietnam, Cuba and Egypt;

Therefore, we condemn the Communist regime in Poland for staging mass arrests and answering with tanks and bullets against the Polish protesters,

We pledge ourselves to continue to support the Polish efforts to free the people of Poland from Communist oppression and extend our sympathy to these oppressed people.

We appeal to the President of the United States and to the Delaware representatives in the Government of the United States to use their influence to secure the release of thousand of Poles imprisoned during recent disturbances and to condemn murder and reign of terror.

We further resolve that copies of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States and to the three Delaware Representatives in the United States Congress.

SPACE PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, Radio Station KCBS in San Francisco broadcast many times a very forceful plea for continued substantial support for our national space program. As we all know, Apollo 14 was a brilliant success. That success was only made possible by the unmatched competence of the space team, including not only the astronauts, but all of the scientists, engineers, technicians, and administrative managers whose dedication to the manned space flight program never faltered. This Nation has also compiled an outstanding record in unmanned space flight with a percentage of success that far outstrips our major competitor in space. All these things were possible because Congress and the American people decided over the past 12 years to make the necessary investments in funding in human resources. Those were investments into a future capability in space that extends far beyond our present vision. We must not throw away the space science and technologies we have already acquired

which are today finding their effects and applications throughout our society. I urge every Member to read and reflect upon the broadcast which I now include for the RECORD:

APOLLO 14

Will Apollo 14 be one of the closing chapters in mankind's effort to cross the frontiers of space? It would seem that's a distinct possibility. There are voices being heard which call for eliminating the space budget in the interest of earthbound priorities. Let's look at some figures.

The space budget for 1972 is placed at 3.1 billion dollars. That's a sizeable sum. The allocation for Health, Education, Manpower and Income Protection amounts to 85.6 billion. A much larger amount is considered inadequate to meet the needs for which it's designed. The space program represents only 4% of the sum allocated to Health, Education, Manpower and Income Protection. Thus, even if the space projects were wiped out, there would be little significant increase in the funds available for earthbound priorities.

We feel there's more than just money involved. America has devoted a decade to developing one of the greatest pools of manpower, talent and knowledge ever created. This is an enormous asset and it must not be wasted. Eliminating the space program would be an easy, highly visible means of soothing the critics. But as far as we're concerned, it would mean the loss of a decade's work and countless centuries of future potential. We hope you'll think about it.

THE RIGHTS OF THE PLAINTIFFS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, because I was away on official leave of absence during yesterday's vote on House Resolution 264, I would like, at this time, to make my views known on this issue. This resolution would limit the plaintiffs, Messrs. Stamler, Hall, and Cohen, in a pending court case, from receiving in entirety the documents held by the former House Un-American Activities Committee regarding their case. For essentially two basic reasons I oppose this resolution. First, it contradicts a prior judgment of a Federal tribunal that these plaintiffs have a basic right to the evidence in full and that this evidence is indispensable to them for carrying on the civil action. For a body that concerns itself so diligently with law and order, it is inconsistent and counter to its tradition for the House to interfere with a Federal court decision.

Secondly, the Chairman of the Committee on Internal Security, my colleague, Mr. ICHORD, has indicated that the only real reason for denying these plaintiffs their request, is because of the extra burden placed on the Committee's staff members. This is not a compelling reason to deny the plaintiffs' evidence that is so vital to an equitable hearing.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I go on record at this time opposing any attempts by this body to circumscribe the judicial rights of any of our citizens.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SCIENCE AWARD WINNERS—
SCIENCE FOR ALL

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend three fine students from Oakland, Calif., for their outstanding achievements in the field of science and technology. Miss Elaine Marie Parker, 17; Raymond Kay Chan, 18; and Kenneth Thomas Luey, 17, all of Oakland were recently named to the honors groups consisting of 300 students around the Nation in the Thirtieth Annual Science Talent Search.

Miss Parker was cited for her work in practical light stimuli for soilless botanical culture, Mr. Chan for work in airplane wing design, and Mr. Luey for analysis of superconducting components in electric motors.

Supported by financial assistance from the Westinghouse Educational Foundation and administered by the Science Clubs of America, the annual science talent search is the pioneering endeavor to discover at the high school senior year level those who have the potentialities to become the research scientists of the future. Many millions of dollars in scholarships in colleges and universities throughout the Nation, supplementing the Westinghouse Science Scholarships, have been given to those who have thus been discovered to have high science talent.

The achieving of honors in the science talent search is evidence of scientific ability and interest which can be taken into consideration by colleges and universities in admissions and granting of scholarships. For this reason, the honors list is distributed to all universities and colleges of the United States utilizing a list furnished by the American Council on Education.

In attempting to make this vast reservoir of scientific talent available for important humanitarian tasks in the world, and for its citizens, we must take steps to insure that those efforts will be used for peaceful purposes and not for the purposes of furthering the war, death, and destruction sweeping the world today.

The schools, institutions, and instructors who have made equally commendable efforts to encourage and develop students of high scientific ability and caliber should be encouraged to promote this same fervor among the poor, the minorities of this country, women, the young, and all those who have generally and historically been considered outside the franchise and denied the fundamental right of every citizen to develop and achieve as far as his interests and innate capabilities allow him.

Janitors, construction workers, teachers, recreation leaders, and, particularly legislators at every level of government, as well as every citizen in this country should endeavor to make these and similar kinds of achievements open to all

Americans—the rule rather than the exception. Institutions must be opened up for those who have traditionally and historically been shut out and as a result have lost hope in themselves, their families and their communities.

We must not, finally, channel them into fields and endeavors which breed war and death, destruction and exploitation. They must not be used to develop projects such as SST, the MIRV system, ABM and other complicated gadgetry of destruction and waste which feed corporate monopolies and economic profiteers, and have no general humanitarian goal.

BREAKING DOWN OUR NATIONAL
DEFENSE CAPABILITY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, last September 16, in this newsletter, I pointed out that only 4 percent of total Federal expenditures are now going to our strategic defense forces—consisting of intercontinental ballistic missiles and bombers, missile-carrying nuclear submarines, and the air defense systems. In constant dollar figures, we are spending only a little more than half as much on our strategic defense systems in 1971 as we spent just 9 years ago in 1962, despite a greatly increased Soviet nuclear threat.

The proposed budget for the next fiscal year would leave this situation substantially unchanged, despite increased funding for some new strategic weapon systems such as the B-1 bomber. The total proposed new defense budget is \$76 billion, \$1.5 billion above last year's total. But in terms of the projected value of the dollar in 1972, this represents a decrease from \$79.6 billion to \$76.0 billion. In other words, the small proposed increase does not keep up with the rate of inflation.

Furthermore, there is no increase at all for our strategic forces in terms of any kind of dollars, but a reduction from \$7.73 billion last year to \$7.63 billion this year, a net drop of \$100 million. The entire \$1.5 billion increase for the entire defense budget will be absorbed by pay increases and other new incentives for servicemen.

The impact of this level of defense budgeting is made clear by the excellent and comprehensive business forecast for the Nation and California in 1971 prepared by the Graduate School of Business Administration of the University of California at Los Angeles. This projects a decline in aerospace procurement and research and development—the categories of supreme importance for the future of our strategic defense capability—from \$16 billion to \$13 billion over the 3-year period ending in fiscal year 1972.

So far, that decline has already, according to the Defense Department's own budget briefing, removed 1,230,000 people from employment in defense and de-

fense-related industries since fiscal year 1968. In southern California the cutback, according to the UCLA study, has been from 425,000 aerospace employees in 1969 to 325,000 in 1970, with a projected further decline to 260,000. This means that nearly half of all the persons employed in aerospace and defense industries in southern California in 1969 will be out of their jobs by 1972.

If there were no need for their work, I would be the last to defend feather-bedding, just as I think the operations of the Department of Defense would actually benefit from a substantial reduction in the number of their clerical employees. But in this case we are talking about what is probably the greatest concentration of trained engineering manpower anywhere in the world, assembled in southern California during the past two decades. It is incredible folly to break it up, for it is an indispensable element in our national defense capability. As Stefan T. Possony and J. E. Pournelle state in the Strategy of Technology:

The Technological War is the decisive struggle in the Protracted Conflict. Victory in the Technological War gives supremacy in all other phases of the conflict, to be exploited either by thermonuclear annihilation of the opponent or simply demanding and obtaining his surrender.

This is the ultimate threat we are inviting by breaking up the defense-producing resources, both in plants and personnel, that now exist in southern California in particular. The increase in funding for the B-1 bomber, though an encouraging sign, does not reflect a true reversal of this potentially suicidal policy, which I will be taking up personally with President Nixon in the near future.

A TRIBUTE TO THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, today is a day when we should bow our heads in grateful thanks for the sacrifices of the disabled American veterans and for the work and courage of the Disabled American Veterans organization. Founded in 1920, this group is, this year, completing 50 years of service to America's servicemen. The DAV assists disabled veterans, their dependents, widows, and orphans in obtaining benefits and in returning to full and productive lives. Our Nation is free and strong due largely to the sacrifices of these men who have given unselfishly of themselves so that others might benefit. The DAV should be commended for its valuable contribution to the country and to the well-being of the disabled veterans and their dependents.

Today, the 50th anniversary of the DAV, is a day when we should solemnly remember and salute this Nation's heroes, whatever war they may have fought in. Their sacrifices and the work and quiet courage of the DAV should serve as an example for all of us.

MUCH NEEDED HEALTH CARE SERVICES PROVIDED IN NEWARK AREA

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, because of the growing crisis in the medical field, I was delighted to note in American Academy of Pediatrics Newsletters articles describing two major programs designed to provide much needed health care services in the Newark area.

I am confident that the Lyons Maternal and Child Health Center, established by the New Jersey chapter of AAP for low income and welfare families, will certainly be helpful in alleviating the problems caused by the lack of prenatal and childcare services. I congratulate the many people connected with the center for their dedication to the needs of the medically indigent.

It was also heartening to learn of the efforts of Dr. Seymour Charles whose weekly broadcasts on WNJR-Newark provide medical information and guidance to the citizens of the Newark metropolitan area.

I commend to my colleagues the following two articles which explain in detail these vitally needed programs. They appeared in the issues of June 1, 1970, and January 15, 1971:

NEW JERSEY CHAPTER ESTABLISHES MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH CENTER FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

The New Jersey Chapter has established a maternal and child health center for lower income and welfare families in Newark.

Designated the Lyons Maternal and Child Health Center, the project is staffed by seven Academy Fellows as well as other pediatricians, two pediatric surgeons, six dentists and one obstetrician, each working voluntarily three to four hours a week serving some four hundred families. Also working for the Center are one full-time registered nurse, two part-time nurses and one bookkeeper.

The Center provides such total comprehensive care services as examination and care of newborns, infant immunizations, dental care and treatment, allergy care, emergency care for injuries and accidents, and specialist consultations.

Instituted in March through the New Jersey Chapter's Committee on Pediatric Practice, the Center was established to meet the needs of the medically indigent who are eligible to receive care under the Medicaid program, but who cannot receive such care because of the physician shortage in the Newark area and the resulting patient overload confronting local physicians.

NIGHT TELEPHONE SERVICE

The Center is open from 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Patients are seen through a regular appointment schedule. For those patients who call after the Center is closed at night, a telephone service has been established to provide information concerning the availability of health services at other local facilities.

GROUP PRACTICE SETTING

Physicians working in the Center, strategically located in the core of the Newark ghetto area, are administering their health care program in a group practice setting to insure private, individualized personal medical care.

In addition to those physicians already working at the Center, it is anticipated that

ultimately psychologists and behavioral specialists will join the Center to broaden the aspects of total health care.

PROJECT INITIATED IN OCTOBER

The health center concept, as originally proposed by Arthur Maron, M.D., F.A.A.P., chairman of the New Jersey Chapter's Committee on Pediatric Practice, was approved by the Chapter last October. The Center began operating in March when current office space became available.

The Center's physician staff was recruited by Dr. Maron from the New Jersey Chapter, the Beth Israel Medical Center, and by utilizing personal contacts. Physicians readily joined the project because of their commitment to the poor, according to Dr. Maron. "All we needed was the space to operate," Dr. Maron said.

According to Seymour Charles, M.D., F.A.A.P., who works at the Center, the New Jersey Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics regards this as a pilot project in the sense that the Chapter hopes that other Newark areas as well as other cities throughout the state will develop their own centers. "We pediatricians in New Jersey feel strongly about our obligations to our state and to its children," Dr. Charles concluded. "Our development of the Lyons Maternal and Child Health Center represents in concrete form just how strongly we feel," he said.

RADIO PROGRAM ON CHILD HEALTH LAUNCHED BY AAP FELLOW & COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

Whatever Marshall McLuhan has to say about the temperature of electronic media, a North Jersey pediatrician and AAP Fellow weekly proves it's one of the most effective means to communicate with the most people at the same time with medical messages about prevention and the sources where treatment or further information can be obtained.

Seymour Charles, M.D., with a practice in the Newark, N.J., metropolitan area, is the moderator each Wednesday on Focus on Community Health over WNJR under the sponsorship of the Essex County Medical Society. Starting 1971 with its 35th consecutive broadcast, the weekly prime time radio series has climbed from an estimated 110,000 to 150,000 in the past six-months on the air.

WNJR, a Rollins station, provides the free public service time, and the challenge of reaching out to a vast listenership draws top names in medical, government, health, nursing, and other related fields.

Probably more important, however, is that Dr. Charles expects his panelists to do more than just talk. An informal format must be reinforced, he insists, by his panelists coming complete with working telephone numbers where information or help is available for listeners with specific problems.

SUBJECTS

For instance, such things as new community health centers are discussed, who qualifies to use them, the areas they serve, and why and how to seek and obtain treatment. It's a matter, Dr. Charles believes, of not only giving information, but knowing how it can be utilized for the family's health care.

One of the major reasons for the success of the program is its basic approach. Use of the vernacular is essential, and medical and technical terminology is kept minimal where it can't be eliminated. The reason for this is more than just communicating in the everyday sense in order to get an understandable message across.

Even more important, listener phone response and ratings show the method works. The Society, as producer of the show, views the series, according to Dr. George L. Benz, president, as "one of the most effective ways of reaching people who rely on radio for information and entertainment. In a dense

population area, this is considered another of the special approaches the organization takes to reach people in as many ways possible to foster prevention as an essential to the individual's health."

From two-weeks to the "second season," this is how the broadcasts sum it up as programs and "specials" are booked now for up to three-months in advance. For Dr. Charles, the pediatrician who helped start the long-run series, his Wednesdays off which he devotes to the program make a full-week schedule, but even more, gives the person-to-person type of postgraduate continued education that few other specialists now realize.

Academy Fellows and Chapter officers interested in learning about the development of this excellent communications approach, can receive a free step-by-step outline of how to organize and produce a program by writing on official letterhead to: "RADIO," Essex County Medical Society, 144 S. Harrison St., East Orange, N.J. 07018.

Utilization of radio programming is one of the more effective methods for reaching the public with information on child health care. When combined with a question and answer format, public service radio programming provides the mechanism for an effective exchange of ideas on any particular problem which may confront parents concerning the health of their children.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, today I insert in the RECORD, part XI of the article entitled: "Private and Public Retirement Pensions: Findings From the 1968 Survey of the Aged" by Walter W. Kolodrubetz:

XI. CONCLUSION

This article has presented data from the DECA Survey about pension programs supplementing OASDIII that should be taken into account in assessing their present and future role in income maintenance for the aged. It has been pointed out that, although 9 out of 10 aged units received OASDHI benefits, only a minority of the aged population enjoyed the luxury of two pension incomes. Thirteen percent of the aged units receiving regular OASDHI benefits had private-plan benefits in addition, and 7 percent had another public pension. Furthermore, the Survey data underscore the contrasting economic positions of aged units with and without these supplementary pensions.

Detailed comparisons of the findings of this Survey and the 1962 Survey results cannot be made until additional analysis of demographic and economic changes are completed and measures of statistical reliability are developed. A few general trends, however, stand out clearly.

The data indicate a substantial improvement in the private plan pensions during a short period. The median private pension income for beneficiary couples went from \$790 in 1962 to \$970 in 1967, and the median for the nonmarried rose from \$665 to \$780—increases of 23 and 17 percent, respectively. These changes chiefly reflect the higher benefit levels for younger aged persons who qualified for pensions in the 5-year period between the two surveys.

During the same period the median regular OASDHI benefit for married couples rose by 11 percent (\$1,405 in 1962 and \$1,555 in 1967) and for nonmarried persons by 16 per-

cent (\$780 in 1962 and \$905 in 1967). Of course, these changes in median OASDHI benefits would be greater if the benefit increases provided in the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act could have been included in the Survey data.

Median total income for private pensioners rose between 1962 and 1967 as the result of improved OASDHI benefits for those retiring and those already in retirement, as well as increased private pension levels, among other factors. For beneficiary couples with private pensions, median total income rose by almost \$700 from the 1962 median to reach \$4,085 in 1967, and the median for non-married persons from \$2,220 in 1962 to \$2,410 in 1967. The percentage increases in median income, however, were not much different from those for beneficiaries without private pension benefits, as shown below.

Year	Median total income of aged units	
	With private pension	Without private pension
Married couples:		
1962	\$3,410	\$2,480
1967	4,085	2,880
Percentage increase from 1962	20	16
Nonmarried persons:		
1962	2,220	1,220
1967	2,410	1,330
Percentage increase from 1962	9	9

When measured in real terms, however, the increases in median total income for these groups were not as impressive. Living costs, for example, rose by about 9 percent in the 5-year period 1963-67, just about the same gain as median income for nonmarried persons and roughly half the gain in median total income for married couples.

The private pension system is still a relatively new and maturing institution and the future impact on retirement income needs continuing study and appraisal. Private pension coverage for active workers has not been distributed evenly throughout the work force. Coverage in private plans still tends to be concentrated in higher paying industries and occupations, although there are some encouraging signs for broadened coverage. Today receipt of private pension is likely to be found among persons with high preretirement earnings and career service in a firm or industry. In addition, persons with such income have higher levels of OASDIII benefits and tend to have more asset income.

Favorable factors for the years ahead include the continuing expansion of private-plan coverage, the increasing number of more broadly based plans, and the rising levels of private-plan benefits. Unfavorable factors—such as inadequate vesting, lack of survivor protection, and erosion of benefit values because few private pensions are tied to the cost of living—tend to dampen optimism about the future role of private plans in income maintenance of the aged. The Survey of New Beneficiaries now being undertaken by the Social Security Administration, will fill certain information gaps on the prevalence and levels of private and public retirement benefits for persons now retiring. It will therefore be helpful in assessing the future role of supplementary pensions.

A YOUNG MAN'S DREAM

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a young man in my

congressional district who has a dream. Although it is but a dream at this time, it may well prove to be a reality in about 4 years. I am pleased to insert Michael's letter into the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues:

CAMPELL, OHIO.

DEAR SIR: I am an 8th grader, and I would like to know if it would be possible for you to try to get me in an Air Force Academy. If it is not possible to get me in an academy with high school grades, I would appreciate it if you could get me in one with college grades. I always dreamed of going to the Air Force Academy in Colorado, so if it is possible, please try to, next time you run for anything you can be sure you will have my mother's and my father's vote. Good luck in the future.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL MAILLIS.

VIETNAM: WHAT IS LEFT OF CONSCIENCE?

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it sometimes seems that we are becoming so accustomed to violence that we have forgotten the pain. In our weariness and despair we have indeed dulled our conscience and lowered our voice. Our heritage has drawn strength and vitality from the rich moral fiber of our Nation. The disintegration of conscience adds sad new dimensions to our dilemma.

Mr. Bill Moyers, former White House press secretary under President Johnson and publisher of Long Island's Newsday, has written of our Nation's crisis of conscience and I would like to bring his article in the Saturday Review of February 13 to the attention of my colleagues: VIETNAM: WHAT IS LEFT OF CONSCIENCE?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following guest editorial is by Bill Moyers, who served as White House press secretary under President Johnson until January 1967, when he left that post to become publisher of Long Island's Newsday. Since last April, Mr. Moyers has been traveling around the country gathering material for his new book *Listening to America*, which will be published next month in Harper Magazine Press.)

We do not yet know the full extent to which the war in Vietnam has affected our moral sensibilities, but we do know enough to be troubled. News of continuing death and destruction appears fleetingly in the press and is quickly forgotten. In a recent national poll, people said they are more concerned with the economy than with the war. When during a television interview reporters finally asked President Nixon a question about the war, he wondered aloud, with a smile, why they had taken so long to bring it up. A consensus has been reached that the war is winding down, at least our active combat role in it; last month when 300 bombers roared over the countryside of Indochina dropping tons of bombs, barely a peep was heard in the land. There was relatively little outrage over the Cambodian invasion until four students were killed by the National Guard at Kent State. Campuses are quiet, I suspect, because the threat of the draft is disappearing. Americans do not seem able to sustain indignation over a situation that does not cost them personally. We do not mind war as long as we do not have to look at its victims.

A committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science recently reported that chemical herbicides used by the United States have poisoned some five million acres of South Vietnam—one-eighth of that country; that we have used six pounds of herbicides per Vietnamese, including children; and that the defoliation program, intended to deny food to the Vietcong, often destroyed the crops of the Montagnards, who are supposed to be on our side. Pictures of once fertile mangrove forests look like pictures of the moon. The report was like a rock dropped into a bottomless well. After the first burst of news coverage, hardly anyone paid any attention to it.

When Col. Robert A. Koob was selected foreman of the court-martial panel for the trial of Sgt. Charles E. Hutto, one of the soldiers at Mylai, he was asked by the chief government prosecutor if an enlisted man should be prosecuted if he shot an unresisting prisoner of war at the order of an officer. Colonel Koob was quoted by *The New York Times* as replying: "Since the time I entered the service, I was taught that a soldier was trained to shoot and kill. Haven't we trained soldiers to be responsive to orders?" Koob was also quoted as saying that "this is not a conventional war. We have to forget propriety."

The problem with the colonel's statement is that nations always "forget propriety" in the waging of war, whether they are sending V-2 rockets into London or dropping an atomic bomb on Hiroshima. In all wars, men have observed Seneca's proposition: "Deeds that would be punished by loss of life if committed in secret are praised by us when uniformed generals carried them out."

However, there are exceptions: Lieutenant Calley and others are on trial for what allegedly happened at Mylai. But even here something seems amiss. What do we learn about ourselves when we realize that for all the outcry over events at Mylai and Kent State the public remains quiet over the bombs that continue to fall indiscriminately—they might as well be labeled "Occupant"—on Indochina? Are we indifferent to the destruction our newspapers are unable to describe? Why is it that men like Calley should bear the brunt of punishment for what has been an official policy of mass and impersonal devastation waged in our name in Vietnam? Are they more guilty than the men who fly the bombers? Than the men who give the orders from Saigon or CINCPAC in Hawaii? Than the men who make the policy in Washington? Than all of us?

I do not know how to deal with the dilemma of such questions. Collective guilt, like a trillion-dollar economy, is of such scope as to stagger my mind. I grew up believing in personal responsibility and individual guilt. Much of the country did, too, which perhaps explains why so many seem so little troubled by the anonymous and abstract manner in which we have destroyed so much of Vietnam in order to save it; in the diffusion of responsibility there is comfort. Perhaps it also explains our willingness to permit the Calleys to be scapegoats through whose sacrifice the rest of us arrive at some atonement. Seeing Calley on television as he is entering or leaving the place of trial, I sometimes find myself wishing the worst for him; the acts of which he stands accused seem so heinous a departure from propriety. But in the next moment, realizing that I have never been in war, have never been asked to kill for society, I am engulfed by sympathy for him, not willing that he alone of all of us should be judged. Perhaps it is these moral doubts to which Colonel Koob unwittingly referred when he said Vietnam is "not a conventional war." Americans have fought brutally in other wars. This is just the first time we have been forced to concede the brutality so frankly and publicly, the first time we have fought with a nagging

conscience openly displayed on television, the first time we have acknowledged in such a wholesale way the discrepancy in justice for the individual soldier who kills in our behalf and the anonymous men who from 30,000 feet carry out official policies of mass destruction, also in our name. We have abandoned propriety before; we have never before doubted the reason for doing so, as we doubt it now.

No wonder our armed forces are being shaken. "The Troubled Army in Vietnam" was the title of a recent cover story in *Newsweek*. But we should not be surprised. War is so total a departure from the traditions of civility men have labored for centuries to achieve, so consuming in its requirement that ordinary men inflict upon one another such extraordinary terror that an army can never again be the same once its troops are denied general confidence that their cause is just. A totalitarian government can march men to war under threat of death; better to take one's chance with an uncertain fate on the battlefield than to die certainly at home by the hand of your own master. But if tyranny can force men to become killers, a democratic government must persuade its citizens that killing in behalf of their government is, in the nature of things, justifiable. Conscription in our kind of society can only work well when sufficient numbers of men believe they would not be asked to kill unless their leaders knew what they were doing. When enlisted men lose confidence in the rationale of the policy and begin to wonder if the killing is worth it, discipline and morale inevitably suffer.

Vietnam has demonstrated that Nietzsche was wrong; a good war does not "hallow every cause." War can defile a cause as it can degrade the men who fight it. Old war movies to the contrary, men who look down the barrel of a gun at another human being, intending his death, want to believe that the irrevocable act they are about to commit has grounds more defensible than the exhortation of politicians. When by intuition, observation, or experience they begin to suspect that the brutality being exacted of them is not only not heroic but futile as well—it will not accomplish what their leaders said it would accomplish, it cannot stay the forces of history—no Congressional resolution or Presidential order can make right to such men what their consciences suggest is wrong. War is the means by which a government can sanction our worse nature, enabling us to do collectively what singly we would abhor. But men have conscience if governments do not, and when the sanction of the state runs out, men remember what they did and what they became under its protection. This is why governments should not expect men lightly to go to war; governments never feel the need for forgiveness, but men do. If Samuel Johnson was correct when he observed that "every man thinks meanly of himself for not having been a soldier," governments ought not to require a man to act in such a way that he will think meanly of himself for having been a soldier. "In becoming soldiers," Cromwell's troops petitioned Parliament, "we have not ceased to be citizens."

When men are asked to forget propriety on a scale that challenges the fragile moral values by which they maintain some sanity and some dignity, many things can happen. Some will become more soldier than citizen—as may have happened at Mylai. Some will resist the right of the government to ask of them such an offense to what the Levelers called their "self-propriety" and will seek refuge in Canada or elsewhere. Some are never bothered because in handling the impersonal instruments of war—bombs and herbicides—they are never confronted with the particular consequences of their acts, the charred bodies of the victims or the Montagnard family without food. "I could take it," a young veteran

told me last summer, "only because I was in the artillery. I never had to worry about who we hit. It might have been Charlie, it might have been somebody else. We never knew who we hit, so pretty soon we just stopped wondering. That was the best way for everybody."

Still others respond by becoming less soldier, less citizen. A Department of Defense task force reported last week that drug abuse among American military personnel in Vietnam has become a "military problem" for which no effective solution has been found, partly because many enlisted men want so much to get out of the service that they are prepared to risk less than honorable discharge to do so. According to *Newsweek*, since last June "the United States Army... has seen the time-honored medal-award system badly tarnished, witnessed large numbers of its troops take to drugs that are prohibited back home, and experienced a measurable decline in discipline and morale."

For a conscripted army, the only thing worse than defeat is the doubt that it should be fighting at all. There is a limit to how much savagery ordinary men in uniform can either absorb or inflict. Sooner or later they will stop wondering, stop caring, or go mad.

At home, we have also experienced "a measurable decline in discipline and morale." We have turned upon each other in spiteful and accusing fashion, which has resulted in violence, division, charges of intimidation and conspiracy, increased surveillance by the state of its citizens, and increased suspicion of the state by the citizen. Most disturbing of all is the ease with which so many tend to suppress their indignation when they are not personally affected by injustice and suffering. Such is what happens when in the name of its ideals a nation has to "forget propriety." Nations cannot abandon civility abroad and remain civilized at home.

COMMITTEE OF LIAISON

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, there is a burgeoning effort underway in our Nation both to prove that our men being held captive by the North Vietnamese Communists are in fact "war criminals," and also to use families of these men to advance enemy objectives in the Southeast Asian theater. These efforts are beneath contempt.

One group which is attempting to advance the enemy war effort by playing on the emotions of the anxious families of the American servicemen being held by the Communists is the Committee of Liaison headed by one Cora Weiss. This organization has rightly been assessed as a "propaganda tool of the North Vietnamese Government" by the House Committee on Internal Security.

Recently I sent a letter to the Attorney General of the United States asking him what action he plans to take to curtail the activities of these people. It is my hope that the Attorney General will move swiftly on this matter.

For the information of my colleagues who have families of captured Americans residing in their districts, I include at this point in the RECORD the findings of the House Committee on Internal Security

on the Committee on Liaison With Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam—COL.

The use of the word "Detained" in the name of this organization to characterize the brutal and inhumane incarceration and murder of our servicemen by the North Vietnamese Communists gives one some indication of their general outlook.

The report follows:

NEW MOBE'S "FRONT" TO HANOI

In the course of the June hearings, special interest was directed by the subcommittee to a New Mobe "front" group dealing with an enemy of the United States. The committee clearly established that the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam (COL) is, in fact, a front for the New Mobilization Committee and that the COL operates at the specific bidding of the communists in Hanoi.¹

Cochairmen of the Committee of Liaison are David Dellinger and Cora Weiss, both of whom have been national cochairmen of the New Mobe and active members of the New Mobe steering committee. The treasurer for the Committee of Liaison is Mrs. Anne Bennett, who was an official endorser of New Mobe's November 1969 demonstrations and who has spoken under New Mobe's auspices. Of the 15 people listed on a COL letterhead as members, the following have been connected with New Mobe: Rennie Davis, Rev. Richard Fernandez, Kalish, Meacham, Prof. Franz Schurmann, Ethel Taylor, and Trudi Young.

On October 28, 1969, William M. Kunstler, attorney for the defendants in the Chicago "Conspiracy" trial, issued a press release in Chicago following his return from a visit with a North Vietnamese "peace" delegation in Paris. Kunstler announced that the New Mobilization Committee was setting up an office and staff to receive names of prisoners of war in North Vietnam and that as soon as possible this office would pass on information about POWs to their families. Kunstler further announced that an office was not yet established, but that one of its leaders would soon be going to Paris to initiate the flow of information.

On December 16, 1969, press accounts indicated that Mrs. Cora Weiss was then in Hanoi at the invitation of the North Vietnamese and that she would be negotiating for disclosure of the names of American prisoners of war.

On January 15, 1970, Dellinger, Weiss, Meacham, and Fernandez held a press conference in Chicago announcing the formation of the Committee of Liaison. As previously noted, all four have been active members of the New Mobe steering committee.

An official Committee of Liaison information sheet dated January 1970 specifically stated that the "Committee of Liaison has now been established * * * at the request of the North Vietnamese." (Kunstler had also said in his October 28, 1969, Chicago press announcement that the new committee was to be established at the request of the North Vietnamese.)

¹ Another New Mobe affiliate engaged in the prisoner of war issue has been Chicago Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, founded and dominated by identified CPUSA member LeRoy Wolins, who has also served as a member of New Mobe's Washington Action Committee. A press report in November 1969 stated that VFP was releasing a list of 74 prisoners of war, together with photographs, which information had been received from Hanoi through Toronto, Canada, some 3 months earlier. The reason it was being released after so long a time, said Wolins, was simply that it had been "lost" in the VFP's files.

The motivations of the North Vietnamese in encouraging the establishment of such a group as the Committee of Liaison were made clear in an item carried in the March 14, 1970, issue of *Liberation News Service*, quoted in the committee staff study. According to the LNS article, the North Vietnamese Government "chose to work with the antiwar Liaison Committee because it believes that the families of the pilots [held in North Vietnamese prisons] should join the antiwar movement. The success of the movement is the first step toward the release of the pilots, say the Vietnamese."

CONFIRMING TESTIMONY

This was dramatically confirmed by the testimony of Mrs. Sue Allen Shuman, wife of U.S. Navy Commander Edwin Arthur Shuman III, an American pilot captured by the North Vietnamese on March 17, 1968. Mrs. Shuman testified that she and Mrs. Martha Shaw Doss, wife of Navy Lieutenant Commander Dale Walter Doss, also captured with Shuman on March 17, 1968, had journeyed to Paris in October 1969 to meet with members of the North Vietnamese delegation there. After a 6-day wait, the two women finally saw two North Vietnamese.

Questions by HCIS counsel Stephen Romines as to the conditions laid down by the North Vietnamese representatives for the release of American prisoners of war elicited the following colloquy:

Mr. ROMINES. What did they tell you about the release of the prisoners of war?

Mrs. SHUMAN. They told us that the prisoners would never be released until the last American was off their soil, out of Vietnam.

Mr. ROMINES. Did they indicate to you at all what you could do to help your husband?

Mrs. SHUMAN. They certainly did, throughout the whole interview.

Mr. ROMINES. What did they tell you?

Mrs. SHUMAN. They suggested if we wanted to get our husbands out that we should come home and join all of those who are in sympathy with them and are against our administration and against the policies of our country. In other words, to join those who were demonstrating that day. It was Moratorium Day in the United States.

Mr. ROMINES. Did they actually tell you to go out and demonstrate?

Mrs. SHUMAN. Absolutely, and they told us to get as many other people to join us as we possibly could.

On January 27, 1970, Cora Weiss held a news conference concerning the Committee of Liaison in Room 345 of the Cannon House Office Building. Mrs. Weiss began her conference by criticizing the American Government for alleged atrocities committed in Vietnam, giving as her source for these allegations a communist document headed "The following was received from the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam."

Mrs. Weiss described her inspection of North Vietnamese prison camps in Hanoi and quoted a North Vietnamese official to the effect that negotiations by North Vietnam concerning the treatment of POWs would be contingent upon a complete withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam² and the recognition by the United States of a coalition government in South Vietnam. Mrs. Weiss said that the peace movement would handle communication between POWs and their families. More specifically, she indicated that the Committee of Liaison would be the exclusive agent for transmitting letters to and from American prisoners of war held in North Vietnam.

² This position is reflected frequently in Committee of Liaison literature: see especially Committee Exhibits Nos. 4, 6, 9, 10, and 11, printed in the appendix to the June hearings at pp. 4246-4258.

DOWNGRADING OF POW'S FLIGHT

During this news conference, Weiss also made light of the testimony of Navy Lieutenant Robert Frishman and Seaman Douglas Hegdahl, both of whom had testified before this committee in December 1969 regarding the inhumane treatment they had received at the hands of their North Vietnamese captors.³ Weiss flippantly dismissed Frishman's arm injury with the comment that since he was captured as a "war criminal," he was lucky to have an arm at all.

Mrs. Weiss discussed the allegedly excellent living conditions she had observed in the North Vietnamese prisoner-of-war camp known as the "Hanoi Hilton", but she pointedly refused to be drawn into any discussion as to whether or not this camp was representative of treatment accorded to all Americans held by the North Vietnamese communists.

Mrs. Shuman and Mrs. Doss had also personally attended Mrs. Weiss's news conference and described its blatantly pro-Hanoi and anti-American tenor. Both women had previously been contacted by the Committee of Liaison and had subsequently decided—with great personal anguish—to refuse to accept any mail forwarded from their husbands by the COL. Both women indicated that the Weiss news conference had been a powerful factor in reaching their decisions.

Mrs. Shuman testified that she had received seven letters and one postcard from her husband since his capture. The first came through normal postal channels in April 1969, 13 months after Shuman had been taken prisoner, and was postmarked in Hanoi. The second and third letters were received in May and June of 1969, also through the regular mails, as were the fifth and sixth, both of which were received by Mrs. Shuman in December 1969.

The fourth letter was received by Mrs. Shuman from Rennie Davis, who had previously sent her a telegram containing a note from him and the contents of a letter from her husband. Davis had sent the telegram upon his return to New York in August after a propaganda trip to Hanoi, a trip which resulted in the release of Lieutenant Frishman and Seaman Hegdahl from their imprisonment in North Vietnam.

The sixth letter arrived on December 24, 1969, in a plain white envelope bearing the initials "L.S." and the simple return address "Philadelphia" in the left-hand corner. Mrs. Shuman could only speculate as to who had sent the letter; but she surmised that it must have come from Louis Schneider of Philadelphia, who had just returned from Hanoi and announced to the press a list of people to whom he was sending letters. Mrs. Shuman's husband was on Schneider's list as announced to the press, and the plain white envelope in which her husband's letter arrived had been postmarked in Philadelphia.

In January 1970 Mrs. Shuman received a letter from the Committee of Liaison informing her that they would be forwarding a letter from her husband. On February 6, 1970, the letter and a postcard, both from her husband, arrived with a covering letter from the Committee of Liaison's office in New York City. Mrs. Shuman accepted this letter and postcard, but later refused all further mail forwarded to her by the COL. Her decision not to cooperate with the Committee of Liaison was reached in March 1970:

But as time went on, after I heard Mrs. Cora Weiss speak in January, the things that she said about Lieutenant Frishman, for

³ See hearings, *Investigation of Students for a Democratic Society, Part 7-A (Return of Prisoners of War, and Data Concerning Camera News, Inc., "Newsreel")*, Committee on Internal Security, U.S. House of Representatives, 91st Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 9-11 and 16, 1969, pp. 2187-2289.

whom I have the highest regard, and I read the things that she said at their press conference against this country, of which they are also members—they are citizens of this country—something inside me just simply could not compromise any longer.

I do feel that it is a compromise to accept mail from these people. It is not something that you can put into a gray area and say, "Oh, well, I need this letter, it doesn't matter, because as far as I am concerned, if it was important enough, if this issue, this war, this conflict was important enough for my Government to send my husband into combat, to lay his life on the line, and with the knowledge that he might be captured, and if it is important enough for him to sit there and resist, which he must be doing, then it is important enough for me to stand up for what I believe in." Therefore, I made my decision.

A FURTHER TESTIMONIAL

The situation of Mrs. Doss was in many respects very similar to that of Mrs. Shuman. Mrs. Doss also received seven letters from her husband, the first of which, written and postmarked in North Vietnam, arrived through the regular mails in April 1969, 13 months after her husband's capture. The next two came on the same day in June 1969, also in the regular mail.

Like Mrs. Shuman, Mrs. Doss received the fourth letter from her husband in August 1969 as a result of Rennie Davis's trip to Hanoi. Mrs. Doss, however, was further subjected to callous publicity-mongering by Davis, who tried "to use my husband's letter for his own glory."

Davis sent Mrs. Doss a telegram in which he notified her of her husband's letter—and also stated that he had contacted some friends at *Time* magazine about the possibility of publishing the letter because, in the words of Mrs. Doss, it allegedly "showed the great courage of the men who remained in the camps, and therefore he felt that I would like to share it with the world." Davis had taken this action entirely on his own without even perfunctory consultation with Mrs. Doss, who was most upset and sent a wire to *Time* asking them not to publish the letter. *Time*, however, before they had received Mrs. Doss's wire, called her to ask permission to publish the letter. Her response was "please, please not to, that it was something very personal, written to me and not to Rennie Davis and not to the American public." About 6 days later, the letter arrived in the mail from New York.

The fifth and sixth letters also arrived through the normal mails, in December 1969 and January 1970, respectively. As with Mrs. Shuman's sixth letter, Mrs. Doss's sixth arrived in a plain white envelope "with no return address and initials scrawled across the back." Unlike Mrs. Shuman's, however, Mrs. Doss's came from the West Coast, not from Philadelphia.

Since the receipt of the sixth letter, Mrs. Doss had received by the time she testified three letters from the Committee of Liaison, "the first one being [as she described it] two pages giving their background, and it is full of procommunist propaganda." The second, though in an envelope correctly addressed to her, was actually intended for another woman whose husband, Mrs. Doss ascertained, is also a prisoner of the North Vietnamese communists.

On March 9, 1970, Mrs. Doss received her third communication from the Committee of Liaison, signed by Cora Weiss and David Dellinger, telling her that a letter from her husband would be arriving in from 1 to 2 weeks. In fact, the letter arrived 8 weeks later. Mrs. Doss testified that she became quite anxious after the second week: " * * * you know, the old story of waiting for the mailman, running, scratching the mail box." But after 3 weeks of this anxiety,

she "stopped and thought, if they could see me now they would be in hysterics because I am doing exactly what they want me to do, plus all the other wives."

REFUSAL TO COOPERATE

By the time the 8 weeks had passed, Mrs. Doss and Mrs. Shuman had both publicly declared that they would in no way cooperate with the Committee of Liaison, even to the point of refusing mail from their husbands if it was forwarded by the COL. Their joint announcement was made at a press conference in Washington, D.C., on April 14, 1970.

Mrs. Doss therefore returned the unopened envelope to the Committee of Liaison in New York. Two weeks later, she received a plain white business envelope with no return address. Upon opening it, she found her husband's letter concealed inside a sheet of paper: "She [presumably Weiss] had camouflaged it, or the committee had camouflaged it so I could not see what it was, so I would have to hold the letter in my hand."

Mrs. Doss subsequently reached the same decision regarding the disposition of these letters as had Mrs. Shuman; she turned the unopened letters over to this committee with explicit permission to open them. (To this day, however, as a matter of principle, neither wife knows the contents of these letters.) Mrs. Doss explained her decision thusly: "Because if my husband's letters have to be used as the Committee of Liaison is using them, I will not let them be used for vile reasons to hurt other people * * * and if I can't have them, then I want them to be used for good, for the cause of good."

Asked what she believed to be the objectives of the Committee of Liaison, Mrs. Doss replied: " * * * they are trying to paint a pretty face on a very ugly situation. They are using our husbands * * *." She then summed up her feelings:

"Now, I would rather give up Dale's letters for something that would be worthwhile. Those letters don't help him. They may help me, but they are not helping him. They are not getting aid in to him and the thousands of others. It is a way that the communists have devised to pacify us.

"If this Committee of Liaison were truly humanitarian and were truly what they paint themselves to be, then, No. 1, when they bring mail out they would not do it with maximum publicity. No. 2, when they go in, they would be truly concerned about the POWs and they would do their best to check into it, not gloss over it. No. 3, they would not hold press conferences, as Fernandez did.

Mr. ROMINES. Would that be Reverend Richard Fernandez?

Mrs. Doss. Yes, and talk about the POWs that are in there, the few chosen ones that they saw, and pour out this pro-Communist propaganda.

"I have had it with them. They will not use Dale's letters anymore. Now they insist on sending them to me, even though I have said no, no more. It is a way to continually harass me because, quite frankly, it hurts not to be able to open those letters. So from here on I will send those letters to a proper official in the U.S. Government."

Mrs. Shuman summed up her own feelings in a similar vein [the "she" referred to in Mrs. Shuman's statement is Cora Weiss]:

"As Mr. Horner said—he said it very well—she spoke against the policies of our country and she spoke against the men who had gone to fight for the country. My husband is one of those men. She seemed totally unsympathetic and non-caring about the fate of the prisoners, and yet she was up there supposedly as the head of this committee that is supposed to be serving these prisoners and serving the families, and it seemed so obvious to me that she cared not in the least for the prisoners or for their fate. All she seemed

to care about was the cause of the North Vietnamese, and yet she is an American, and I can't understand that.

"I can understand the North Vietnamese. I met them face to face and I can tell you frankly I would rather go and meet with the enemy in the middle of the street—at least I would feel decent and clean and honest—than to talk to another American who is sitting here enjoying the freedoms of this country and yet fighting for the other side and giving aid and comfort to the enemy."

The testimony of these two wives vividly corroborates other evidence that the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, is a propaganda tool of the North Vietnamese Government, playing upon the hopes and anxieties of the wives of American prisoners of war for Communist propaganda purposes. The activities of the Committee of Liaison aid and abet a nation with which the United States is engaged in armed conflict.

The Committee of Liaison appears to be acting as an agent for a foreign power—the Government of North Vietnam.

THE DANGER OF BEING A POLICEMAN

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following insightful commentary, by David Lawrence, on how many of our law enforcement officials are treated nowadays. In this article, taken from the Washington Evening Star of March 1, 1971, we see further evidence of the fragmentation which is splitting this country into futuristic divisions of warring factions. James Madison long ago warned against this phenomenon in his justly famous Federalist Paper No. 10. It is a pity that extremists of left as well as right have chosen to ignore his words. That those who are charged to protect our lives, property, and liberty should be treated as a hostile force not only by a few but by many is itself an astounding fact. That tolerance of such an attitude has indeed become part of the general permissiveness of our day is a sign of the sure imminence of national catastrophe if something is not done by good and moderate citizens to correct the blight.

We must, if we are to remain as one nation under a fair system of laws, lend support of the fullest kind to those who uphold it. The alternative is the chaos of anarchy, and those who will not turn away from it lead our country every day closer to ruin.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 1, 1971]

THE DANGER OF BEING A POLICEMAN

(By David Lawrence)

Policemen are expected to maintain order, but their tasks are becoming more and more dangerous. The figures show that 88 policemen were killed in 1970, a new record.

Unquestionably, there is an insidious campaign behind the terrorism which has swept many a country in the world today, including the United States. One of the targets of persistent attacks—physical and verbal—is the police. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Fed-

eral Bureau of Investigation, has written in the March issue of the "FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin" a significant statement on the subject, released today. He says in part:

"Frequently, some belligerent, anti-law enforcement elements of our society refer to police officers as 'pigs.' Obnoxious four-letter words are shouted at policemen, and the familiar chant, 'Off the pigs,' meaning 'Kill the police,' is a prominent cry wherever these groups assemble. Further, cartoons and publications depicting police officers as pigs are common fare, even for children. The ridiculous statement, 'The only good pig is a dead pig,' is a slogan of violent protesters. Such deplorable epithets can be gratifying only to little minds. . . .

"In a free society, which owes its very existence and prominence to the rule of law, abuse and ridicule of the law and those charged with enforcing it should not be taken lightly. I urge all members of law enforcement—in spite of personal indignities suffered—to serve with dignity and honor. As a rule, a repulsive slur is more descriptive of its origin than its target."

Hoover declares also that "community leaders, professional spokesmen, educators, clergymen, and others in positions of influence should take a firm stand to preserve our sense of values." He adds:

"Too many are swayed or intimidated by loud, unruly, and aimless rambles—people with a lot of dialogue but no message."

There are plenty of persons who feel that community leaders could do more to educate youth on the basic functions of our governmental system. The youngsters should be taught how petition for reform or change ought to be handled and that violent or coercive methods are not productive.

Looking back over the campus disorders of the last few years, it is apparent that many universities and colleges allowed themselves to be drawn into the debates instead of keeping out of the controversies. Educational institutions are given tax exemption provided they refrain from participating in political activities. Students who want to organize anti-war campaigns, for example, ought to be free to do so, but they should not have the use of campus buildings or facilities for such purposes.

College faculty members as individuals have a right to express opinions on any subject, political or otherwise. They can, however, hardly be justified in speaking as members of the faculty to the students on university or college property as political partisans without impairing the position of the institution itself.

In the 1969-70 college year, nearly 1,800 student "demonstrations," sit-ins, arsons and building seizures occurred. Outbursts on campuses this school year have been insignificant. This may be due to the fact that American troops are being gradually withdrawn from Vietnam and youths are being drafted in smaller numbers. While campus disturbances which require local police or state troopers or, in some cases, the National Guard to restore order have diminished, what is important now is to learn how the riots were incited and what outside influences, if any, were involved in the episodes.

So far as the police are concerned, press reports have unfortunately given emphasis to alleged brutality by law enforcement officials, and many an unverified story stressing police initiation of violence has been published. Some of the militant organizations feel it aids their cause to blame the police for starting the shooting or otherwise stirring up trouble. Little is said about snipers who fire upon police or about the participants in disorders who shout taunts and insults at the police.

The fact remains that many criminals and "activists" today kill or assault policemen with greater frequency than at any time in

the past. Police are confronted with more dangerous situations than they have ever faced.

The states, the cities and the federal government are increasing their law-enforcement personnel and will continue to do so until the era of terrorism has been changed to one of internal peace.

REVENUE SHARING: THE PRAGMATIC CASE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, although the \$5 billion "general revenue-sharing" proposal of the President has attracted by far the most public attention, the \$11 billion "special revenue-sharing" plan is also an exciting—and in some ways more dramatic—invention. For those of us who have long sought a proper vehicle for implementing our feeling that decisionmaking should be more often shared by State and local governments, "special revenue sharing" is a bold and promising measure; and I hope that it will be given the consideration it truly deserves by this Congress. In today's Wall Street Journal, Robert L. Bartley puts the issue in what I consider the proper perspective. It is a wise and easily read article; and I hope that all of my colleagues will have a moment to consider it. For their convenience, I now present the full text of that article:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 3, 1971]

REVENUE SHARING: THE PRAGMATIC CASE (By Robert L. Bartley)

WASHINGTON.—Officials who evolved the administration's revenue-sharing proposals say they are trying to solve "the gold-plated octagon problem." One explains, "If the federal government were giving away gold-plated octagons, and the cities had to pay half the cost, every damn city in the nation would have one."

Powerful incentives come into play every time somebody in Washington has a brainstorm for a new federal aid program, revenue-sharing backers say, and often the result has been to give the cities and states something closer to gold-plated octagons than to what they really want and need. And somehow, the budget and Treasury officials who make this case are far more persuasive than the presidential messages expounding philosophically on "power to the people" and "the new American revolution."

The President can of course argue that decisions made closest to the people are the best ones, but his opponents can counter that the federal bureaucracy is more efficient and less venal than state and local ones. The ancient debate is not only endless and inconclusive, but its ideological generalizations obscure the specific problems and pragmatic responses that actually did give birth to the administration program.

In particular, the "special revenue-sharing" proposal is designed to redress problems the federal government has thrust on states and cities by its past efforts to aid them. So far this \$11 billion program, which would consolidate into six broad categories funds already going to states and cities under existing grants-in-aid, has received less attention than the \$5 billion in "general revenue sharing," which would shore up state and local finances with a direct cut of the federal in-

come tax. General revenue sharing was spelled out in a presidential message back on Feb. 4. This week special revenue sharing takes the spotlight; the first of six special messages was sent to Congress yesterday.

The six bills for special revenue sharing face intricate political problems, though few if any of their opponents argue against the principle of grant consolidation. If the measures should pass, however, they would constitute a sweeping reform of the way federal money is passed to lower levels of government.

To date the standard procedure has been for Congress to set up national programs to plant trees, or educate migrant children, or control outdoor advertising, to take a few real examples. A state or city wanting federal funds for any of these purposes is required to contribute half, or a third, or 10 percent of the total cost from its own funds.

This procedure made a good deal of sense as a way to focus both federal and local efforts on a few high-priority problems, but it was forced far beyond that use as the New Frontier and Great Society seized on grants-in-aid as the available device for financing local social efforts. A 1962 study found \$7.9 billion in federal aid advanced to lower governments for 160 different purposes. Today \$30 billion, or nearly a fifth of all state and local revenues, is granted under 1,019 different categories. In these terms, the grant-in-aid procedure makes little sense, if any at all.

As an example of one of the problems it creates, George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, showed up at a conference the other day with a 2½-foot stack of papers. It was, he said, the application for one urban renewal grant. The proliferation of grant-in-aid programs, each with its own regulations, has reached the point where catalogs had to be published to guide state and local officials through the bewildering complexity. As one presidential message observed, there is now a catalog of the catalogs.

Despite the proliferation of federal programs, to take a second problem, aid money remains available for some purposes but not for others. And while Washington has not literally sponsored any gold-plated octagons, the present structure of grants-in-aid grew like Topsy, with no systematic effort to weigh one program against another. It is by no means clear that the resulting structure of priorities makes more sense than what the states and cities would do if left to their own devices.

The lack of a firm overview of priorities in federal programs leaves the best-informed administration officials entirely impatient with the argument that present federal strings are necessary to insure against local stupidity. "That's a cute and clever point," one of them says, "but the questions you really get when you go to these towns is 'We've got county libraries coming out our ears, what we really need is a new fire station. Can't you change that federal aid system?'"

A third problem is that the aid system not only limits what localities can do with federal funds, its matching requirements act as what Assistant to the President John Erlichman calls a "blotter," with "more and more local financial resources soaked up in federal participation." Aides to Governor William G. Milliken of Michigan say that between federal matching funds and other normal fixed requirements, a state budget of \$1.95 billion left the governor with real discretion over only \$85 million.

The cumulative result of all this, plus uncertainty about year-to-year appropriation levels in various programs, is to leave state and local governments unable to do much planning. Governor Richard B. Ogilvie of Illinois complains, "We are always waiting for someone in some federal agency to tell us what is our most important problem."

The drawbacks of present grants-in-aid are for all serious purposes indisputable, but how to cure them is a separate question. Under special revenue sharing, the administration proposes to abolish some grant-in-aid programs accounting for a third of federal aid spending, or \$10 billion a year. Other present programs would be continued and expanded. While decentralizing many programs through the revenue-sharing device, the administration would further centralize others, notably the welfare system, which accounts for another third of federal aid expenditures.

The \$10 billion for abolished programs plus \$1 billion in new money would be put into six revenue sharing funds: rural community development, urban community development, education, manpower training, law enforcement and transportation. Lower levels of government would receive shares of each fund as determined by mathematical formulas, and would have wide discretion in spending and no set requirements for matching funds. Present projects started under grant-in-aid could be continued, or localities could transfer the money to anything else within the relevant broad category.

ZEAL AND LOGIC

The administration's wheelhorse for special revenue sharing is Richard P. Nathan, assistant director of the Office of Budget and Management, a man who defends the program with evangelistic zeal but pragmatic logic. He sees it as an effort not to get more decisions made by nice little states rather than bad old Washington, but to sort out what types of decisions are best made by each. The program is, he says, "a careful definition of the federal role, but a definition that moves away from the one that developed during the Great Society and New Frontier."

Mr. Nathan believes centralized administration is needed in three circumstances. One concerns economies of scale. With computers and such, the central government is pretty good at checking formal eligibility and dispensing checks, as in the Social Security system. He defends further centralization of the welfare system for the same reasons.

The federal government should play a heavy role in programs, like air and water pollution, where there is a large spill-over across state lines. And, he says, it should be active in an "innovator-disseminator role," sponsoring research and new programs like family planning that are "just being recognized as a government responsibility."

At the same time, Mr. Nathan continues, there are things the Federal government cannot do. "Service responsibilities do not lend themselves to orchestration from Washington," he says, "You couldn't run a school system like you run the Social Security system."

The supply of talent and time in Washington is perhaps better than in the states, he adds, but it is not infinite. It's a mistake to assume that any one group of people can make nation-wide the detailed decisions implied by Secretary Romney's 2½-foot stack of paperwork. "What should be the mass transit system in Community X? How should education programs change or expand in City Y? These are decisions for the local level. We can't make them, we couldn't make them if we wanted to."

Mr. Nathan is harsh about the past proliferation of grant-in-aid programs. As a Congressman, he says, "you've got to have a program where you can be identified, where it's your idea." So in a field like manpower training there are a lot of programs, each with different rules about how to "jump through the hoop to get the federal dollar, and then we sit back and say the state and local governments don't know how to run manpower." Also, such programs tend to be under-funded because Congress reacts to mathematical reality: "You can get more programs if you make them small."

THE BIG CATCH

But if that's how the present system arose—to get to the big catch in the President's program—how do you persuade Congress to change it? The political problems here go beyond the President and his opponents competing for credit. Special revenue sharing is certainly not the only way to address the grant-in-aid problem, and valid criticisms may be directed at its details as they are disclosed. Conceivably Democrats could honor the principle by offering grant consolidation programs of their own. But a narrower sort of political interest is the big obstacle. Grant consolidation is like free trade, everyone's for it for everyone but himself.

At the winter Governors' Conference here last week, Gov. Winfield Dunn of Tennessee was explaining to the press that the President's program was not political but idealistic. That this was strictly a matter of the public interest. How, a mean-spirited reporter asked, did he feel about folding the Appalachian Regional Commission into special revenue sharing? Oh no, that's a "unique situation," and its separate identity should be preserved until it has had a chance to prove itself. Sen. Howard Baker (R., Tenn.), the administration's floor leader for general revenue sharing, feels the same way. And imagine the feelings of a Democratic Senator who fought hard for his own manpower program.

One evaluation of all this, mostly from people who have cried for presidential leadership and vision, is to complain that the President's proposals are too idealistic to pass. A more becoming observation might be that if special revenue sharing is indeed emasculated or defeated in Congress, it will mark the victory of some fairly narrow political interests over one thoughtful approach to some real and serious problems.

VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS SUFFER GROWING PAINS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the Members to an article in the Chicago Tribune's south metro section on Thursday, February 25, describing the activities of volunteer fire departments in suburban Chicago. The article is, I believe, not only interesting, but it very properly emphasizes the tremendous motivation and civic pride that is typical of men serving in volunteer fire departments not only in suburban Chicago but throughout the country.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we too often read of the radicals and malcontents of our society and seldom of the civic and community accomplishments that is exemplified by our volunteer firemen, which is far more representative of American spirit than the demagogues and radicals who receive abnormal press attention.

I am very pleased to note that the article which follows mentions a number of fire departments and individuals in my district:

TRAGEDY EMPHASIZES PROBLEMS; VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS SUFFER GROWING PAINS

(By Frank Zahour)

Edward Nowakowski, 46, 1916 Ivy Lane, Mount Prospect, the father of seven children, made his living as a proficiency expert. He was also a volunteer fireman for the Forest River Fire Protection District.

At 4:20 a.m. Sunday, Nowakowski and scores of other firemen from Forest River, Buffalo Grove, Prospect Heights and Vernon were summoned to help the Wheeling Fire Department fight a fire at the Wheel Inn dance hall and restaurant, 39 S. Milwaukee Ave., Wheeling.

GETS OXYGEN AND RETURNS

During the fire, Nowakowski suffered smoke inhalation. "He went back to the truck to get some oxygen," said Forest River Fire Chief Charles Nick, 54. "I asked him how he felt. He said fine, then he went back to the fire."

"We wrapped up the whole thing at about 7:45 a.m. Ed was on the truck, rolling up his last hose. Then he collapsed. He died later, apparently of a heart attack.

"He was a good man . . . one of our best. He joined in August, 1969. Made every drill. Why did he do it? I don't know. Why do any of these guys do it? We've asked them if they want some compensation. But they refused.

If fire strikes your home (and you live in a small town, village or city) chances are that a volunteer fireman, someone like Edward Nowakowski, will rush to answer your call for help.

COMMUNITY SERVICE TRADITION

Volunteer fire departments comprise the majority of fire companies in the nation. Long a tradition of community service that worked to cut the costs of government and provide fire protection, many volunteer departments face increasing problems of funds, recruitment and training.

While closely knit communities usually have few recruiting problems, suburbs and towns that are rapidly expanding are finding it harder and harder to recruit physically qualified and interested men to man the fire hoses.

"Some of these recruits are eager, perhaps too eager," said Chief Charles Prentiss of Hazel Crest Volunteer Fire Department. Prentiss likes to tell the story of the new recruit who was anxious when he answered his first fire call.

After the department dashed to a burning garage and set up its equipment, he grabbed a fire hose and shot a thick jet of water thru the smoke surrounding the structure.

He aimed at the closed garage door. In his haste he failed to realize that the fire was inside, and the smoke was merely seeping thru the door.

GOOD WASHING JOB

"I walked over to the man and told him he was doing one heck of a job washing the building," said Chief Prentiss. "Then I told him to open the door so we could put out the fire."

While the story is by no means typical of the usual firefighting efficiency of the Hazel Crest department, it does point to two of the problems, recruiting and training, that many volunteer fire departments in the Chicago area face.

"Running a volunteer fire department is a tough business," Prentiss said recently. "Sometimes you don't get the kind of volunteers you want and you have to take your chances."

BEGAN WITH BEN FRANKLIN

Property owners have been "taking their chances" on volunteer firefighters since 1736, when Benjamin Franklin organized the nation's first volunteer department in Philadelphia.

Volunteer departments today account for about 85 per cent of the nation's fire companies. Illinois has about 1,200 volunteer departments, mostly in small cities and villages.

When the fire siren sounds, volunteers form all walks of life rush to answer the call. James Newhouse, a flying instructor, finds time to work on the Batavia Fire Department. Marketing specialist Ken Kucera has been a member of the Lyons Volunteer Department for the past five years. Stephen

Mistakevich, a machine operator for United States Steel Co. in Joliet, is a volunteer for the East Joliet Fire Protection District.

The backbone of the department is the man who works a full day at his job and then drills at the local firehouse and stands ready to answer the call. Why are men willing to work these hours, often for no pay or, at the most, only a few token dollars?

EACH HAS OWN REASON

"Every man has a different reason," said Chief Lee Reynolds, of the Willow Springs Volunteer Department. "Some say they like the idea of serving the public, others will admit it's the thrill of the siren."

The Willow Springs department receives about \$12,000 a year from the village. The firemen themselves, as most volunteers, stage a dance and fund raising events that provide about \$4,000 each year.

Reynolds said recruiting is always a problem. "It's getting harder and harder to get men," he said. "We may have to put on a few paid men."

"We're getting like all the big cities. Its getting so that people don't care. The suburbs are attracting many apartment dwellers, people who usually don't care who their neighbors are."

"Fire fighting is a highly complex and professional business," said John Tebbens, president of Chicago Firefighters Union Local 2. "With new construction developing in the suburbs, new techniques, new building codes, how can we expect volunteers to keep up to date?"

"In the past, there has always been a technological lag between the paid departments and the volunteer departments," said M. J. Hyde, a grading engineer for the Illinois Inspection and Rating Bureau. The bureau works to assist and rate fire departments in the state to help insurance companies set fire insurance rates.

IMPROVES EFFECTIVENESS

"In the last few years, however, more and more volunteer groups are taking advantage of government-sponsored seminars and conferences to help them improve their effectiveness," said Hyde.

Chief Joseph A. Steinhoff of the Stickney Fire Department believes not enough volunteer groups take such extra training seriously.

"I'd say that half the volunteer groups in this area [the western suburbs] are under-trained. I've seen some guys go to conferences just to get drunk on the taxpayer's money," said Steinhoff.

URGES MORE PARTICIPATION

Steinhoff demands a written report from any of his men who train at places such as the University of Illinois Conference for Fire-fighting. Then he insists on using new information in the department's drills.

Fred Marcon, manager of the rating bureau, said "We would like to see volunteer departments ask us to participate even more in their programs."

The bureau's primary function is to classify and rate fire protection in communities, on a scale that runs from one to 10. No city in the nation has a one [top] rating. Chicago rates 2. In general, volunteer departments rate lower on the scale than most paid departments.

"The volunteers are a group of dedicated men, certainly they should be commended, but in most cases, the time they can give to the fire department is secondary to their paid jobs," said Marcon.

Response time is probably the single most important factor that separates the volunteers from the professionals, according to Marcon.

NO TIME WASTE

Tebbens agrees. "When fire strikes," he said, "you don't have time for the mechanic to drop his tools, for the businessman to put on his fire coat."

Most firefighters, paid and volunteer, agree that the next few years will determine the pattern of fire protection in the nation. Faced with industrial development into rural areas and with the rapid growth of suburbs, many cities and villages already have begun to expand departments and hire paid firemen.

"We couldn't get volunteers in the daytime, so we hired a few people last year," said Chief George W. Hamby of the North-lake Fire Department. "We're very happy with them. Since they are paid, we have control over their time, and it gives us better maintenance and record keeping."

"I'm not questioning the dedication or sincerity of these men, but I want a professional responding to a fire in my house," said Tebbens. "I believe a man should be paid for what he does."

"Most of these volunteers are 'firemen at heart,' they like the helmets, they like the clothes, they like the sound of the siren. They fail to realize that firefighting is no place for amateurs."

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PLAN ON LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my full support for the President's first special revenue sharing plan on law enforcement assistance. Because aid for local and State law enforcement is a relatively new area of Federal activity, we have largely avoided the grant proliferation that afflicts areas like manpower training and education. Nevertheless the President was not satisfied to rest content with the status quo, and has proposed even further streamlining and elimination of funding restrictions.

The most important of these is the elimination of the State matching and maintenance of effort requirements currently contained in the LEAA program. I believe this establishes a vitally important precedent. One of the most unfortunate consequences of the categorical grant system has been the locking in of more and more local funds to meet Federal matching maintenance of effort, set-aside, and other requirements. This not only distorts local budget priorities, but also has the unfortunate tendency of transforming local and State governments into little more than administrative appendages of the Federal bureaucracies. Clearly, this is something that must be reversed if we are serious about returning decisionmaking power to the local level. I believe, let me stress, that we are making an important step in that direction with this first special revenue sharing program.

There are those, of course, who will say that we at the Federal level know best what measures are needed to achieve more effective State and local criminal justice systems, and that rather than removing restrictions we should be adding them. They will point to the first year of the LEAA program in which probably an inordinate amount of funds was spent for the procurement of police department hardware and not enough for professional upgrading, court mod-

ernization, or reform of our corrections institutions.

I do not wish to deny these charges nor make apologies for questionable priorities established at the local level during the first year of LEAA's operation. But I would point out that it was the police departments who were probably in a better position to make immediate use of the initial funding than any other institution in the criminal justice system and naturally walked away with the lion's share of outlays in the first year. After all, it is a relatively simple matter to order riot gear, new communications systems, or police vehicles. It is a considerably more complicated task to devise a new prison rehabilitation program, a plan for speeding up the court procedures, or to develop roles for new specialists in police departments. These take time, planning, and deliberation. In most instances, there simply was not opportunity for this during the first year.

A more accurate view of what we can expect if decisionmaking power is spun-off to the local level is to be found in the returns from fiscal year 1970. Though the total amount of LEAA funds available for 1970 was four times that spent the year before, spending for correction related programs increased 30 fold—from around \$2 million to over \$38 million. Similarly, spending for court reform activities increased by a factor of 10. These returns indicate to me that local and State officials are fully aware of the need for reform across the entire range of criminal justice functions and that courts, corrections, and juvenile programs can count on a fair shake from local officials.

I believe it is about time that we begin to give local officials and agencies a little credit. If they have been unduly cautious and unimaginative in the past it may be in no small part related to the fact that they have been hemmed in between prying Federal officials on the one side, and hard-pressed taxpayers on the other. As a result, the margin for innovation and experimentation has been slight. What we are attempting to do in these special revenue sharing programs is provide a little room for local officials to maneuver as they attempt to meet the unique needs and problems of their areas and constituencies. I am confident that they will make the most of this opportunity and prove once and for all that successful problem solving and sensitivity to new needs is not a monopoly of the Federal Government.

Let me say in conclusion that this special revenue sharing program does contain a number of important safeguards. First, it provides that States shall pass through funds to local governments in proportion to expenditures at the local level. Second, it requires that high crime areas get an equitable portion of the funds. And third, it provides for the strict guarantee of civil rights in all programs in which the Federal funds are involved. These are necessary but minimal conditions. They establish a framework in which, I believe, local and State officials can attempt to deal creatively, flexibly, and constructively with the task of fashioning a criminal justice system that is attuned to the needs of our society in the 1970's.