

remarks by the two able leaders under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) for not to exceed 10 minutes, to be followed by the transaction of routine morning business with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The period for the transaction of routine morning business is not to extend beyond 12 o'clock meridian under the previous order.

The operation of rule XXII will be suspended until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow. Under the rule there will be 1 hour of debate, and under the previous order, the hour will be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) and the equally distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH).

At the conclusion of the hour of debate, a quorum call is mandatory under the rule. Upon the establishment of the presence of a quorum by the Presiding Officer, a rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 9 will be mandatory under the rule. Therefore, there will be an automatic rollcall vote on tomorrow at about 1:10 p.m.

Following the disposition of the pending business on tomorrow—if cloture is not invoked—the Senate will consider Senate Joint Resolution 7, lowering the age to 18 for voting in State and local elections.

Under the previous order, when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it will stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday next.

On Wednesday next, under the previous order, immediately following action on the approval of the Journal, if there is no objection, and the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) is to be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

RECESS UNTIL 11:30 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1971, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of February 17), 1971:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Homer I. Lewis, [redacted] AFV, U.S. Air Force Reserve, for appointment as Chief of Air Force Reserve under the provisions of section 8019, title 10, of the United States Code.

IN THE ARMY

Gen. George Robinson Mather, [redacted] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

The following-named officer for appointment as Chief, Army Reserve and for appointment as major general, Army of the United States, and major general, U.S. Army Reserve, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3019, 3442, and 3447:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. James Milnor Roberts, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army Reserve).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Howard Wilson Penney, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roderick Wetherill, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David Stuart Parker, [redacted]

[redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Raymond Leroy Shoemaker, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Philip Seneff, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Harleston deSaussure, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hugh Franklin Foster, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Robertson Desobry, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, United States Army).

Maj. Gen. Herron Nichols Maples, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leo Henry Schweiter, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Bautz, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Marlon Seignious II, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Logan Irby, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Alfred Feyerelsen, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard George Ciccolella, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Francis Hollingsworth, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

MEDICAL CORPS

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Dew Orr, [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JUNIOR GIRL SCOUTS MAKE AN ECOLOGY PLEDGE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are greatly concerned about the problems of pollution and litter and their effect on our environment and our natural resources.

Unfortunately, too many of us voice our concern and then neglect to follow through.

A group of Junior Girl Scouts and their leaders from Atwater, Calif., have written me of their own environmental con-

cerns, and have also spelled out their pledge to protect the environment and preserve our Nation's natural resources.

I found this group's pledge and letter to be outstanding and worthy of the attention of all Members of the Congress.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the letter to me from Junior Girl Scout Troop 19, Atwater, Calif., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FEBRUARY 25, 1971.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
Sacramento, Calif.

MY DEAR Mr. WALDIE: Junior Girl Scout Troop 19 is studying a new badge this year. We are pioneering in Eco-Action for 1971. We are learning, what we can, of the problems facing us as a nation and as individuals. We are making a pledge, our own solemn pledge to find the pioneering spirit to start to overcome the problems which are robbing us of

clean water, free fresh air which we need to sustain life, problems of too many people, too much litter and shrinking wilderness areas.

OUR PLEDGE

1. I promise to never, ever throw or drop a single tiny piece of litter on the ground. If I see someone doing it be he child or old, old man, I will pick up his litter and politely hand it back to him.

2. I will never contaminate a stream, river, lake or waterway in any way.

3. I will not waste paper or food. When I am grown, I will not work for a company which willfully pollutes our environment.

4. I will encourage my dad and mom to demand autos which will not pollute, to demand that our local water supplies be clean and healthy and that our sewage treatment plant be adequate for our community; and that our community and state adapt methods of collecting items which can be recycled.

5. I will encourage my family and friends to support legislation which will help clean up our environment and to enforce these laws; and to support legislation to create new wilderness areas.

In looking for some way to actively participate in saving our remaining wilderness areas from encroaching civilization, we found that there is a proposed all-weather highway planned to go through the high Sierras between the John Muir Wilderness and Dana Mines Wilderness areas crossing the 200-mile road-free John Muir Trail.

We applaud your efforts to block this proposed highway by reintroducing the San Joaquin Wilderness Bill.

As Girl Scouts who live with and love the outdoors in its natural state we support this bill. And, although we cannot yet vote, we want to raise our voice in opposition to this highway. We have written letters to the President, the Secretary of the Interior and our Representatives in Congress. As well as the Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General and our representatives in the state legislature. We have urged them to support the San Joaquin Wilderness Bill with whatever power they possess.

We would like someday to take our own children to this most lovely area where no road exists and where hopefully no road will ever exist.

Very sincerely,

JUNIOR GIRL SCOUT TROOP 19.

ATWATER, CALIF.

Deana Adams, Kathy Grammes, Michelle Hemme, Deborah Lloyd, Sharon Lonjin, Lisa Gycock, Terri Culbreth, Beth Grammes, Susie Mahoney, Angela Bone, Cathy Gurley, Vicky Spagnola, Barbara Pierce, Tammy Spagnola, Annunette Myers.

Susan Katsch, Shirley Bene, Cathy Snyder, Kathy Clifford, Judith Noderer, Christine Honea, Sandra Boyce, Naomi Czipka, Melanie Grisby, Deborah Robinson, Laura Prowell, Cindy Anstead, Connie Grammes, Leader; Janet Smyela, Assistant Leader; Patricia S. Bone, Leader.

DAV 1971 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Mr. Cecil W. Stevenson of Jonesboro, Ark., recently appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with a presentation of the DAV 1971 legislative program.

That program reflects the continued high purpose of the DAV to assure adequate care for the disabled veteran and his family.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the presentation by Commander Stevenson which follows:

STATEMENT OF CECIL W. STEVENSON

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to come before you to speak on the 1971 Legislative Program of the Disabled American Veterans.

I thank you, too, on behalf of our National Officers, our State Commanders and Adjutants who are here with us this morn-

ing. Our mutual interest in veterans' affairs brings us together again in the Nation's Capitol for formal discussions on programs and plans of our Organization for the current year.

It would be derelict on the part of the Disabled American Veterans, Mr. Chairman, if we did not at the very outset pay special notice . . . and give congratulatory appreciation to you and the members of your Committee who have made it possible for the 91st Congress to be remembered as the "Best Veterans' Congress in Years."

That quote is not mine, ladies and gentlemen, but it has been used to describe the 91st Congress in the newspapers, service organization publications, and in the *Congressional Record* itself.

We know you made it possible for the new legislation now on the books—new laws—that makes life easier for the disabled war veteran, his dependents and survivors. We are especially grateful that you gave your all-out support to have the new compensation law become effective on July 1, 1970, instead of January 1, 1971, as originally scheduled.

In addition to the generous increases in compensation rates, the 91st Congress substantially improved and expanded the programs of education and training, dependency and indemnity compensation, disability and death pension, and the hospital and medical care program. Indeed, every major benefit program for veterans and their dependents was dramatically improved and expanded.

These and other actions—all of which cannot be covered here—provide more than three quarters of a billion dollars in increased benefits and represent achievements of outstanding significance by this Committee and the 91st Congress. I know that the Committee will, as it has always done in the past, continue to give serious recognition to veterans problems as it undertakes its work in the 92nd Congress.

We of the Disabled American Veterans look forward to working with you, and providing you with whatever assistance we can in the coming months. I wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the dedicated members who continue to serve on this great Committee and to say a very warm word of welcome and congratulations to the newly assigned members. I know that all members will find us ready and available at all times so that with our joint efforts we may continue to give all help, reasonable and proper, to those of our fighting forces who bear the scars of battle wounds, or the marks of injuries or illnesses incurred while on active duty.

Before proceeding further, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should take this occasion to explain to the new members the principal purpose for which the Disabled American Veterans was created. That purpose in part urges all of us "to uphold and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States; to realize the true American ideals and aims for which those eligible to membership fought; to advance the interests and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured and disabled veterans; to cooperate with the United States Veterans Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the condition, health, and interest of all service-disabled veterans."

In accordance with these principles, the DAV, as part of its National Service Program, is making a special effort to seek out returning war veterans to advise them that our Organization stands ready to offer assistance in securing for them all benefits to which they may be entitled. For this purpose, the DAV maintains 150 National Serv-

ice Officers—46 are Vietnam veterans—located in Veterans Administration Regional Offices and Centers across the Country. These dedicated, specially trained national employees—all of them disabled as the result of wartime service—assist the veteran in the preparation and presentation of claims for compensation, pension, hospitalization, medical treatment, education and vocational training, and sundry other benefits under law.

As National Commander of the DAV, Mr. Chairman, I have a genuine pride in our Service Program and the high stature it has attained through the efforts of our National Service Officers. In this connection, I recognize that the success of their efforts often depends upon the sympathetic understanding that you and your Committee members have consistently given to our Legislative presentations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and honorable members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, here are the 1971 DAV Legislative Objectives.

I want to say at once, ladies and gentlemen, that it is not the purpose of the DAV to come here and make extravagant demands upon the Committee and the public treasury. The generous record of veterans' benefits enacted in the 91st Congress would, in any case, constrain us to keep our program within reasonable and equitable limits. However, with your indulgence, I should like to cover in general terms certain areas of veterans' programs to which the DAV is addressing itself this year.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

With respect to the VA disability compensation program, Mr. Chairman, I want to re-emphasize that the DAV, throughout the years, has been deeply impressed with the interest and concern this Committee has consistently shown for those veterans who have suffered disability as the result of service in our armed forces. We are most grateful to the Committee for repeatedly exercising initiative and leadership in the development of programs to meet the growing needs of these deserving war veterans.

Traditionally, it has been accepted that payments for service-incurred disablement should be adequate to meet the special circumstances of the veteran. This is particularly so in the cases of the very severely disabled, whose income consists solely of compensation and where very often the recipient is so disabled that he cannot work. Accordingly, it is the feeling of the DAV that the maintenance of the purchasing value of compensation payments must continue to be a major factor in the established compensation policy.

We are confident that the Committee will, as it has steadfastly done in the past, keep the disability compensation program under close and continuing study. The constant rise in the cost of goods and services offers, we think, a real and compelling reason for the Committee to do so.

Since Disability compensation is a matter of fundamental interest to the Disabled American Veterans, it is only natural that a number of resolutions touching on this program be considered and approved by our National Conventions.

Among those adopted by our most recent National Convention is a resolution calling for a long-delayed and well-deserved increase in the statutory awards payable to disabled veterans for the loss or loss of use of a single extremity or body organ. The Veterans Administration has persistently opposed this proposal, giving as its reason that they "have been engaged in the preliminary steps" of a study to obtain data for use in validating the disability Rating Schedule. This study has been going on now for well over a decade,

and we cannot see it as a valid excuse for delaying action any longer on this worthy proposal.

Although the basic rates of disability compensation have been increased at more or less regular intervals over the years, the monthly rates for the statutory awards have remained constant since July 1, 1952, at which time there was granted an increase of \$5 a month over the rate prevailing since September 1, 1946.

Inasmuch as the costs of goods and services have risen substantially during the 1952-1971 period, we believe a generous increase in these statutory payments is wholly justified. We urge the Committee's favorable consideration of this pending proposal.

Another DAV resolution associated with compensation would authorize an annual clothing allowance of \$300 to veterans who, because of service-connected disabilities are forced to wear prosthetic appliances which tend to wear out or tear their clothing.

The proposal is a most reasonable one, is inexpensive, and its enactment will give recognition to the value of military service and the difficulties these veterans endure daily because of the special nature of their service-connected disabilities. We urge the Committee's approval of this deserving and appealing measure.

The DAV also proposes a modification of existing law to extend the full range of wartime benefits to a very deserving group of VA beneficiaries.

Enactment of the Cold War G.I. Bill (P.L. 89-358) in March of 1966, and the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967, expanded significantly the wartime benefits program for veterans who have served in time of peace under wartime conditions.

There still remains, however, a group of disabled peacetime veterans who are paid disability compensation at wartime rates but who are not, under existing law, entitled to other wartime benefits.

The DAV believes that a veteran who sustained a disability under wartime conditions, while performing extra-hazardous service, should have a fundamental entitlement to the same benefits provided for war veterans who became disabled under similar circumstances.

In the spirit of fair play, we heartily recommend that equal treatment be accorded these deserving veterans and that they be provided with the full range of wartime benefits.

The DAV National Convention last August adopted a number of other resolutions on the subject of disability compensation. Included are proposals to authorize concurrent payment of compensation and pension under a special formula; dependency allowances for veterans whose disabilities are rated less than 50 percent; dependency and indemnity compensation for widows of veterans rated 100 percent service-connected disabled for 20 or more years; and to authorize aid and attendance allowances for dependent parents of veterans who die as a result of service-connected disability.

VA MEDICAL CLAIM

The DAV, by its very nature, has a deep and abiding interest in the Veterans Administration's Hospital and Medical Care Program. We strongly support the position that the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery maintain its prominence in the entire field of medical care.

The DAV is deeply indebted to you, Mr. Chairman, for conducting the surveys last year which resulted in a better understanding of the hospital and medical needs of disabled war veterans. Indeed, information adduced by the surveys was instrumental in

securing additional hospital funds which brought about improvements in the VA Medical Care Program.

As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, much discussion is going on within and outside the Government to establish a National Health Insurance Program. There is a variety of health care legislation of both large and small scope pending before the Congress. Proposals to improve the distribution of physicians, dentists, nurses, technicians, and other allied health personnel are under consideration. Some of these proposals have a laudable purpose because the national shortage of doctors and other health professionals is severe and worsening.

The DAV recognizes that the problem of health care for the general population is swelling rapidly and that legislation is needed to deal realistically with all aspects of the health issue, including the plight of medical education.

The question arises as to what role the VA will play in any proposed National Health Care Program. In this connection, the VA Chief Medical Director stated recently that all health systems "must link their resources, talent, and knowledge." It was further stated that "no component of the Nation's Health Care System as large as that represented by the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery can consider itself, or be considered, in isolation—no matter how splendid."

The DAV senses here the beginning of a subtle effort to assimilate the VA medical system into a National "unified health plan" under the jurisdiction of HEW or some other social agency. As the Chairman and members of the Committee know, HEW has already proposed that 8 of its Public Health Service hospitals and 30 out-patient clinics be closed. It is indicated that if the closings occur, public health service patients will be transferred to VA hospitals.

Despite all of the plans being advanced for the operation of a National Health Program, we believe that the welfare of the disabled war veteran and the debt his nation owes him dictate aggressive action to make certain he receives a high level of medical service as a matter of right, that he be considered apart from the general population, and that he must be given total priority with respect to health care benefits. In our view, the principle of first-rate medical care for wounded and otherwise disabled war veterans is at once so just and indisputably right that the Government is under a strong moral obligation to continue to effectively operate the VA Hospital and Medical Care system as it is presently constituted.

In this regard, the recently published VA budget for fiscal year 1972 indicates an increase of \$124.7 million over fiscal year 1971 for medical care. Upon reviewing the immediate and massive needs of the Program, it becomes evident that this increase is unrealistically low and will necessarily result in the loss of 5,500 hospital beds. At the same time, reports received from across the country reveal that applications for VA hospital and out-patient treatment have been on the increase, the demands for all hospital and medical services have reached an all-time high, that the number of veterans seeking nursing home care is rising. The reports, in fact, reflect an increased need for across-the-board services to psychiatric, medical, and surgical patients.

The VA can go forward with positive programs that provide greater health services to more patients with increased effectiveness. But, again, this can only be done with a level of funds far higher than that requested in the budget for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Chairman, several resolutions relating to the VA Hospital and Medical Care Pro-

gram were adopted by our National Convention. Included are proposals to provide an Aid and Attendance allowance for service-connected totally disabled veterans who are confined to a nursing home; to provide complete medical services to veterans who are rated 50 percent or more disabled; to authorize hospital care for the widows and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities and for wives and children of veterans who have service-connected conditions rated as totally disabling.

As you know, under the terms of the Military Medical Benefits Act, hospital care is made available to dependents of retired military personnel and to the widows and children of servicemen who die while on active duty.

It is the feeling of the DAV that dependents of totally disabled service-connected veterans and the survivors of veterans who die of service-connected causes should be placed in a position comparable to that enjoyed by dependents of military retirees.

Over the years, this Committee and the Congress has consistently recognized that the widow of a man who dies of service-incurred disease or injury is in a very select category and deserves the special gratitude and assistance of our nation.

This is reflected in the passage of legislation that has established programs of death compensation payments, provisions for home loans, and for educational assistance benefits to war orphans and widows. We believe that authorization for hospital and medical benefits would be a logical and natural progression of a grateful nation's efforts to fulfill in a greater degree the needs of survivors of those who contributed so much to preserve America's security in time of war.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The subject of national cemeteries has been a long-standing priority concern of the Disabled American Veterans. Several bills pending before the Committee would consolidate Federal cemeteries into one system administered by the Veterans Administration. The DAV strongly supports this proposed legislation, for we see it as a means of eliminating the confusing and uncertain condition currently associated with the cemetery program.

The DAV has National Convention resolutions calling for increasing the burial allowance to \$400, and to establish a National Cemetery in every state. With regard to the latter resolution, we recognize that for practical purposes this proposal may have to be modified. Some heavily veteran-populated areas may require several sites. There is no easy solution, but we are sure that the members of this distinguished Committee recognize this. We know, too, that the Committee has, through the years, constantly held to the view that veterans who have faithfully and honorably served our country should be entitled to the secure knowledge that there is a carefully drawn plan governing cemeteries for veterans—a plan that is equitable now and will sustain in the future.

I want to say again, Mr. Chairman, that the DAV is solidly behind the proposal to transfer control of national cemeteries to the Veterans Administration. It represents, in our opinion, a major step toward the fulfillment of the doctrine that "every veteran should have the right to burial in a national cemetery situated reasonably close to his home."

GUARANTEED AND INSURED HOME LOANS

As you know, Mr. Chairman, since the inception of the Home Loan Program, the interest rate has risen from the original 4 percent to last year's all-time high of 8½ percent—a cost of financing that has priced

most of the nation's veterans out of the housing market.

The members of our Organization have always held that in order for the Home Loan Program to be a meaningful benefit, the interest rates on these well-secured, Government guaranteed loans must be set at a reasonable level which is within the reach of the average veteran. We, therefore, welcomed the recent actions which started the downward trend in interest rates, and we are hopeful that the present 7 percent rate will soon go even lower.

While encouraged by the lowering of the interest rates and the extension of the Loan Program to cover mobile homes and condominiums, Mr. Chairman, we were dismayed to learn that the Veterans Administration apparently intends to get out of the "direct loan program." The news that there were no funds available in the 1972 VA Budget request for this important Program came as a shock, and must have been especially discouraging to that small group of severely disabled veterans who, by an act of Congress last year, were made eligible for direct loans to purchase specially adapted housing. Veterans who will benefit from this new law deserve every consideration and should be assured of this benefit without regard to where they live or the availability of other possible sources of mortgage credit.

Eliminating the direct home loan program runs counter to resolutions adopted by the DAV National Convention. These resolutions urge that the Program be expanded, that the maximum direct loan amount be increased to \$25,000, and that such loans be made available in metropolitan areas.

We view the hasty and ill conceived decision to eliminate direct loans as an arbitrary abuse of Executive authority, and we respectfully request that this distinguished Committee exercise its power of legislative oversight to reassert the will of the Congress that "direct loans" in any area be made available to disabled veterans who are entitled to assistance in the purchase of specially adapted housing.

Other DAV legislative recommendations associated with the Home Loan Program provide that the specially adapted housing benefit be extended to veterans who have suffered the service-connected loss, or loss of use of an upper and lower extremity; that the exercise of strict controls over the discount rate be maintained in order to prevent lenders from artificially increasing the maximum interest levels by the charging of excessive points; and that the National Service Life Insurance reserve fund be used to provide home loans for veterans at reasonable interest rates.

Mr. Chairman, my statement has covered some of the major aspects of our 1971 Legislative Program. There are other matters of equal urgency which will receive our attention during the course of the 1st session of the 92nd Congress.

The Committee has been furnished a complete set of resolutions adopted at the 1970 DAV National Convention held at Los Angeles, California. Bills relating to most of these proposals have already been introduced, while others are presently in the drafting stage.

When the Committee holds hearings on specific pending legislation, we hope you will allow us to present more detailed reasons why we feel that these and other proposals in which we are deeply interested should be given early approval by the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to express our grateful appreciation for giving me the opportunity to come before you and present our views on matters of vital importance to the people whom we serve—the wartime dis-

abled, his dependents and survivors. I also want to take this occasion to pay special tribute to the staff members of this distinguished Committee and to thank them for all the competent help, advice, and practical assistance they have given us throughout the years. I am pleased to commend and thank them for their splendid cooperation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another high-point of our Conference this year. This afternoon the Senate and House of Representatives will salute the Disabled American Veterans on the Anniversary of its fifty years' of service to America's disabled war veterans and their dependents.

The highly respected ranking majority member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, Mr. Dorn, will act as Co-Chairman of this event in the House. It is my hope that other members of the Committee will participate in this very special event.

The final activity of our Conference will, of course, take place this evening when we have our annual reception honoring all members of the Congress. I shall look forward to meeting with you on this festive occasion which begins at 6:00 P.M. in the Presidential Ballroom of the Hotel Statler Hilton.

MINED AREA PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for myself and for Messrs. KYL, STEIGER of Arizona, DON H. CLAUSEN, RUPPE, CAMP, SEBELIUS, TERRY, GERALD R. FORD, BOB WILSON, WIDNALL, BLACKBURN, and COUGHLIN, legislation to provide for cooperation between Federal Government and the States with respect to environmental regulations for mining operations, and for other purposes.

This legislative proposal is a part of President Nixon's environmental message which was submitted to the Congress on February 8, 1971.

Historically, the continued growth, prosperity, and strength of this Nation has been proportional to our ability to develop our mineral and human resources. Throughout the length and breadth of our land we see the marvels of our great strength as a Nation—great highways, inspiring buildings, factories, steel mills.

And throughout our land, too, we see the price paid for these structures—great pits, spoil banks, and other unsightly scenes.

President Nixon—and more than 200 million Americans—would like to see this growing ugliness stopped. And a proposal by the administration, keyed to the President's far-reaching environmental message of February 8 is designed to do just that. I am proud to lend my support to legislation that will soften the environmental impact by mining in the United States.

Action is long overdue. We owe it to present generations and future ones to save whatever we can of our terrain.

In our quest for minerals, 3.2 million acres of land already have been dis-

turbed by mining. And some 150,000 acres are being added annually to this total. If we continue along the present path, 5 million acres will have been affected by 1980.

I do not mean that the States and some of the mining companies have ignored the problem. They recognize it and have taken steps to reclaim the countryside. There are, on the books of 22 States, regulations concerning mining environmental problems.

But there is a lack of uniformity, both in the laws and in the effort to see that they are followed to the letter.

Corrective National legislation is the only reasonable approach to the problem. The legislation I support gives the States the initial responsibility for developing and enforcing environmental mining regulations. This is an excellent approach. However, if the States do not act by coming up with an acceptable program in 2 years, the Secretary of the Interior would promulgate regulations for mining operations within the State.

I have not touched upon cleaning up the damage already suffered—the millions of acres already ravished. The administration, I have been assured, is working on this phase, too, but it is not part of the present legislative proposal.

I wish to point out that the proposed Mined Area Protection Act of 1971, which should become law, is not limited to the adverse effects of surface mining, but would cover such eyesores as unsightly spoil heaps from underground mines and the sink holes and the water pollution created by workings beneath the surface.

It is a good bill and merits your support.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, this body spends a good deal of time considering Federal grant-in-aid proposals which would affect both the State and local levels. And in considering them, we always try to be alert to the proper balance among State and city interests and competition for funds, on the one hand, and national goals versus local preferences, on the other.

This sometimes confused democratic process somehow seems to produce relatively adequate legislation when we need it—but we seldom have adequately solved the problems of State versus city interests, of national responsibilities versus local wishes. And perhaps the nature of this pluralistic country is that these problems never can be permanently or completely solved. Perhaps, too, we try to say too much for a piece of legislation to hold.

Maybe the motto in Washington should be the fewer words the better—and I am happy to note that the Presi-

dent seems to feel the same way. Let me refer specifically to his Manpower Revenue Sharing bill, which I trust the Congress will consider fully in this session. One of the simple, but logical, features of this bill is to give revenue sharing funds directly to both State governments and local jurisdictions, according to simple published formulas, without the complications of "pass-through" devices, comprehensive State plans, new organizations in the State governments, or approval of local plans by the Federal Government. In this way, the principle that government should be returned to the people is followed in State and local relations as well as in national and State relations.

Both State governments and local jurisdictions are required, however, to publish their annual plans 2 months in advance. Then the State has 1 month in which to comment on each local plan, and each local jurisdiction has 1 month in which to comment on the State plan. I think this is a sensible, realistic way of encouraging coordination without encouraging the growth of excessive red-tape.

This example is typical of the approach in this bill. I think it would be instructive for each of us to study this bill carefully and consider the ways in which it contrasts with much of the legislation now on the books.

I, for one, am grateful to the President for showing that far-reaching legislation can still be written in a few simple pages, and that power can flow back to the people again—if we in this Congress are equal to the moment.

ALASKA PIPELINE QUESTIONS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the Gardner, Mass., News recently had one of its characteristically perceptive editorials on the Alaska pipeline question.

I am happy to include this editorial in the RECORD as a balanced presentation of a very complex subject.

At the same time I am happy to pay tribute to the Gardner News, a daily which under the able leadership of the Bell Family, has served the greater Gardner community for all of the 70 years of this century.

The editorial follows:

ALASKA PIPELINE QUESTIONS

A short time ago a Department of Interior report cited numerous reasons for not installing the proposed trans-Alaska hot oil pipeline, but then came down in favor of it on the grounds of overriding national need for the oil. This appeared to all but deliver the coup de grace to the efforts of conservationists and others to halt the project at least pending more study of alternatives.

Hope is not quite gone, however. Hearings in Washington and in Alaska offer one last chance to make a case against the pipeline persuasive enough to overcome the momentum generated by powerful oil interests—

interests so confident that pipe already is stacked across the tundra awaiting the green light.

Another encouraging note has been sounded by Russell Train, chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality. He said in a televised interview on the eve of the Washington hearings that the agency he heads is "not satisfied completely" with the justification for the pipeline.

"Before we go ahead with the pipeline," Train said, "I think we must be satisfied that pipeline represents the best alternative available to us." This is the nub of the matter. Few would maintain that the Alaska oil reserves should simply be abandoned; that would be folly, in a society that depends so heavily on oil. Other methods of transporting the oil are potentially feasible, and ought to be thoroughly investigated—not merely by the oil companies, which necessarily are more concerned about profit than environmental questions, but by such ecological expertise as the government can command.

Even the federal report opting for the pipeline noted its many-faceted threat to the ecological balance in a large slice of Alaska. Unanswered questions about possible alternatives should be carefully gone into before the oil companies are given the final go-ahead.

HERE, SIR, THE PEOPLE GOVERN

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, that which we all knew could happen did happen last week when the Capitol Building of the United States was desecrated by a tremendous bomb blast at 1:32 a.m. on March 1. The indignation, the outrage, that I feel for this tragic act is not that of a Member of Congress apprehensive of any special danger but rather that of an individual citizen of the United States realizing the proportion to which disregard for authority and lawful processes of Government has risen.

In describing the position of the Congress and particularly the House of Representatives to the New York State Convention on the adoption of the Constitution of 1788, Alexander Hamilton said, "Here, sir, the people govern." In all its imperfections—compromising, slow moving, sometimes tedious—the Congress is fairly representative of the people of America, and generally the end product of its work should be the composite will of the American people. The Capitol itself is both a workplace and a national symbol of the institution. It belongs to all of the citizens of the United States, past, present, and future; we who are privileged to labor here for a time as elected Representatives have no proprietary interest other than as ordinary citizens of the Republic.

Whether by derangement of mind and purpose or by design, those who perpetrated this act have committed a grievous crime against our society. If possible, it is even more reprehensible coming as it did during the week that the House passed the bill raising the public debt limit of

our Nation to \$430 billion. The enormous debt was largely incurred by a nation caring for its own and at the same time trying to be a good neighbor to the rest of the world.

Those who would damage the Capitol deny both the attempts which have been made to improve mankind under this roof and the system of government under which those attempts have been made. No honest man contends that the system is flawless; but no rational man could argue either that it has not dreamed of great achievements and often implemented them.

In a speech to Parliament shortly after World War II, Winston Churchill said:

Many forms of Government have been tried, and will be tried in this world of sin and woe . . . No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed it has been said that democracy is the worst form of Government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, if we really believe that our system is worthy of saving, it is becoming increasingly apparent that more must be done by all Americans if we are to preserve it for our children and grandchildren.

I believe it is not enough to merely tighten security in our Capitol—though this must and will be done. Nor is it enough to insure continued free access by all Americans to these Halls—though this too must be accomplished. What is needed is a reawakening of the old virtues of America—the belief in ourselves and in each other which has been our crowning virtue in times past and seems so desperately lacking throughout our country. Those who through violence, would cripple this free system should be met by an America determined to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

In those famous words spoken at Gettysburg over a century ago:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

THE REVEREND AND MRS. DURANT

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Marion A. DuRant is leaving the pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church in Marianna, Fla.

For 29 years he has been the spiritual leader of this congregation and has watched the church grow and prosper. But more important, the Reverend and Mrs. DuRant have been leaders in their community and an inspiration to all who know them.

My wife and I attended his church and his example and kindness have been a particular source of comfort to me in many hours of trial.

His has been a life of service—dedication—devotion.

Some men cross the paths of others and inspire them. This is the tribute that I would pay to this devoted couple.

In that regard, I would have to have reprinted on these pages the resolution which was adopted by the Jackson County Ministerial Association as a testimonial of the esteem that all of us have for the DuRants:

RESOLUTION HONORS REV. AND MRS.
DURANT

Whereas, the Rev. Marion A. DuRant has retired from the pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church, Marianna, Florida, after 29 years of faithful and effective service, during which time the church grew in membership from 107 to 373, and

Whereas, he has served for 46 years in the ministry, and

Whereas, he has served as president and held other offices in the Jackson County Ministerial Association, and

Whereas, he has served as Moderator of the Presbytery of Florida and Moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of Florida, and

Whereas, he has been a member of the Marianna Welfare Board, president of Marianna Rotary Club and president of Jackson County Conservation Club, and

Whereas, he has been called to serve as interim pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Thornwell Orphanage, Clinton, South Carolina,

Be it resolved, that the Jackson County Ministerial Association extend to Brother and Mrs. DuRant our sincere and earnest prayers, our Christian love and best wishes, and our hopes for an effective ministry as they go from our county to this new work.

PRIVATE POWER PRESENTS A
PARADOX IN MAINE

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the following feature appeared in the Portland, Maine, Press Herald of March 3 under the by-line of Frank Sleeper, our State's most impressive business columnist. The article is devoted to a curious contradiction which Maine private power companies have adopted of late with regard to the needs of the people of Maine and the cause of the environment. I believe that it will prove interesting reading for many of our colleagues:

LITTLE MAN IS PAYING THE BILL

November 30, the Public Utilities Commission granted Bangor Hydro-Electric Co. a fuel adjustment clause to let that company pass along to its customers the added cost of oil used at its generating stations.

Recently, Maine Public Service Co. applied for a similar increase.

In its annual report, Central Maine Power Co. hints that it will seek rate increases.

Great Northern Nekoosa Paper Co. attributes some layoffs at its Maine mills to the higher cost of fuel.

Thank you, conservationists and those opposing oil in the Maine Legislature.

The costs of conservation are now coming home to roost.

The private power companies of Maine present a paradox and a puzzle in all this.

The fight for an oil moratorium on the

Maine coast is being led by State Sen. Richard Berry, R-Cape Elizabeth, the president of Rangeley Power Co.

Yet, the presidents of all three large Maine private power companies assured this writer about half a year ago that they favored an oil refinery being built in Maine. They wanted the cheaper fuel which would result and might have not only allowed them to keep power rates stable but even might have let them drop those rates.

Power company people aren't running around explaining this apparent contradiction. Here's one try at an explanation.

The power people in Maine can't at this juncture, come out in opposition to the conservationists. They even feel they have to lead the conservationists as Sen. Berry is doing right now.

The reason—the power companies don't want the conservationists to raise a rumpus about Maine Yankee Atomic Power Co., about the nuclear power plant that's being built in Wiscasset.

There are other benefits for the companies. They can blame (and probably justly) any rate increases in the near future on the rising price of oil fuel. With others to blame, the power companies won't have to bear the brunt of public disfavor which would drive them farther down on the public opinions polls in Maine. Several times polls made by candidates in this state showed the power companies as the most unpopular of all businesses here—and a good subject to take off against if you wanted to get votes.

If they get along well with the conservationists on Maine Yankee, other nuclear power plants may eventually rise in Maine. And there would be no trouble with conservationists over hydro projects—such as the proposed peaking power project just off the Kennebec River. The power companies, keeping the conservationists as allies, could get them to continue their opposition to the Dickey-Lincoln public power project.

The benefits outweigh the costs, by far. One of the costs may well be an oil refinery on the Maine coast and lower fuel costs for Maine. The power companies may want such a refinery but not enough to break their alliance with the conservationists. That alliance has been built up over many years. Rod and gun club meetings for years have received benefits from Central Maine Power Co. I've talked to fishermen who swear by CMP in spite of the dams that company has built. I've been to rifle club meetings where the hall was donated by CMP. There was method in this. The power company wanted the fish and gun men to be under obligation to them when they wanted to put in a major hydro project on a Maine river. When that happened, CMP collected the IOU's in silence from the fish and game clubs. This is what is going on now with the conservationists. Remember, power companies supply electricity to summer homes just as they do to industry.

Oil prices will continue to go up. The settlements on increased prices in the Middle East guarantee that. The small Maine consumer will be hit as he already has in the coming higher power bills.

He'll be hit again and again by higher home heating fuel costs. A way out of this is provided by a refinery on the Maine coast. The Maine legislature is actively fighting that solution to high fuel costs.

It's clear that the establishment—both in Maine and outside this state—has taken over the fight to preserve the Maine coast against oil. Note the makeup of the board of directors of CRAC (Coastal Resources Action Committee). It's an elite board. Note the votes in the legislature on conservation. Many are nearly unanimous.

The little guy, most hit by the increases in power and heating fuel bills, is overlooked.

He's the same little guy who probably makes the least use of the Maine coast.

Extremes in conservation, like anything else, are bad. In this case, it's the little man who is being hurt.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The first prize is a \$10,000 scholarship, second prize is \$5,000, third prize is \$3,500, fourth prize is \$2,500, and the fifth prize is \$1,500.

The contest theme was "Freedom—Our Heritage."

Mr. Speaker, I am happy and proud to announce that the contest winner for the great State of Minnesota is Miss Candace Fier, a 19-year-old lass from Ivanhoe in my Sixth Congressional District.

Candace plans to enter the medical or health field as a career. She has been secretary of the student council, editor of her school paper, and business manager of the school magazine subscription drive.

She received an A rating in the district speech contest, an A rating for flute trio in the regional music contest, was chosen to represent her high school at Minnesota Girls' State, lettered in band and chorus and was awarded two bowling trophies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time the winning entry, the Minnesota first place winner in the Voice of Democracy Contest, "Freedom—Our Heritage" by Miss Candace Fier, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Fier, of Ivanhoe, and I extend my most sincere congratulations to the winner.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

Headlines: "Riots Disrupt Campus for Third Day," "Bomb Explodes Killing Ten," "Peace in the Middle East Elusive Dream." There is much in our world today that is disturbing and disruptive. There are many conditions that men are striving to change. But how do we, or how should we strive for change?

Many people seem to have varying views. Some favor violent means of protest such as bombing, burning, and destruction of property, while others use democratic and peaceful means.

Freedom is an age-old thing based on understanding; an understanding between people and their ideas. This understanding must be one and the same for all ages and all ideas.

We in the United States live in a nation founded on relative rights and freedoms. By relative, I mean your rights as an individual in so far as they do not infringe upon the rights of your fellow man. Because of this fact, our nation is comprised of many different kinds of people. We have left wing

and right wing, radical and conformist, apathetical and extremely patriotic people.

The fact that we do live in a democracy makes it mandatory that we live in contact with people who through their beliefs threaten to tear down our free system.

So whether a person is left wing, right wing, or believes in our democratic system, he is free to live in our society and take advantage of all the freedoms it offers. Because of this fact, we must be constantly on guard against the destruction that is brought about by these people who are fighting against our freedom. And we must listen more closely to those that fight to strengthen freedom. We can do this by strictly enforcing the laws that structure our society and protect us against those that are striving to destroy us from within.

More and more each day this seems to be coming evident in the upcoming generations. Today, one half the total population is under 21 years of age. We young people are trying to direct the country's attention to the fact that we are distressed and disillusioned by conditions in our land—conditions such as poverty, racism, fraud, hypocrisy, and militarism. We firmly believe that only by facing, understanding, and trying to cope with these problems does hope reside for our country.

Stemming from this mixture of people and these relative freedoms come the demonstrations of freedom of speech and dissent. Because of our relative freedom of speech and dissent, we are able to assemble and march, to rally with people free to express their views and ideas to those that will listen and understand. We must listen and try to understand, but are we? Have we, in the United States, really been listening? I think not, when it becomes evident that we have headline stealers who bomb, burn, and destroy just so we will listen.

Freedom, as all things, has extremes. We here in the United States, have a heritage, a birthright, of relative freedoms. But as we take our relative freedoms of speech and dissent, and in the process bomb and destroy human life as well as property, are we still taking relative freedom, or have we gone to the extreme and taken absolute freedom? Absolute freedom means we have no respect for our fellow man's freedom, only our own. It is when we think only in terms of ourselves and not how something may limit another man.

Prince Charles, 22-year-old heir to the British throne, has been quoted as saying:

"Sad as it may seem, we do not live on a desert island where complete freedom may be thought to exist."

No, for if we do not strive for a better understanding among people to facilitate our relative, not absolute freedom, we will not survive. For if we cannot, in our free country, solve our problems, dissent will reign and a totalitarian government such as Russia will be happy to step in and solve our problems for us.

For yes, freedom is our heritage, our birthright, but we can throw it away, or we can fight through understanding to keep it. It is our freedom to choose.

We live in a large complex society where reasoning, understanding, and above all listening, are very important in making our plan of action, our choice of freedom.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

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

CXVII—339—Part 4

"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?

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, over 400,000 students participated in the Voice of Democracy essay contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxilliary.

I take pride in saying that the winner in the State of Illinois is from my congressional district. Her name is Melissa Jo Bailey, of Kankakee. She is a student at Eastridge High School. I am sure I speak for all the people of my district in extending to her our congratulations.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD her prize winning essay, entitled "Freedom—Our Heritage."

I include the material as follows:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

Freedom—our heritage—my heritage and your heritage.

As a member of the "tell it like it is" generation the words "freedom" and "heritage" are sometimes forgotten in the noise of the crowd.

It is difficult to convey my feelings. If I were a parent today, these are the thoughts I would leave with my child:

Dear Johnny, Bobby, Susie, Mary (or whatever your name may be) —

I believe that you should know right from the beginning that in which I believe very deeply.

I hope that you grow up believing in America as I do. I want you to be different and to talk openly of your love of God and country; not hide behind petty politics and crumbling convictions. You should stand firm for the things in which you believe but respect the rights of others to disagree with you. I'd like you to be the kind of person who is a real honest-to-God, flag-waving patriot, who, if you touch march, will tell people what you are marching for—not against. You're not aware of this but just a few months ago in Russia a group of students were protesting the arrest of a small band of scientists. As their punishment they were sentenced, without trial, to 20 years in Siberia in a concentration camp at hard labor.

But that was Russia and this is the United States.

Not long ago I heard some lyrics of a familiar song, which started me thinking of America and our heritage. The words went something like this:

Freedom isn't free,
Freedom isn't free,
You've got to pay the price,
You've got to sacrifice
For your liberty.

These are just words to a song and you don't know the meaning of it yet. But you will someday. Just like we the people of the United States know of the price we have had to pay, or do we?

You will learn in your history class some-

day that our system of freedom began when 56 men affixed their signatures to the Declaration of Independence. The idea of freedom began centuries before that with the hopes and dreams of man since the first day he was set on earth.

Your ancestors have had this freedom in their blood since the beginning of time and have tried to preserve it through the ages. Naturally there has been blood shed, generations of it and each generation fights harder than the previous because of the increasing difficulty to keep this freedom. Your great-great grandfather, great grandfather, and grandfather were not just fighting for a dream of their own—but for an ideal for future generations.

The idea of freedom is what the young dissenters of today find so hard to accept. They are constantly protesting our involvement in foreign nations. But do these radicals realize that we are fighting to protect for these nations what we ourselves not too long ago were fighting for. The right for their natural God-given freedom. These young people condemn our system of government and so-called tyrannical establishment. But what gives them the right to express their grievances and objections? The very same government they are condemning.

As you grow older be proud of your country. Don't ever be ashamed of the mist in your eyes or the lump in your throat when you look at the Stars and Stripes or hear the Star-Spangled Banner being played. Be just a little humble because your grandfather and great-grandfather, and yes, maybe by that time, your father and millions like him paid a high price for the freedom you enjoy.

I want you to always be proud of your name and origin and keep your morals and ideals high. I expect you to face fear, disappointment and indecision—but just remember—that because of the heritage being passed to you, you can become a carpenter, a salesman, or president of the United States. It's your choice!

You are, and will be, enjoying the country in which your ancestors believed and fought so hard to protect. One of the signers of the Declaration of Independence when told that the war for freedom was ended said, "But the fight for liberty has just begun:

Be proud, my child, for you do have a great heritage.

FIGHTING OVER FILIBUSTERS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a succinct editorial titled "Fighting Over Filibusters" appeared in the February 27, 1971, edition of the Charleston Evening Post newspaper in Charleston, S.C.

This editorial makes several excellent points in reference to the current debate about changing the rules of the Senate.

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

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

FIGHTING OVER FILIBUSTERS

Twice in the month liberals in the U.S. Senate have been thwarted in their attempt to modify rules governing extended debate. More precisely, they have been unable to muster enough votes to choke off a filibuster

against making it easier to choke off a filibuster.

It is just as well.

The reformers are out to change the Senate rule which requires a two-thirds majority vote to end debate. They want to reduce the margin to three-fifths. Thus far they have been defeated by Southern-led conservatives who have been talking against change.

Attempting to weaken the filibuster as an accepted parliamentary instrument, opponents are saying it is undemocratic, that it permits a minority to stymie the will of the majority. The argument is baseless. The Senate can cut off extended debate anytime it wants simply by voting cloture.

Existing rules governing the filibuster are, rather, part of the prized system of checks and balances. Filibusters can serve to focus the attention of the Senate and the public on hasty or ill-conceived legislation. They can give the people time to let their senators know their feelings on controversial bills. Further, in necessitating more than just a simple majority to override opposition, they help assure passage of laws which express the will of a substantial majority of the Senate—and presumably of the citizens back home.

Liberals in the Senate and out charge that filibusters are used most by Southerners, in concert with a few Republican conservatives, to block civil rights measures. They conveniently neglect to mention the times they themselves have resorted to filibustering.

On Tuesday the anti-filibuster forces will have another go at it. We see no reason to wish them well.

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) duPONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. duPONT. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join with my colleagues in sponsoring House Joint Resolution 16, which authorizes the President to designate the period beginning March 21, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

For too long the American public has remained largely unaware and uninformed about the plight of those brave fighting men who are still fighting a very lonely, grim battle of their own.

I hope that a week of concern will focus attention on this atrocious treatment of our men by the North Vietnamese, and that the American people will mount a loud and indignant protest against Hanoi.

I include the text of this resolution in the RECORD at this point to remind all citizens that we all must take part in bringing world criticism down on the North Vietnamese for their atrocious acts, which are in clear violation of the Geneva Convention.

Text of resolution follows:

H.J. Res. 16

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to demonstrate our support and concern for the more than one thousand five hundred American listed

as prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia, and to forcefully register our protest over the inhumane treatment these men are receiving at the hands of the North Vietnamese, in violation of the Geneva Convention, the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning March 21, 1971, and ending March 27, 1971 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action", calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

PROTECTION OF AMERICAN WAR PRISONERS

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the condition and prospects of our American war prisoners being held by the North Vietnamese is a matter of growing concern at all levels of our society. That concern was voiced again in strong official terms last week by the State Senate of West Virginia with the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 24 introduced by State Senators Leonard and Sharpe.

Official action of this kind of a State deliberative body underscores the very heavy trend of public interest in this question and the need for maximum attention to its solution. The following text of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 24 of the West Virginia State Senate reminds us again of the growing public and official interest:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 24

Expressing concern and sympathy to the families of West Virginians, and to the families of all Americans, held as prisoners of war in Southeast Asia

Whereas, All captured American personnel held in Southeast Asia suffer privation and hardship; and

Whereas, Prisoners held in North Vietnam are existing under particularly harsh circumstances; and

Whereas, Many of these prisoners are confined in a primitive jungle environment in Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia; and

Whereas, These prisoners are primarily members of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps; and

Whereas, These prisoners include American civilians; and

Whereas, The enemy's refusal to acknowledge publicly the presence of all prisoners in these areas, and the enemy's refusal to permit certain prisoners to correspond with their families, have increased the burden of anxiety and concern on the families of prisoners of war; and

Whereas, The government of West Virginia and the government of the United States are concerned with continuing efforts to bring national and world public opinion to bear in securing humane treatment for, and the release of, our beloved sons of West Virginia, and all captured American personnel; and

Whereas, The National League of Families of American Prisoners Missing in Southeast Asia, recognizes that the Prisoner of War issue is not a political issue, but is a humanitarian issue; and

Whereas, The West Virginia State Coordi-

nator of the National League of Families of American Prisoners Missing in Southeast Asia has received permission from a few families to furnish names of certain West Virginians who are prisoners of war; and

Whereas, Lieutenant Commander William Hardman, U.S. Navy, son of Mrs. Sadie M. Thompkins, St. Albans, West Virginia; Major Glenn H. Wilson, U.S. Air Force, son of Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Wilson, St. Albans, West Virginia; and Major Hubert Kelley Flesher, U.S. Air Force, nephew of Mrs. Charles Carson, Jane Lew, West Virginia are prisoners in Hanoi; and

Whereas, Sergeant Albert H. Altizer, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth W. Altizer, Squire, West Virginia, and Chief Warrant Officer Joseph A. Rose, U.S. Army, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Rose, Morgantown, West Virginia, are believed to be prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas, There are more than fifteen hundred Americans known to be missing or prisoners; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia:

That the members of the Senate express their deep concern and sympathy for the families of all West Virginians held by hostile forces in Southeast Asia; and, be it

Resolved further, That the members of the Senate express their deep concern and sympathy for the families of all Americans held by hostile forces in Southeast Asia; and, be it

Resolved further, That the members of the Senate are mindful of the sacrifice of West Virginians and many Americans who have given their lives in the Vietnam War, and that the Senate of West Virginia expresses sympathy to the families of those who will not return, and, be it

Resolved further, That the Senate of West Virginia urges humane treatment for, communication with, and the release of, all prisoners of war; and, be it

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the Senate is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the families of the West Virginians named herein who are prisoners of war or who are known to be missing and to The Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, Washington, D.C.; The Honorable Ton Duc Thang, President, Democratic Republic of North Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam; The Honorable David K. E. Bruce, U.S. Delegation to the Paris Meeting, U.S. Embassy, 2 Avenue Gabriel, Paris, France; Minister Xuan Thuy, 8 Avenue General Le Clerc, 94 Choisy-Le-Roi, Paris, France; Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, 39 Avenue Georges Mandell, Paris 16, France; and Mrs. Bobby G. Vinson, National Coordinator, National League of Families of American Prisoners Missing in Southeast Asia, 1 Constitution Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C.

AEROSPACE INDUSTRY LOSES A LEADER—GEORGE H. STONER

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the aerospace industry of America has lost one of its leaders, George H. Stoner, who was senior vice president—operations, the Boeing Co.

Mr. Stoner joined the Boeing Co. as a 24-year-old engineer and later helped develop and manager major missile and

space programs. He was responsible for Boeing's engineering and manufacturing operations as well as corporate planning and corporate offices outside Seattle. His accomplishments over the years are a testimonial to his talents. One of his major contributions to our Nation's defense was the B-47, the first Boeing multijet bomber.

In 1950, Mr. Stoner was appointed assistant project engineer on the Bomarc pilotless interceptor, frequently called one of the most difficult programs in Boeing's history. He was responsible for design and development testing of Bomarc's guidance and control system.

And, in 1961, Mr. Stoner led Boeing's winning proposal to build first stages for Saturn V rockets which have been so successful in our moon missions.

Mr. Speaker, a giant of our vital aerospace industry is gone, but his contributions will be with all generations of the future.

MANPOWER REVENUE SHARING ACT

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my other colleagues in endorsing the new Manpower Revenue Sharing Act proposed by the President.

During the last 9 years we have witnessed a continual growth of manpower training programs—one stacked upon another—each one of which was directed to a specific group of individuals.

Many times, too numerous to mention, it was found that the States and their local units of government—the cities and counties—could not use the funds allocated to one program, while, at the same time, they were in need of additional funds to administer another program for which there were insufficient moneys as all had been used. There were provisions, of course, for the reallocation of unused funds—but this required action from Washington and we all know the additional time this consumes.

With the enactment of this legislation, such restrictions will not be encountered.

The States will be allocated specific amounts of manpower funds, to be used for manpower training and manpower related services—even to the extent of underwriting jobs in public service employment in Federal, State, and local governmental units.

This same opportunity will be available for city and local government units as certain amounts of money will be allocated to them—using the State apportionment formula—to train or hire, or both, some of their residents who are unemployed or underemployed.

The decision of what to do—and how to do it—when it comes to helping their constituency secure adequate training, either institutional or occupational, will

be made by the proper elected officials—mayor or Governor. They are close to the people and they know better what they need.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation which brings Washington—and its programs—home to our people.

CONTEMPT POWER: PREVENTION, NOT RESTRICTION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the issue of media coverage of congressional hearings is very much in the forefront and the following article by Prof. Paul Freund on the contempt power and the need for further education of all citizens as to the laws of our courts is valuable. The theory Professor Freund advances is that while exclusion of television from the courtroom meets with his general approval, the use of television at a trial for documentary purposes, not for the broadcast of live news, but as an educational experiment would meet with his approval. We might be well advised to consider similar experimentation with congressional hearings and committee markup sessions.

The article follows:

CONTEMPT POWER: PREVENTION, NOT RETRIBUTION

(By Professor Paul Freund)

The problem of controlling courtroom disorder depends on both judge and counsel. The main reliance of the judge must be on his moral authority, compounded of austerity, balance, and comprehension.

Normally counsel can be relied upon to deter their clients from making a shambles out of the proceedings. But when counsel as well as clients regard the courtroom as an open forum for demonstrations, presumably addressed to a wider audience elsewhere, the system is put under an extraordinary strain.

To the argument that only by indulging counsel and client will defendants receive the representation to which they are entitled, Justice Jackson—himself a hard-hitting courtroom lawyer—has replied: "That such clients seem to have thought these tactics necessary is likely to contribute to the bar's reluctance to appear for them rather more than fear of contempt."¹

It may well be that we are experiencing a general revolt against authority that history will see as a secular Reformation, with the most militant playing the role of the radical Anabaptists. But if so, the infantile regressive mode of expression by the vanguard is all the more unworthy of the cause. It has all the persuasive power of that classic line of Ring Lardner, "Shut up!" he explained.

The courts, in one way or another, will protect their own processes. As Justice Jackson said, courts "will not equate contempt with courage or insults with independence."²

It is ironic, and self-defeating, that the assault on authority should now focus on the courts, which have been the special shield of

the liberties of the dissident and despised. The contempt power itself has been a crucial instrument for enforcing civil rights.

One is reminded of the spectacle of Sir Thomas More's young friend William Roper, who is described in *A Man For All Seasons* as a youth with "an all-consuming rectitude which is his cross, his solace, and his hobby." He would, he exclaims, cut down every law in the land to get at the devil. And then, More asks, where would you hide, how could you stand upright against the winds that would blow through the void?

The judicial process, like the scientific process, can commit blunders, but each has its built-in correctives. If a jury convicts, an appeal can challenge the statute, the composition of the jury panel, the atmosphere permeating the trial, the sufficiency of the evidence, and the rulings of the trial judge.

Those who would transform the very nature of the process from a reasoned search for truth and justice to a trial by epithets and antics are committing the most grievous of offenses—a crime against intelligence.

The right blend of firmness and forbearance, of respect for the dignity of one's office and for the humanity of its contemnors is as difficult to achieve as it is universally moving when it occurs. For a century and a half Congress and the federal courts have been concerned with the proper use of the ancient Anglo-American judicial power to hold a recalcitrant person in contempt of court.

Three kinds of contumacious behavior have to be kept distinct.

One is *conduct disrespectful to a judge but not occurring in his presence*, such as a verbal attack in a newspaper. When a hypersensitive federal judge in the early 19th century committed an editor for contempt, an impeachment proceeding was brought against the judge, and although he was not convicted, Congress in 1831 enacted a law, which is still in force, severely limiting the contempt power in such cases.

An editor would be entitled to a jury trial on a charge of obstructing justice, and the guarantee of freedom of the press would give him large protection. The power of the judge acting alone was limited to cases of disobedience of an order of the court, or misbehavior in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice.³

In the second class of cases—*disobedience of an order*—Congress again intervened. This time it was not the press, but organized labor, that was aggrieved. Some federal judges were issuing injunction orders against strikers, often without a full hearing, and when the strikers were charged with violating the injunction by obstructing or damaging their employer's property they could be jailed by the judge for contempt.

The Clayton Act of 1914 reformed this bypassing of normal procedures by requiring a jury trial in such cases and limiting the maximum sentence (unless the suit for injunction was brought by the United States).⁴ Similar restrictions on the judge have been included in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1964.

All of this legislative activity left intact the judge's authority to deal with the final class of contempt—*misbehavior in the courtroom itself*. Here the need for summary power is clearest, in order to keep the pursuit of truth through the adversary process within tolerable bounds of reason and civility. Here, too, the facts about what actual misbehavior did occur are plainest.

Even in the case of courtroom misbehavior, however, there have been misgivings about the power of the judge alone to impose lengthy sentences of imprisonment. A majority of the Supreme Court in 1968 decided,

Footnotes at end of article.

for the first time, that a sentence of more than six months would require a jury trial,⁵ but whether this limit applies to the aggregate sentence or merely to the punishment for such separate act of obstruction remains to be decided.

Unless some latitude is allowed in the definition of separate offenses, a judge, who before the trial is over imposes a series of sentences aggregating six months upon a recalcitrant person, will have exhausted his power to deal with that person by further exercise of his authority during the remainder of the trial. The alternative of a jury trial for this class of cases is not entirely satisfactory, because of the awkwardness of reconstructing the setting through oral testimony addressed to a lay jury. It is assumed that the original trial jury would be disqualified to serve in the contempt case.

The option whether to pronounce sentence immediately upon the commission of an act of contempt or to await the ending of the trial is itself a decision of some moment. Immediate action may be imperative to protect the court or necessary to make credible the risk of penalty for contempt. Where these factors are not urgent, the judge may be well advised to wait, in order not to interrupt the trial unduly and not to act under the emotion of the moment.

But if the judge does wait, and if the contempt involved personal abuse directed at himself, the question arises: Should he refer the record to another judge for suitable action, in order to remove even the appearance of personal vindictiveness or wounded pride?

This course was in fact decreed by Chief Justice Taft, speaking for the Supreme Court in 1925. Taft pointed to the psychological dilemma facing the judge in the exercise of this "indispensable" but "delicate power":

"The judge must banish the slightest personal impulse to reprisal, but he should not bend backward and injure the authority of the court by too great leniency." In that situation the judge may refer the matter to a fellow judge "without flinching from his duty," and he was required to do so.⁶

Although in the later case of contempt involving the lawyers in the celebrated Communist trial of 1949 this procedure was urged by Justices Frankfurter, Black and Douglas, it was held not to be mandatory.⁷ It remains, however, at the very least a salutary device in the measured administration of justice.

Punishment for contempt is effective only if the threat of it serves as a deterrent to obstructive conduct. The power is used not for retribution but for prevention. Because some defendants may be prepared to risk the penalty, other measures may have to be brought to bear to neutralize their behavior in the interest of an orderly trial.

If the defendants are in custody, the proceedings may be suspended indefinitely, until they agree to speak only through their counsel or on the witness stand. This course is more suitable for pretrial hearings before the judge than for the main trial before a jury, since it might entail a new start for the trial and a newly impaneled jury.

But the defendants could hardly assert that they were being deprived of their right to a speedy trial, since the key to speedy resumption of trial would be held, so to speak, in their own pocket. This is, in substance, and can be best treated, in form, as an order of civil contempt.

May defendants by their disorderly conduct in the courtroom be held to forfeit their basic right to be present at their trial? This is a drastic forfeiture. Nevertheless the Supreme Court has given its approval to this sanction against courtroom disruptions, evidently finding it closer to the self-created loss of a speedy trial than to the case of an accused

who cannot be apprehended for trial.⁸ Although permissible, the sanction of continuing the trial without the presence of the defendant is plainly one not lightly to be employed.

Still more extraordinary, although also approved by the court, is the confinement of a defendant in a glass enclosure, perhaps with telephonic communication between him and counsel—the use of modern technology that would produce a disturbingly archaic atmosphere in the courtroom.

Thus, we face a time of crisis of confidence in our legal system. It is no great consolation to recognize that a similar crisis besets our other ancient institutions of authority—the churches and the universities. Nor is it much comfort to reflect that the phenomenon is not merely national; it is worldwide, or at least it is endemic in the more industrialized countries of the world.

Though these facts are not a comfort, they are a *caution* against any purely parochial or one-dimensional view of the crisis. As lawyers we know that causation, like truth, is rarely pure and never simple. No doubt the crisis is fed by such elements in our culture as permissiveness, affluence, boredom, the Indochina war, the problems of race, the migration to the overcrowded and impersonal cities—every citizen has his own favorite cause, and these are just a few.

But the global nature of the crisis leads me to seek out a more general explanation, to which these others may well be tributary, and I find this above all in the gap that exists between the technological capacity and moral promise of our society on the one hand and the actuality of our achievement on the other.

What does all this imply for lawyers individually and in convention assembled? To meet the crisis of confidence is an urgent task. I would suggest three ways by which in combination this might be done: *expiation, mediation, and education.*

Expiation: The first requisite for gaining and holding respect is to deserve it. Still unfinished business for law since Magna Carta is King John's pledge: To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay right and justice.

No longer is the problem simply or primarily corruption or wilful injustice; rather it is the inherent injustice of heavy costs and long delays, a problem attacked with increasing concern in recent years, through support of legal assistance programs, group legal practice, and administrative reforms in our courts.

The ordinary citizen—and I do not think the justices would disagree—judges law less by the pronouncements of the Supreme Court, vital as these are in setting standards and a tone for the whole country, than by what he sees of local courthouses, lawyers' offices, legal aid bureaus, prisons and probation services.

Not only the procedures but the substance of law must meet the demands of rising expectations. Justice, we would agree, is the giving to every person his due, measured by merit or achievement or need or his equal worth as a human being. Sometimes merit and achievement have served as standards of measurement that perpetuate an initial injustice, so that the system of justice itself becomes a closed circle. The critics, focusing on these instances, would explode the whole system, while the standpatters are lost in admiration of the comfort and abstract symmetry of the circle.

Put in this way, the description leads to the second recourse of lawyers: *mediation.* Our whole perspective and experience leads us to see civilization as a tension between continuity and change, between heritage and heresy, atrophy and anarchy.

Because we regard ourselves as having clients rather than being somebody's lawyer,

because our detachment gives us a longer-range view than the immediate contestants may have of their self-interest, because we are accustomed to cushioning the overly enthusiastic client against the shock of disappointment, and prodding the overly complacent against the dangers of lethargy, because we are used to interpreting to each adversary the point of view of the other, we are in an especially favorable position to mediate sympathetically the claims of constancy and reform.

This position is no longer a luxury, it is a pressing necessity, and the councils of this Association provide a beckoning opportunity to help construct an order that is stable while it is in motion.

There is, finally, besides expiation and mediation, the avenue of *education.* There is an immense fascination with law on the part of the layman, but in fact he generally sees law in its least appealing aspects, or he appreciates it as a spectacle where a crime is solved in the courtroom by suddenly breaking down a guilty witness at invariably two and a half minutes before the program ends. At its best the legal process can be a most moving and memorable experience, as we are assured by jurymen who have served in a well-tryed and scrupulously conducted case.

A few years ago, on a plane leaving London, I found myself seated next to a passenger who introduced himself as an emigre to England from Latvia. He spoke feelingly of a recent newspaper account of a trial in which the accused, when offered a chance to address the court before sentence, let loose a tirade of abuse on the judge. When the outburst subsided, the judge said that he would recess the case for 24 hours because he did not trust himself to pass sentence at that moment. My neighbor on the plane was deeply moved by this, "Where else in the world," he said, "could you find such justice?"

In fairness let me refer to an American experience many of my lay friends found similarly moving. An educational television network filmed a trial in Denver of a Black Panther leader on charges of resisting arrest, and broadcast the document in full, in four instalments, several months after the case was concluded—concluded incidentally, with a verdict of acquittal.

No one could witness that trial without a feeling of profound respect for the painstaking way in which the truth was searched for, for the ways whereby law copes with uncertainties and ambiguities through presumptions and burden of proof, and the sense of gravity with which judge and jury carried out their responsibilities.

I agree in general with the exclusion of television from the courtroom, for the familiar good reasons. And yet the use of television at a trial for documentary purposes, not for the broadcast of live news, and with the safeguards of completeness and consent, is an educational experiment that I would be prepared to welcome. Properly safeguarded and with suitable commentary, the depiction of an actual trial is an agency of enlightenment that could have few equals in its impact on the public understanding.

Understanding of our legal process, so rarely provided by our educational system, is now a desperate need.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Sachar v. United States*, 343 U.S. 1, 13.

² *Ibid.*

³ See *Nye v. United States*, 313 U.S. 33.

⁴ See *Michaelson v. United States ex. rel. Chicago, S.T.P., etc. Ry.*, 266 U.S. 42.

⁵ *Bloom v. Illinois*, 391 U.S. 194; cf. *Frank v. United States*, 395 U.S. 147 (1969).

⁶ *Cooke v. United States*, 287 U.S. 517.

⁷ *Sachar v. United States*, supra note 1.

⁸ *Illinois v. Allen*, decided March 31, 1970.

BILL SCOTT REPORTS

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have sent a monthly newsletter to my constituents in the Eighth District of Virginia, and I would like to insert the March issue in the RECORD at this point for the information of the membership:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN BILL SCOTT REPORTS
CONGRESS ORGANIZES

Much criticism has been levied at the seniority system but it still exists in large measure. Primarily because of this, I chose to remain on the Committee on Veterans Affairs where I rank fourth among the 11 Republicans and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on which I rank fifth. These two committees will hold their initial meetings to adopt rules and organize within the next few days. However, the House, in each instance, has re-named the same Chairmen who headed the Committees in the 91st Congress. The 92nd Congress convened on January 21, a bit later than usual, and members have spent much of their time since then in organizing the House, introducing bills and hearing Administration proposals. There are 53 House members serving their first terms and two vacancies among the membership.

REDISTRICTING

The State Legislature has reapportioned Congressional seats as well as those of the General Assembly. The reapportionment places my home just a hundred yards across the boundary line into the new 10th Congressional District, but you should know that I will continue to represent the 8th District as it existed prior to the passage of this act until noon, January 3, 1973, and hope you will continue to call on me whenever I can be of assistance. This new law is subject

to approval by the Attorney General under the Voting Rights Act, and apparently, its validity is being challenged in the courts. Among the alternatives open to me are the following: 1) to be a candidate for election to Congress from the 10th District now represented by another Congressman, 2) to be a candidate for re-election to the new 8th District since the law does not require a Congressman to be a resident of the District from which he is elected, 3) to move my home into the newly created 8th District in the event the validity of the reapportionment is upheld, 4) to be a candidate for election to the U.S. Senate, 5) to return to private practice of law. One of my sons was admitted to the Virginia Bar last year and the other will graduate from the University of Virginia Law School this year, so, we could have a family firm.

BUDGET SUBMITTED

The President's Budget released on January 29 was a surprise to most of the members of Congress since it contained a planned deficit. Mr. Nixon calls it a "Full Employment Budget". Simply stated, this means that the Federal Government will spend as much as if the tax system were collecting revenues under full employment conditions. He believes that by spending as if we had full employment will help bring about full employment. Budget receipts for the fiscal year beginning July 1 are estimated to be 217.6 billion dollars and the budget deficit for the year is estimated by the resident to be 11.6 billion dollars. Of course, this method of accounting includes trust funds not subject to appropriation by the Congress and which are earmarked to be spent only for a specific purpose such as Social Security and highway funds. Some fiscal experts believe that the budget deficit, exclusive of trust funds, may approach a 40 billion dollar mark if the budget proposals are carried out.

While most people are concerned with the present state of the economy, I have reservations about the deficit financing concept he has proposed. The Federal Reserve Board has attempted to increase the money supply by reducing interest rates and the President has

attempted to stabilize wages by suspending the operation of the Davis-Bacon Act which requires contractors working on Federal construction projects to pay certain prescribed wages. It is understood that almost one-third of all construction is done by various levels of government and it is hoped that the suspension of the law requiring the area wage rate to be followed in Federal construction will tend to halt the inflationary spiral. Of course, the backlog in the demand for new automobiles built up during the General Motors strike a few months ago should help stimulate the economy and if citizens gain an increased confidence in the future of the economy, the pump priming technique proposed by the President may not be necessary.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

A status symbol is an instrument you clash when you want someone to know you are there.—William Sansom.

COMMUTER TAX

The head of the District of Columbia government has indicated that principal revenue measures to be included in next year's D.C. budget will be a tax on all individual income earned in Washington and that the proposal has the support of the President. The Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee has been advised of my opposition to any form of income or payroll tax for non-residents and has indicated that he will do everything possible to prevent the passage of this legislation. I have also written to the President expressing the hope that contrary to Commissioner Washington's statement, the Administration will not support such a proposal. While this is the Federal capital and assistance in the cost of government must be given to local residents, it seems reasonable that the Federal contribution be paid from general funds rather than by a special levy on those who live in nearby Virginia and Maryland.

OPINION POLL

We received more than 30,000 responses to our recent questionnaire and the tabulated results are shown below in percentages:

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. To settle nationwide labor-management disputes, would you favor:			
a. Compulsory binding arbitration in lieu of right to strike	47	48	5
b. Compulsory binding arbitration only for industries affecting the public interest such as railroad and public utilities	67	30	3
c. Permit strikes in all industries after reasonable cooling off period and negotiation	36	56	8
d. Let labor and management settle all their differences without governmental restrictions	26	67	7
2. To strengthen the economy:			
a. The administration should urge labor and management to hold the line on wages and prices	88	9	3
b. The Government should put wage and price controls into effect	51	46	3
c. There should be no Government control of wages and prices	33	60	7
d. There should be a general cutback of Government spending	68	27	5
3. Should the development of the supersonic transport (SST):			
a. Be subsidized by Federal loans	40	53	7
b. Be subsidized through cooperative effort of private industry	72	22	6
c. Be left to development by other nations	36	56	8
4. Do you believe the busing of schoolchildren to obtain racial balance should:			
a. Be required by the Federal Government	12	85	3
b. Be determined by State and local governments	34	62	4
c. Be eliminated entirely	81	16	3
5. In Vietnam and Southeast Asia, do you:			
a. Support the President's method of terminating the war	80	18	2
b. Favor immediate unilateral withdrawal of all American troops	32	65	3
c. Favor escalating the war to obtain a military victory	25	68	7
6. Do you believe airline hijacking could be reduced by:			
a. International agreements for the return of hijackers	94	5	1
b. Strict examination of passengers and freight before departure	82	11	2
c. Armed guards on flights	74	23	3
d. Arming the crew	37	58	5
7. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas:			
a. Should be impeached	34	50	16
b. Should be left alone	44	44	12
c. Should be investigated and hearings had by a Congressional committee to determine whether impeachment is warranted	69	23	8
8. Selective Service laws should be amended:			
a. To abolish the draft and have all volunteers	46	49	5
b. To have universal military conscription for all males	61	34	5
c. Continue existing laws	48	47	5
9. In trade with other nations, do you believe this country should:			
a. Have no tariffs on imports	22	69	9
b. Have tariffs only to protect new industry	17	72	11
c. Have general tariffs to protect American industries	48	45	7
d. Establish reciprocal tariffs based upon those imposed on American imports by other countries	86	10	4
10. A national health program for all citizens:			
a. Should be established and operated solely by the Government	39	55	6
b. Should be established by the Government, but operated through private insurance and medical organizations	57	37	6
c. Should not be established	41	52	7

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Iowa we have an organization which has done a tremendous job of educating voters in Iowa, and contributing to their understanding of how our political system operates. I refer to the Iowa Center for Education in Politics headed by George B. Mather. One of the center's current projects is of special interest to me, since it deals with our new 18-year-old voters. It seeks to explore means by which political parties, schools, and Government officials can assist the new 18-year-old voters as they prepare to become active participants in our political process.

A recent story from the Cedar Rapids Gazette gives more details on the program:

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Dec. 24, 1970]

VOTE RULING TO ALTER EDUCATION

IOWA CITY.—The U.S. supreme court's ruling Monday to lower the voting age to 18 for federal offices will have a profound effect on teaching about politics in high schools and colleges, George B. Mather, director of Iowa Center for Education in Politics, said this week.

"Teaching objectives and methods will have to change radically to accord with this new reality," Mather said.

"It's a totally new ballgame."

The implications of a lower voting age were discussed at a Dec. 7 meeting of the advisory board of the Iowa Center for Education in Politics, Mather said. The board comprises representatives of the state's political parties and college teachers and administrators.

ICEP headquarters is on the campus of the University of Iowa. Mather is assistant to the U. of I. dean of extension and university services.

EXPAND PROGRAM

"We agreed that we should expand our program to include more activities for high school and junior college teachers and prospective teachers," he said.

In the past, one objective of ICEP was "to encourage college men and women to participate actively in the political party of their choice after graduation," he said.

"In view of this new reality, such an objective is fatuous.

"Voting and political participation now are an immediate anticipation for high school students; political action is a current activity for college students.

"We must work very hard to make sure that teaching approaches and methods adjust quickly enough to meet these new conditions."

New activities proposed at the ICEP meeting earlier in the month include expanded workshops on the legislative process. In the past such workshops were limited to college students and teachers, said Mather, but now high school teachers, and possibly students, will be invited to participate.

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS

Also, regional workshops for high school social studies teachers were proposed. Mather said the cooperation of the state department

of public instruction and the Iowa State Education Assn. will be solicited in these efforts.

"The emphasis in political education must be put on practical political participation, rather than on theoretical or idealistic considerations.

"Not that these matters are unimportant," Mather said. "Rather, we must concentrate on how our political system really operates, and how citizens can have an effective voice in what the system produces," he said.

Another implication of the court ruling on the lower voting age is that the Young Democratic and Young Republican organizations "now are superfluous," Mather said.

"On the other hand, the Teen Dem and Teen Age Republicans organizations will take on new meaning for the parties and their young members," he said.

PARTY PROBLEMS

"The parties have new problems of recruitment to face. They will have to find ways to involve these new voters in meaningful activities."

While the shift in voting age was anticipated, the changes in educational methods are not clear even now, he said.

"We reached no consensus at our Dec. 7 meeting. However, we agreed on the awesome problems of political education that remain to be solved and the great need for concerted action to try to solve them quickly."

The Iowa Center for Education in Politics is a cooperative effort of the state's political parties, colleges and universities to improve teaching about practical politics. Its action program is supported entirely by contributions from foundations, organizations and individuals.

LESSON OF A PERSONAL TRAGEDY

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and needless death of yet another teenager as a result of an overdose of drugs prompted the boy's grandfather to make an appeal to me to share with my colleagues his expression of concern about the nature and extent of the drug problem.

What follows is the letter from Mr. Richard F. Thornton, Linton, Ind., grandfather of the 17-year-old high school junior, and the statement made by the principal of the victim's school to the student body on the day of his funeral. I share them with you in the hope that those who still doubt the seriousness of this problem will learn something from this personal tragedy:

LINTON, IND.,
February 26, 1971.

HON. JOHN MYERS:

I am sending you a four page story written by the principal of a high school at Waterford, Michigan. The story is about my grandson and I'm hurt very badly.

I can't understand spending billions and billions of dollars on moon rockets and foreign aid and letting this drug racket ruin our country.

Dear Mr. Myers, I hope you will take this to

the floor of the Congress and get something done. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. THORNTON.

STATEMENT TO THE STUDENT BODY REGARDING THE DEATH OF RICK THORNTON

(By Howard R. Bennetts, assistant principal)

I have a story to tell—it is not fictitious—it is a true story which began here at Waterford-Kettering last Thursday, February 11, 1971. I have not been free to tell you this until this moment, and it is at the request of a boy's mother that I tell you now.

Last Thursday, one of our students, Rick Thornton, got up to get ready for school. He kidded with his mother who was busily getting breakfast of bacon and eggs—for Rick always ate a full breakfast. As she was preparing the meal, Rick called out he thought he had time for a shower—it was only 6:30. When breakfast was being served, his best friend came in and sat at the table while Rick finished eating. In kidding with his mother, he said, "I don't feel like going to school today." His mother responded by saying, "You had better be there unless you are sick. Don't you feel well?" Rick laughed it off, and the two boys left for school.

When they reached school, the two boys lingered in the main lobby and, eventually, decided to go through with their plans to skip school for the day. They were joined by another boy who agreed to go with them and provide his home as a place to stay. As they made their plans, Rick said he wanted to take a trip. His friend advised him against this, but Rick insisted on it. Rick went into the boys' lavatory in the main lobby and allegedly made a buy of LSD for \$2.00. Soon afterward, he took the pill, turned to his best friend and said, "So long, friend. See you later."

The three boys then left the school and walked toward a house in a nearby subdivision. While on the way, they stopped off at Huntoon Lake and sat on a raft there.

Meanwhile, back at the school, a student came in and said she wasn't feeling well and wanted to go home. A parent was called, but had no way to come to the school. Apparently, the student had thought of this, and she had brought a senior boy with her to provide the ride. This was agreeable with the parent. The boy loaded his car with skippers—seven in all—and proceeded to the home of the girl. As they passed Huntoon Lake, they spotted Rick and his friends; two of the boys got out of the car and went down to the raft. This increased the party at the raft to five.

From there, the boys proceeded to their destination. They sat around talking during the morning hours, but it was apparent that Rick was extremely ill. He complained that he thought he was going to swallow his tongue. One boy held on to his tongue while another went to get a glass of water. This did not seem to help. Rick thought the best thing to do was to go home and get his mother to take him to the hospital. The boys were worried whether Rick could make it on his own, but Rick insisted on going home alone. It is about a twenty minute walk down Airport Road. The boys gave Rick sufficient time to get there, then they began calling every ten minutes or so to see if he had made it. But there was no answer. The school also called about 11:00 to see why Rick's name was on the absence list, but there was no answer.

Apparently, finding no one at home, Rick went up to his room and lay on the bed. His mother later said there was an imprint on the bed. Rick's mother returned home from shopping to pick up some things, but immediately left again for her work, not realizing her son was on the bed upstairs. What hap-

pened then is simply guesswork. In that lonely hour, apparently the effects of the drug were so severe that Rick preferred death to enduring the hallucinations he was suffering. He descended from his room and picked a .22 calibre rifle from his dad's gun case, went out on the back patio, sat down, leaned his head against the barrel and pulled the trigger. This was about 12:30. Rick's father came home from work much later—about 4:30—entered the front door, turned on the TV, and proceeded to the refrigerator for a snack. As he looked out the kitchen window, he saw his son in the snow surrounded by blood. He went, and as he says, "Rick must have been dead for some time, the snow was melted all around him, and he was so cold."

Back at the house of his friend, one boy decided to return to school about 11:00. Two others returned later and caught the 2:30 bus home. One remained at the house. They found out that Rick Thornton had died when one of them called about 5:00 p.m.

On Friday, friends of Rick's reported to my office and told the story. It was heart-breaking, recounting the chain of events, errors in judgment, tragic mistakes made during those fateful hours. There was guilt expressed, there was anger expressed toward those who brought drugs into the school for distribution—not realizing the serious consequences of their acts.

I told the group that we were aware that a drop had been made about 7:35 in the parking lot, and that the police had been notified, that we were anxious about unusual behavior in the student body. But we had nothing concrete to go on. As I talked with students on Friday, they were anxious to prevent a recurrence of this kind, but still reluctant and afraid to supply details. The Narcotics Bureau of the State Police Department arrived at the school, as did the Waterford Police. Investigations were made.

I am not free to divulge the direction the police are taking, except to say that Rick's death is not fully attributed to the fact that he pulled the trigger of a rifle. His death was staged when he made a \$2.00 purchase in the boys' lavatory in the main lobby of our school; it was staged when some big-wheel supplier contacted students in our school to act as pushers.

Many of you know more of the story than I but are afraid. May I tell you this: when I talked with Rick's Mom and Dad yesterday, their only comfort now is that in Rick's death many other students will realize the seriousness of drug abuse and be willing to do something about it. We on the staff have long realized that there are drugs in the building, that many of you are using them, and that many of you need help. We have talked with you, we have counseled you, we have warned you, but we do not know if we are effective, apparently, we are not. We know that there are students who bring drugs into the building to make a fast buck. These persons are often suspected, but we do not have the proof to take action. Students simply will not talk. I plead with you now—tell us before others are also dead like Rick. Somewhere in this student body there must be those who have the courage to be heroes—and we need these heroes now. Let us not sit back under some fake code which tolerates and encourages the destruction of the lives of our friends. Let us not say Rick Thornton died for nothing.

Rick's funeral will take place at 1:00 today at the Faith Baptist Church on Airport Road. At that time I will come on the air and ask for a moment's silence in the memory of this happy-go-lucky, 17 year old boy who tragically died because he needed to do his thing and because there are those who would let him die.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMISSION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of the 92d Congress, I introduced legislation, H.R. 1209, which would establish a National Economic Conversion Commission in order to cushion the human and economic impact of ending the war, withdrawing the troops, and cutting back on military production.

I have asked for the views of business and government leaders on my proposal and am pleased to include these comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

Most recently, I have received a letter from W. M. Magruder in the Department of Transportation. He states that:

The proposed legislation could be a major step in helping bridge the gap between the defense-oriented economy and a civilian-oriented economy.

However, Mr. Magruder feels that the \$450 million which is authorized in H.R. 1209, may not be enough if we cut back our spending in scientific research and development. I, too, feel that the Government must stimulate or facilitate more ambitious programs in transportation, electronics, power generation, and the like to make up for the programs and cutbacks in the Defense Department and NASA.

Mr. Speaker, defense industries have been a great blessing to this country and they have contributed greatly to our success as a nation. We must keep this great resource of talent together by guiding them toward fields such as pollution control, housing, mass transportation, oceanography, and recreation.

The letter from Mr. Magruder follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, Washington, D.C., March 4, 1971.

Mr. CLIFTON MADISON, Legislative Assistant, Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MADISON: I appreciated very much and enjoyed the opportunity to discuss the SST program with you and Congressman Anderson on Thursday, 18 February.

We have reviewed the proposed legislation H.R. 1209 to "Establish a National Economic Conversion Commission" with interest and are very much encouraged to see the recognition of a serious problem and a proposal for a constructive interim solution. My staff and I are not qualified to objectively comment in detail on the proposed legislation due to our limited perspective. It does appear, however, that perhaps several times the total \$450 million requested may be required if programs like the SST are not continued and if the strong opponents to technology are successful in their efforts. For unless there are jobs for the people that would be retrained and unless there are healthy technology oriented industries, then the funds spent under H.R. 1209 could to a large extent be wasted. The Government must stimulate or facilitate more ambitious programs in transportation,

electronics, power generation and the like to make up for the programs and cutbacks in the Defense Department and NASA. There is considerable leverage that can be gained from R&D which is needed to maintain a constantly increasing standard of living and constantly improving quality of life. We believe that rather than attacking technology there should be constantly increasing support for technology for only through technology will solutions to many of our current problems be achieved.

In summary, we believe the proposed legislation could be a major step in helping bridge the gap between the defense oriented economy and a civilian oriented economy but must be related to a long range permanent solution.

Sincerely,

W. M. MAGRUDER, Director, SST Development.

THE MANPOWER REVENUE SHARING ACT

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act offers to our State and local governments, and to our people, a better means of solving our chronic unemployment problems.

We are all aware of the many unmet needs in our local communities and our cities. The schools, libraries, recreation facilities, police and fire departments, hospitals, day care centers, even the clerical divisions of these institutions and agencies; all of these lack sufficient personnel to conduct normal day-to-day activities.

Simultaneously, we see scores of unemployed people—from the school dropout to the highly skilled technician and professional man or woman—all unable to find employment due to a slowed economy, resulting from our war-to-peace transition.

The enactment of this legislation would contribute much toward solving the problems of our States and local communities.

With Manpower Revenue Sharing Act money, the cities and States could train—where necessary—and hire many of the unemployed of today. They could bring them on the payroll today; and over a 2-year period move them into regular public jobs.

If these jobseekers could become jobholders, not only could they provide the needed services in the community, but they also could regain their self-respect, support their families, contribute their share of the cost of State government and become an active member of the American economy. This, in turn, would decrease the need for so much State financial aid to the cities, thereby lightening the burdensome responsibilities now carried by the State.

I ask the support of all my colleagues in getting the bill enacted into law.

GOOD TIMES IN PEORIA

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. MICHEL, Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the Peoria Journal Star had an editorial which was of considerable interest to me, and I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues here in the House:

GOOD TIMES IN PEORIA

Peoria is in a unique position in regard to unemployment, judging from a nationwide analysis of the problem which was published last week in the Congressional Record.

The study lists the changes in unemployment figures between November 1969 and November 1970 in the 145 major labor markets where more than 3 per cent of work force was out of work.

And Peoria is the only one of the 145 cities where the unemployment declined!

In every other city on the list unemployment was rising—and rising dramatically in most cases.

Even though Peoria was bucking the trend, the improvement in Peoria taken by itself was not really significant—from 3.5 per cent in 1969 to 3.4 per cent in 1970.

But compared to most other cities where unemployment was jumping by several full percentage points—and often doubling—Peoria has really been sitting on top of the nation during this recession.

In six major cities, the unemployment rate in November rose to more than 10 per cent—a figure so high that Peorians will have to think back to the massive Caterpillar layoffs in 1957-58 to appreciate what it means.

And in every one of those six cities the increase must seem just about as catastrophic as the 1957-1958 lay-offs were in Peoria, because in every one of the cities the lay-offs came suddenly judging from the fact that 1969 unemployment in these cities was generally 5 per cent or less.

So things were bad in Wichita, Kansas; Seattle, Wash.; Flint, Mich.; Muskegon, Mich.; New Bedford, Mass.; and Waterbury, Conn.

And things weren't very good in Los Angeles (6.6 unemployed compared to 4.1 a year earlier) in New Orleans (6.2 compared to 4.5), in Lowell, Mass. (9.5 compared to 5.1), in New York City (4.4 compared to 3.3), in Detroit (7.3 compared to 3.1), and Chicago (3.7 compared to 2.7)—all big cities where such statistics translate into increasing thousands upon thousands of men and women without jobs.

Chicago's jobless level—like the level in Peoria and a few other midwestern cities—is not and has not been as high as the rates in many other parts of the nation which do not have strong comparatively stable employers.

Even so, Peoria stands much better off today than Chicago and most other metropolitan areas in the Midwest.

For instance, Rockford's rate rose from 3.4 to 5.5 in the period involved, Davenport-Rock Island-Moline rose from 4.3 to 5.7, St. Louis went from 3.4 to 5.6, Indianapolis from 2.5 to 4.8, Terre Haute from 2.6 to 5.1, Gary from 2.8 to 4.7, Cedar Rapids from 1.8 to 4.6, Louisville, from 2.8 to 4.3, Milwaukee from 2.9 to 4.9, Cleveland from 3.1 to 4.6, and Kansas City from 3.6 to 5.7.

Peoria with its 3.4 rate in November, 1970, was less than one full percentage point above the lowest November unemployment rate—2.5 in 1966—during the past decade. What

that means is that we in this area are not generally feeling the big impact of unemployment that is being felt elsewhere.

So there is something we in Peoria, Woodford, and Tazewell counties (the Peoria labor market area) can be thankful about in this period of general bad times.

But it's hard to be happy when we look at what seems to be happening almost everywhere else.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in discussing American agriculture, and the great progress made by the American farmer. Discussion of agricultural programs is of tremendous value, for in drawing farm problems to the attention of Congress and the urban population, we can implement progressive, positive, agricultural policies.

In the past decade, farm production has increased 6 percent, or approximately twice that of other industries. One American farmworker produces enough farm commodities for himself and 44 other Americans.

Still, there are many problems. Though farm income has increased, more and more rural residents are moving to the cities. Farmers are bound in the cost-price squeeze. Farmers face an ecological challenge. Foreign imports are increasing. Basic services such as health care are scarce or absent.

We must continue to provide incentives to keep young men on the farm. We must stimulate rural development and continue to develop a progressive land-use policy.

The administration has recognized many of the problems and has formulated policies to try to solve them. Revenue sharing can provide \$16.1 billion immediately for the decisionmaking centers in the States, cities, and rural communities to better meet the needs of rural inhabitants. In 1970, rural housing loan efforts increased 5 percent over 1969. In 1971, they increased another 88 percent to equal an annual amount of over \$1.4 billion. Other special revenue sharing benefits will help manpower development and training, education, transportation, and law enforcement.

Administration welfare proposals will help rural America by helping the working poor, many of whom are agricultural workers. The Nixon health proposals offer health education centers in medically underserved rural areas.

Congress, too, has recognized rural Americans' needs. Last year's farm bill benefited dairy farmers in Wisconsin and throughout the country. Dairy products owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation can be donated to veterans hospitals. Indemnity payments can be

paid to dairy farmers whose milk was condemned because of pesticides and residues. Dairymen's class I base plan in Federal milk market order areas has been extended in order to reduce dairy surpluses in areas of excess production and help stabilize income.

The farm bill also extends the National Wool Act through 1973, continues the food for peace program, and the cropland conversion and greenspan programs, and establishes an indemnity program to reimburse beekeepers for losses caused by pesticide residues.

In less than a month, the Secretary of Agriculture will announce the 1972 dairy price supports. I include in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin urging him to announce supports at 90 percent of parity:

FEBRUARY 24, 1971.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I respectfully urge you to raise dairy price supports to 90% of parity, or \$5.157 per cwt.

Additionally, I hope you will complete your review and announce your decision as soon as possible, and certainly well before the April 1 deadline, so that dairy farmers in Wisconsin, the nation's leading milk-producing state, as well as dairymen and processors throughout the United States can formulate their production program.

I need not remind you of the uncertainty facing the dairy industry. Suspension of the mandatory price support for butterfat for three years, cheese imports, and substantially higher costs for both production and processing have contributed to the uncertainty. Though milk production is up nationally, and up in the state of Wisconsin, the twelve North Central States as a unit, traditionally the major milk producers, showed a decrease.

Both the Congress and the President have indicated a strong commitment to the goal of adequate nutrition for all Americans. Milk is vital to this effort. Because there is a two to three year gap between the birth of a calf and its production of milk, the strong resolve of the Department of Agriculture and the Administration to continue to maintain a healthy and strong dairy industry must be shown now.

An increase in the dairy price support to 90% of parity is vital, and immediate announcement would be most helpful, to insure a productive and strong dairy industry ready to meet the needs of all Americans.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress.

Imports of foreign milk products continue to challenge our dairy industry. Though more needs to be done, quotas placed on four products have already been of some help; first, ice cream quotas have cut the import quantity 95 percent; second, chocolate crumb imports have been cut to less than one-third of last year's imports; third, animal feeds have been cut to one-half; and fourth, skim milk cheese has been reduced 8 percent.

The special milk program, overwhelmingly supported by the Congress, reaches one-third of our schoolchildren. Adequate amounts of protein in a child's diet are vital for proper mental and physical development. The special milk program

provides, in many cases, the only fluid milk disadvantaged children get. We must give this program top priority to assure adequate nutrition and development to all our children.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I do not become directly involved in most problems of agriculture. I do, however, deal directly with nutrition of our young, our poor, and our elderly.

The hungry people of this country cannot hope to get adequate nourishment or hope to get a minimum diet unless we have a prosperous and productive agriculture. It is basic to a healthy economy.

Our farmers cannot and must not be ignored. We have taken this segment of our population for granted too long. Their contribution to a sound economy, to an adequate food supply for all our needs, cannot be ignored. Their contribution deserves more recognition, attention, understanding, and action.

FARMERS' SHARE MIGHTY SLIM

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the *Worthington Daily Globe* in an editorial appearing on January 30 performed an excellent service in putting agriculture's share of the U.S. budget in proper perspective. As the editorial emphasizes, "Eliminating actual farm programs totally will scarcely shave a penny from a tax dollar." It is a story that needs telling more often, and I insert the entire editorial in the *RECORD* at this point:

FARMERS' SHARE OF TOTAL U.S. BUDGET

At this time of year, as Americans begin computing their income tax obligations simultaneous with the announcements of new state and national budgets, even small cuts in government spending can seem important. All across the predominantly urban nation expressions of resentment can be heard directed toward the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the federal agricultural budget. Efforts in the national press to "expose" and discredit agricultural appropriations seem sometimes to be a planned and coordinated campaign.

USDA appropriations are substantial, undeniably. For fiscal 1972 they will total \$9.5 billion, an increase of \$800 million above appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The agriculture budget should be considered in the context of the entire budget, however: \$9.5 billion out of \$229.2 billion. If the agriculture budget were eliminated entirely, and if this saving were passed intact to the taxpayers, it would cut tax bills by four per cent. Every tax dollar owed would be reduced to a 96-cent obligation.

But first . . .

It is important to consider that \$2 billion in the agriculture budget is earmarked for the national food stamp program. This program benefits farmers in the sense that farmers produce food and the stamps buy food. The food stamp program indisputably, however, is primarily a program which bene-

fits urban America. It is credited to the Department of Agriculture budget; could as well (even more appropriately) be credited to the budget of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The actual appropriation for agriculture is thus reduced to \$7.5 billion, three per cent of the total budget.

But one more thing . . .

The USDA budget also includes \$356 million for the nation's school lunch program. Once again, primary benefit accrues to urban America rather than America's farmers. It would not be untoward to credit school lunch appropriations to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Then there is \$5 million appropriated for meat inspection. Most citizens would want this service continued. There is another \$4.2 million for poultry inspection—in all, \$12.4 million for consumer protection programs all of which are made a part of "agriculture's grab." The Consumer and Marketing Service (which reports to the nation week by week on the best buys in food at the supermarket) will get \$172.5 million which is also made part of the agriculture budget.

This cataloguing of specific expenditures could grow long finally, approximately three-fifths of the agriculture budget is for programs related to farms and rural development. This total (\$5.7 billion) is but two per cent of the total federal budget.

Still . . . two per cent is two per cent. Cut out the federal allocations specifically for farmers and you slice two cents off each tax dollar owed.

If the farmer is to be permitted any break at all, however, it should put on the record that \$2.46 billion in the USDA budget is earmarked for the Farmers Home Administration. This is not money given away, it is money put out to farmers on loans. It will be repaid with some interest. It is an investment rather than an appropriation. That much might be allowed.

Then there is \$345 million for the Rural Electrification Association—all money put out on loans, not a gift. REA will also get \$125 million for telephone loans.

The total actually allocated for the "notorious" crop price support operation is \$2.7 billion, less than two per cent of the total budget. And even this appropriation is a form of loan. If the government in not repaid in cash it has the commodities—the food-stuffs—for its own.

To the extent that the American public has been persuaded that huge and unconscionable piles of tax money are being doled out to America's farmers the public has been misled. Eliminating actual farm programs totally will scarcely shave a penny from a tax dollar. In the total picture of federal spending, agriculture is an incidental item.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ABOUT TV PROGRAM: "THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have, on several recent occasions, pointed out that the CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon," made a number of implications about me which were and are false.

Inasmuch as some of the program contained erroneous information and biased implications, I requested that the De-

partment of Defense respond to 15 specific questions in order to determine the accuracy of the other portions of the program.

I have received the response I expected and, in the interest of providing the facts to Members of Congress and the American public, I submit both my letter to Secretary Laird and the response I received from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, the Honorable Daniel Z. Henkin, for insertion in the *RECORD*:

MARCH 2, 1971.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you are perhaps aware, I have expressed some concern about a CBS television program of February 23 entitled "The Selling of the Pentagon." I pointed out that the program made a number of implications about me which are false. Because of the blatantly false innuendos about me in the program and the slanted nature in which the whole thing was presented, I would like additional information from your department concerning various matters mentioned in the program.

Specifically, I would like answers to the following questions:

1. How much time and money was spent by the Department of Defense in assisting CBS in this movie?

2. What was the duration of Secretary Henkin's interview with Roger Mudd?

3. How many questions did Mr. Mudd ask Mr. Henkin and how many were used on the program?

4. Were any of the answers taken out of context?

5. Was there anybody else in the grandstands at the fire power demonstrations besides the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference members? And have any of them complained that they were brainwashed?

6. Would it be possible under the Freedom of Information Act, as voted by the Congress, for the Defense Department to withhold from the public any films which have been cleared for public release in past years? How many of the Defense Department films used as illustrations in the programs were initially made for internal information programs, and how many were initially made solely for public release?

7. Why wasn't the former Air Force officer who bragged about deceiving CBS when he was serving in Vietnam fired for doing that?

8. Does the Department of Defense know why the producers of the program chose to single out particularly Mr. Chet Huntley and Mr. Walter Cronkite for opprobrium in that they were allegedly used by the Department of Defense in certain films? Have either Mr. Huntley or Mr. Cronkite requested the Department of Defense to withdraw the films in which they appeared from Defense Department use?

9. How much of Mr. Friedheim's 11:00 news briefing at the Pentagon did CBS film? What portion of the briefing appeared on their show?

10. Would answers to any of the questions from that briefing, which were carried on the show, have involved classified national security information?

11. What are the facts concerning the so-called "traveling colonels" who are discussed in the program and, specifically, is it true that they are discussing foreign policy in violation of regulations as the programs implied? What foreign policy direction is provided to these colonels?

12. I am aware that the Department of Defense budget provides so much money

each year for use of ammunition in training of personnel and in unit training. Is the use of ammunition at fire power demonstrations, such as that for the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference members, part of the regular practice firing of troops and units or is it an additional use of ammunition for which additional funds have to be provided?

13. The program did show, in at least one case, small children observing demonstrations of killing tactics used by professional military personnel. I agree with the inference of the program that showing such things to small children is objectionable. Is it possible for the Department of Defense to take steps to prevent reoccurrences of this kind of action?

14. Would you provide me with the breakdown of the budget for public information for the Department of Defense and for the several military departments.

15. During the course of our hearings on the extension of the draft and related legislation, I asked for a detailed breakdown on the money that will be spent for recruiting in connection with the department's aim to move toward a voluntary force. I reiterate that I would like a complete breakdown as to what outlets will be used in the spending of this advertising money and how much it is planned to spend with each outlet.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1971.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary Laird has asked that I respond to your letter of March 2 in which you expressed concern about the CBS television program titled "The Selling of the Pentagon."

Enclosed are the answers to the 15 questions you posed in your letter.

Sincerely,

DANIEL Z. HENKIN.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1. How much time and money was spent by the Department of Defense in assisting CBS in this movie?

Answer. It is impossible to estimate precisely the number of DoD manhours devoted to helping in preparation of this program. Understandably, we don't know everywhere CBS went, everyone they talked with or everything they did and asked for—nor should we. We do know what we provided from OASD (Public Affairs) and what has been reported to us as provided by the military departments at the request of CBS. In that context, we estimate that more than 640 DoD manhours were expended, including at least 200 manhours by our Audio-Visual Division's action officers, and more than 440 hours by units of the military departments, other OSD offices, and DoD agencies. We regard this as a conservative estimate.

Our OASD (Public Affairs) file on assistance to this program contains 150 separate letters, memoranda and other information.

The cost of this work to DoD can only be roughly addressed by applying an average hourly time and labor cost (assuming \$5 per hour) to the conservative estimate of manhours expended by DoD personnel of various ranks in various offices—or at least \$3,200 in time and labor costs.

I believe that it was completely appropriate to provide this assistance, as we would to any other news organization working on a documentary show.

Question 2. What was the duration of

Secretary Henkin's interview with Roger Mudd?

Answer. The interview took slightly more than an hour. Mr. Henkin was on camera more than 40 minutes of that time. On its program CBS showed 2:04 minutes, including the time for the narrator's questions.

Question 3. How many questions did Mr. Mudd ask Mr. Henkin and how many were used on the program?

Answer. Forty-five questions were asked and all were answered in the interview.

It is difficult to assign a specific number to the questions CBS used because of the way Mr. Henkin's responses were edited. Fragments of answers appear to have been used, sometimes edited down to only parts of Mr. Henkin's responses and sometimes transposed to questions other than the one to which Mr. Henkin responded.

Question 4. Were any of the answers taken out of context?

Answer. Some answers were taken out of context by cutting and rearrangement. A transcript of the "interview" as it was telecast by CBS on the program is provided below with explanatory comments. Also attached is a transcript of the entire interview as filmed in the Pentagon on September 23, 1970. Only those portions of the interview that were used by CBS are underlined.

MUDD NARRATION. We asked the man in charge of all Pentagon public relations, Assistant Secretary of Defense Daniel Henkin, if he felt the press did a good job covering the Defense Department.

MR. HENKIN. I believe that it does. It from time to time, of course, gives me some headaches, and I give the press some headaches. We understand that. We act as professionally as a professional relationship, not only with the Pentagon press and other members of the Washington press corps, but with newsmen who cover military activities around the world.

This constitutes about half the original answer. The meaning and intent were not changed substantially. (See Tab "A")

MUDD. What about your public displays of military equipment at state fairs and shopping centers? What purpose does that serve?

MR. HENKIN. Well, I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their armed forces. I believe the American public has the right to request information about the armed forces, to have speakers come before them, to ask questions, and to understand the need for our armed forces, why we ask for the funds that we do ask for, how we spend these funds, what are we doing about such problems as drugs—and we do have a drug problem in the armed forces; what are we doing about the racial problem—and we do have a racial problem.

I think the public has a valid right to ask us these questions.

Only the first sentence of the original answer was used. (See Tab "B") The remainder of the material was taken from another question and answer. (See Tab "C") The modification alters the tenor of the response from attracting volunteers to problems in the armed forces.

MUDD. Well, is that the sort of information about the drug problem you have and the racial problem you have and the budget problems you have—is that the sort of information that gets passed out at state fairs by sergeants who are standing next to rockets?

MR. HENKIN. No, I wouldn't limit that to sergeants standing next to any kind of exhibit. Now, there are those who contend that this is propaganda. I do not agree with this.

Only the first sentence of Mr. Henkin's original answer is used. (See Tab "D") CBS then added two sentences which were lifted from the middle of an earlier question. (See Tab "E") Mr. Henkin's comment referred to data on increasing Soviet threat.

(No intro; abuts DeMiter interview.)

MR. HENKIN. We're trying our best to provide information. There undoubtedly have been times when certain actions have been staged. I think this is true of all TV news coverage. After all, this interview is being staged.

MUDD. How so?

MR. HENKIN. Well, props were set up; arrangements were made. You and I just did not walk into this room cold. Arrangements were made for it.

MUDD. Well, we wanted to film in your office. But your people said let's go in the studio. So we didn't stage it.

This segment on staging is inserted without narration immediately following DeMiter's claim that newsfilm released by DoD is staged. Mr. Henkin qualified his statement that the interview was "staged", the qualifying line, "as one might say", was cut. The deletion changes a statement into an accusation. (See Tab "F")

INTERVIEW BETWEEN DANIEL Z. HENKIN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND ROGER MUDD, COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM

MR. MUDD. Mr. Henkin, in a recent speech you gave here in Washington you said that you were one of those who took unequivocal positions on the need for a strong defense posture and the need for a strong and free press.

Could you tell me what you mean? Are the two antithetical? Do they work at cross purposes? What is your definition? When one definition collides with the other?

MR. HENKIN. Quite the opposite. I don't believe they work at cross purposes. I believe they are inter-related. I believe a strong defense in our country requires an informed public. And the American public has the right to know about what our armed forces are doing. I don't see any antithetical position.

MR. MUDD. But there have been times when the national security and the free press collide, have there not?

MR. HENKIN. Oh, yes, there . . . in our society there are inevitable times when the working of newsmen collecting news and the needs of the government at that moment may be in opposition, but over the long period of time, there is, I think, an interrelationship that is very, very vital to our society.

MR. MUDD. But when they do collide, as you say they do on occasions, what do you do, what is your position?

MR. HENKIN. Well, first of all I—my responsibility is for the security of the United States and the safety of our men and women in uniform. That is my first responsibility. With that is my responsibility to make available to the public through the press as much information as possible. And one must make judgments on a day-to-day basis with those criteria. Those are spelled out for us in a statement of principles issued by Secretary Laird shortly after he assumed office.

But it is a matter of judgment.

MR. MUDD. Well, now, I can remember the famous quotation from one of your predecessors, Arthur Sylvester, that the press is part of the nation's weaponry, and when threatened by war, the government has the right to lie. Everybody remembers that.

Phil Goulding, who was your immediate predecessor, said he regarded his job as that of a game keeper and the press as that of a poacher. How do you view your relationship between the press and the Pentagon?

MR. HENKIN. Well, without regard to what any of my predecessors may or may not have

said, I feel strongly that no government official ever has the right to lie, but I believe that every government official always has the responsibility to protect the country. That is my view.

Mr. MUDD. Well, you mean you don't call it lying? But what do you call it? If you are withholding or giving out—

Mr. HENKIN. Well, there are certainly a number of occasions when either I or one of my two deputies, Mr. Friedham or Brig. Gen. Chapple James, must respond with a "no comment", or "I can't give you that information", or "I am sorry, I can't discuss that" in order to protect the security of the country or the safety of our men and women. That we do. You may interpret that as withholding information. I don't. But that, again, is a matter of judgment.

The information is not made available to you at that time, but, oh, no one, at least I would hope no one who is responsible to me, would ever tell a lie.

Mr. MUDD. But, what is your view, Mr. Henkin, of the press, and how it functions? Do you—does the press do a good job covering your department?

Mr. HENKIN. I believe that it does. From time to time, of course, it gives me some headaches, and I give the press some headaches. We understand that. We act professionally, there is a professional relationship, not only with the Pentagon press but with other members of the Washington news corps, but with newsmen who cover military activities around the world.

I—it is for them to assess not for me to assess, but my evaluation of this is that we have a working relationship, an understanding that we make mistakes and we do make mistakes, the press makes mistakes, but I do not believe that there is a feeling of distrust. I think there is an understanding of the fact that we do make mistakes and the press makes mistakes. And I think it would be a tragic situation for our country, particularly for our national strength, if there developed a feeling of distrust, and not a recognition that as humans we do make mistakes.

Mr. MUDD. You don't think distrust exists?

Mr. HENKIN. It does not exist on my part. As for the press, it must make its own assessment.

Mr. MUDD. What about, uh—what are your views of television coverage of DOD and the war in Vietnam?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, television coverage has presented additional problems, there's some technical problems. It takes a bit of equipment to move a television team to a scene of action. There television news presentation requires condensation. That is just a reality. But it has brought—in my view, television has brought to the American public more information about defense activities than ever before. It has problems, which I think the television news industry recognizes and certainly which we recognize. With a mutual trust, I think we are able to provide increased assistance to television people in access to the story and I think the television news industry has an increased understanding of the complexities of covering national defense news.

Mr. MUDD. Do you think the American TV viewer has got a good picture of the war in Vietnam, having watched television?

Mr. HENKIN. I believe over the long run—a month, two months, six months, a year—that the American public has received a fine understanding of the war. And I don't include from this just the daily or hourly or evening news shows, but when one views the total picture including some of the documentaries which have been run, some of which have been outstanding. I believe that

the public has received an insight into the war that would not be possible through any other medium.

Mr. MUDD. And you include in that the local stations? In their coverage?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, as to the local stations, I am not in a position to give a really perceptive evaluation of that. I met with a number of local TV news directors and I feel that they have not devoted as much attention to defense news on a broad scale beyond the local story as is true comparably with newspapers. We have discussed this. Therefore a number of local television stations throughout the country which have done some very fine work in covering defense news, but not yet to the extent that newspapers throughout the country have covered defense news.

Mr. MUDD. The reason I asked, was because of a recent speech by Senator Fulbright criticizing the existence in Vietnam of four or five—I don't know the number—Defense Department film crews which turn out a—maybe seven stories a week that are brought back here and you distribute to the local stations, or at least offer them to everybody—

Mr. HENKIN. That is right. We offer them to everybody on an equal basis.

Mr. MUDD. Why do you do that?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, these teams were established after some discussion with the television network people and with others. First, we felt that we had to develop a technological capability to see if we could do it in the Armed Forces with military people. I think we have established that we have that capability.

Secondly, there are some stories that do not lend themselves to coverage on a spot news basis which we felt the American public had a right to be informed about and we covered those. I think now that we have gained this knowledge, learned a lot of technical details with regard to our own needs and those of national and local TV that we can reduce these teams in Vietnam, particularly as we reduce our strength there and as these reductions will be made.

But I think it is essential that the Department of Defense have the capability to document our actions. There could be times when it might be possible only to get a military TV team, news team, into a particular scene of action initially. And I think it is very important that we have that capability.

And in this I have the agreement of the TV news executives with whom I spoke about.

Mr. MUDD. As far as I know, uh, networks do not use DOD film do they?

Mr. HENKIN. I have seen some networks use some of our TV on film.

Mr. MUDD. But generally the DOD film production is used on local stations, is that right?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, I am pleased that local stations do use a considerable amount of our footage, but again I say there are a number of instances where this footage has been used by the networks, where it so happens that one of our teams was on the scene of a particular action that was not covered in any other way.

Mr. MUDD. Well, now, Senator Fulbright has said and I am sure you are familiar with his comments since this is in your province, he said that there have been instances of "staging", that almost 50 per cent of the output during a given period of '69 was designed to make the South Vietnamese Army look more proficient than it was and that the real purpose of—I think you called it the V Series, Victory Series—was to propagandize the American people into thinking the South Vietnamese were better than they really were. What is your answer to that?

Mr. HENKIN. First, let me say that we here have studied and, of course, will continue to study very closely any comments made by Chairman Fulbright. I have been in communication with him and his office over a number of months on his views with regard to these, this TV coverage. I do not believe that we have—in fact, as we are forbidden by Secretary Laird's directive from participating in a propaganda effort. We are trying our best to provide information. There undoubtedly have been times when certain actions have been staged. I think this is true of all TV news coverage. After all, this interview here is being staged, as one might say.

Mr. MUDD. How so?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, props were set up, arrangements were made—I did not just walk into this room cold; arrangements were made for it.

Mr. MUDD. Well, we wanted to film in your offices, but your people said let's go to the studios. So, we didn't stage it.

Mr. HENKIN. No, I am not accusing you of staging it. I made no accusations at all.

Mr. MUDD. But back to the point that Senator Fulbright made about the propagandizing, he said that the bulk of the subjects chosen by the film crews, and the audiovisual team over there, was to elevate the image of the South Vietnamese.

Mr. HENKIN. Well, I think that one would have to go through all of the releases that were made and I do not believe that that contention would be proven correct.

Mr. MUDD. Ah—

Mr. HENKIN. Let me say that we do make mistakes and there have been times when actions were misrepresented, but if that is true, it was a mistake, and should not have been done.

Mr. MUDD. Did I understand you, Mr. Secretary, to say that the—that you were reducing the number and the amount of activity on your crews?

Mr. HENKIN. In Vietnam, yes.

Mr. MUDD. And why?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, first of all, we have established—we gained the technological knowledge of what it takes in the armed forces to staff these teams. We have learned how to handle the copy. The material is brought back here and processed commercially and made available on a pool basis to the TV networks and to local stations. Secondly, we are reducing our strength in Vietnam and, as we reduce our strength I think it is possible now to reduce significantly the number and activity of these teams.

Mr. MUDD. But the whole question of a government having film crews in the field on any kind of story raises the question of—of putting the government in the position of deciding which stories ought to be covered.

Mr. HENKIN. I don't believe—

Mr. MUDD. Is that valid?

Mr. HENKIN. I don't believe it is any more valid than our putting out news releases to what we in our trade call the hard print side of the picture. I don't think there is any great difference between putting out a printed news release for use in newspapers than making film available for TV networks. Now if the TV networks disagree with that they have yet to communicate with me that disagreement.

Mr. MUDD. But in the case of a press release, the AP man or the Cincinnati Inquirer man can take your press release and dump it or rewrite it or add to it. But in the case of a film clip it is there to use or not to use. And isn't there a difference?

Mr. HENKIN. I don't see a difference. Perhaps you on the TV side of the news coverage do. I don't. I think your—TV news directors have the same option, to use it or don't use it, to come in and ask us questions about it, to amplify it. I don't see any fundamental

difference. Perhaps you on the TV news side view it differently than other newsmen. If so, that has not been communicated to me.

Mr. Mudd. Ah—to go on to another subject, Mr. Henkin. It has been pointed out to me that—I've taken the last ten years—the overall budget for the Defense Department has approximately doubled. I think—would you accept that? I think that is about right. About double. And the budget for the Public Affairs department of the Defense Department has increased approximately tenfold. If that is accurate, and I can't swear that it is, but if that is accurate, how do you explain that?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, I can't attest to its accuracy either. The only thing I can attest to are the figures in my own office. There has been an increase in public information activities. I think there has been better accounting for what is public information activities. I think there has also been an increase in troop information activities, which, in the services, I am not at all responsible for troop information. My only responsibility is for public information.

But in the services an information officer may be, and usually is, responsible for both troop information and public information. So it is very difficult to, in my view, obtain precise figures on what is public information and what is troop information.

Mr. Mudd. Well, how much has your budget increased? In the last ten years?

Mr. HENKIN. Very little in my office, in the ten-year period, except as regards pay increases which have increased substantially—pay increases, per diem increases over the years.

Mr. Mudd. But by your office, do you include audiovisual and community service and speakers bureau and all those related agencies?

Mr. HENKIN. That's right.

Mr. Mudd. That is your whole Henkin domain, if I can use that.

Mr. HENKIN. That's right.

Mr. Mudd. And it has not increased much at all?

Mr. HENKIN. The fact is it is going down; it has been going down for the last several years. It continues to go down. This also includes—this as you call it, the Henkin domain—also includes approximately 40 people, more than 20 per cent, who are in the of—in the Directorate of Security Review, who review congressional testimony, who review the speeches (unintelligible) to see how much information we can make available. This office was expanded some years ago after a—before my time here, when the Senate Armed Services Committee concluded an investigation of certain Defense information activities and decided that the Office of Security Review should be expanded and it was expanded, after that action by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Mudd. What about the community relations service, if that is the correct title?

Mr. HENKIN. Directorate of Community Relations is the correct title.

Mr. Mudd. What is the purpose of that Mr. Henkin?

Mr. HENKIN. It is to establish and maintain liaison with national organizations throughout the country whether they be veterans organizations, labor organizations, student organizations, to respond to their requests for information about the Department of Defense. Thus it is that that directive would for example maintain a liaison relationship with the organizations such as, well, let's just say, the Air Force Association and also arrange for meetings here at the Pentagon which we held not to long ago with the group called the "Concerned Mothers of Massachusetts". We spent several hours with

them here. That meeting was arranged by the directorate of community relations.

It also recently has focused strong attention on arranging meetings in responding to requests from student groups throughout the country. We are very much interested in increasing our communications with students and this—these past months, we have met here in this building and elsewhere in the country with, I would say, thousands of students, in what have been very informative and rewarding sessions.

TAB B

Mr. Mudd. But aside from your meetings in which you disseminate information, what about your public displays of military equipment at State Fairs and shopping centers? What purpose does that serve?

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

Mr. Mudd. Is a rocket or missile display on a flatbed, is that put at a state fair by request of the State Fair people or do your various officers apply for space?

Mr. HENKINS. No, these are—all of these are requests, made by State Fair people and others under our directive which imposes certain restrictions. These must be—for example, there must be no admission charge. They must be non-profit. There must be adequate insurance provisions. There are a number of others listed. They must be non-political. We have a number of restrictions which apply as we assess these requests.

Mr. Mudd. But there is no pressure on these field offices to place their displays at various public functions?

Mr. HENKINS. There is no pressure from my office. I cannot speak for the entire Defense establishment. I can say there is no pressure from my office.

Mr. Mudd. I—

Mr. HENKINS. We have more requests than we can fulfill.

Mr. Mudd. You do?

Mr. HENKIN. Both for exhibits, for speakers—we just can't fulfill all the requests we have.

Mr. Mudd. Do you regard the display of military equipment in the country and the instant availability of military speakers at Kiwanis and Rotary and so forth as excessively militaristic?

Mr. HENKIN. Of course I don't. If I believed that we would not have approved these requests. I believe it is our obligation insofar as our resources permit to respond to a request from Kiwanis or a Rotary group in a Midwestern city as well—or any city, as well as New York or Chicago or San Francisco. I think the people in any part of our country have a right to come to us and ask us if we can provide a speaker, and when we can, I would hope we will.

Mr. Mudd. But criticism has been raised, Mr. Henkin, that the result, unconscious though it may be, does create in the minds of the citizen a dependence, or an acceptance of the military and what it represents, as a way to solve problems. You have heard that criticism?

Mr. HENKIN. Yes, but I—

Mr. Mudd. What do you say—

TAB C

Mr. HENKIN.—I would—I would only amend your question there, Mr. Mudd, to say in the minds of some citizens, it presents this, if I may use the word "image." But I believe that the American public has the right to request information about the

armed forces, to have speakers come before them, to ask questions, and to understand the need for our armed forces, why we ask for the funds that we do ask for, how we spend these funds, what are we doing about such problems as drugs and we do have a drug problem in the armed forces—what are we doing about the racial problem in the armed forces—and we do have a racial problem. I think the public has a valid right to ask us these questions. Not only in the big cities but throughout the country and to the extent that our resources permit, I believe we should respond to these requests. And also I believe that we have an obligation to inform, discuss with the American public the problems that we confront, problems such as the increasing Soviet threat.

TAB E

Now there are those that contend that this is propaganda. I don't—do not agree with this. There are those who contend that we do this to influence the budget. I submit to you that, in my view at least, this is not a valid argument. The budget for the current fiscal year was sent to Congress in February. It has not yet passed. It probably will not pass, as you well know, covering the Hill, until late this year, possibly early next year.

If I permitted that to be my criteria, I would be forced to suppress news, and I am not in this job to suppress news.

TAB D

Mr. Mudd. Well, is that sort of information about the drug problem you have and the racial problem you have and the budget problems you have, is that the sort of information that gets passed out at State Fairs by sergeants who are standing next to rockets?

Mr. HENKIN. No, I didn't—wouldn't limit that to sergeants standing next to any kind of exhibits. I knew—I thought we were discussing speeches and all.

Mr. Mudd. What I mean—what—what possible—what sort of information—

Mr. HENKIN. But I am sure that if someone at a State Fair were to ask an officer in charge or a sergeant. We have some understanding sergeants who can speak to all of these subjects and we are proud of them—who would respond and tell the public, the youth there, what we are trying to do in the armed forces to increase equality of opportunity, as an example.

Mr. Mudd. You mentioned.

Mr. HENKIN. One might be concerned about sending our sergeants to meet with the American public. I am not.

Mr. Mudd. I didn't mean to say that I was, I was just thinking that the display of a rocket was seen more for display than for the actual dissemination of information.

Mr. HENKIN. Well, we find that a number of citizen groups who sponsor State Fairs, to use that as an example, requests from time to time displays of military hardware. Where we can provide this within our resources, we do try to do that.

Mr. Mudd. What purpose does it serve, Mr. Henkin, for the so-called VIP trips where a base is opened up, for a display of a new weapon and you bring on a group of businessmen and important people in a community, is that a—is that a necessary function within a—in a democratic—

Mr. HENKIN. Well, I believe it has been an important and valuable function since these were started in 1948 to bring together our military people and the VIP's, as you describe them, these VIP's include college presidents, professors, labor leaders, church leaders, business leaders, academicians, scientists, the whole variety, the whole spectrum of American society. I think it contributes

to public understanding of our armed forces that these visits are made, and that these people have an opportunity to meet with our men and women in uniform. I go back to my basic conviction and it is one that I held since I first began covering this building in the early days of—just before World War II that our national strength depends upon an informed public to a large extent. And that which contributes to informing the public about our progress and our problems, our successes and our failures, I think, contributes in the long run, contributes greatly, to the strength of our country. And I am interested in this job, in my professional career in two things.

One is to strengthen the country, and, two, free access to what our armed forces are doing.

Mr. MUDD. I will have to stick a knife in you right now—I'm sure it won't hurt—

Mr. HENKIN. Make sure it won't hurt.

Mr. MUDD. I am sure it won't hurt. But you just mentioned that you were an ex-reporter and I am prompted to ask because of that background I was curious to know why you or your office asked me to submit a list of questions to you ahead of time.

Mr. HENKIN. I don't know. As I recall, before we came in here, I asked you, I believe I am quoting myself correctly, "Do you want to do this cold turkey or do you want to discuss some of the questions you may wish to address to me—just to save you time?" Well, I don't know what your next question is going to be—

Mr. MUDD. I know—I know you don't, but a week ago we were asked to submit a list of questions that I was—knowing your background, I was curious—

Mr. HENKIN. In the interest of saving time, I sometimes ask newsmen who interview others around here what they are interested in so the person can be prepared.

Mr. MUDD. It was just as simple as that?

Mr. HENKIN. Yes.

Mr. MUDD. You mentioned a minute ago, Mr. Henkin, that included in your area was the Security Review, I think you call it.

Mr. HENKIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MUDD. There has been a lot of attention given to a case up on the Hill, I think maybe six weeks ago, in which a transcript before the Foreign Relations Committee was released, made public, about our relations with the Government of South Korea, and in it there was an article published in the New York Times deleted from the hearing. In other words—

(Break in production—physical break—new start below.)

Mr. MUDD. You mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Henkin, that one of your agencies that you control, that you run, Security Review, there was a well-publicized case a few weeks ago in which a transcript before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was made public, and deleted for reasons of security was an article or part of an article from the New York Times which circulates all over the country and abroad. And how possibly could the interests of security be served by withholding a paragraph from a newspaper?

Mr. HENKIN. I said earlier in this interview, Mr. Mudd, that we make mistakes here. Mistakes were made. Incidentally that transcript was shown to the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee before it was published and they raised no objection to the error that had been made, and it was put out. Obviously an article of the New York Times is not classified or in any other place.

Mr. MUDD. It—it was just simply a slip there.

Mr. HENKIN. Yes, it was a slip.

Mr. MUDD. What is the general philosophy that you have as regards classifying documents? What is the criterion for classifying a document?

Mr. HENKIN. I don't classify any information. Information that is classified comes to me, as the person who originates it classifies it. To the best of our ability we try to see if we can get information de-classified to be made public, and we go through the various agencies, offices, the Office of the Secretary himself, at times, to try and get information de-classified, so that it can be made available. But I do not classify any information myself.

Mr. MUDD. Your purpose is in de-classifying it?

Mr. HENKIN. That is correct.

Mr. MUDD. By your estimate, how much of classified material could be de-classified right now, today, without hurting the national interests?

Mr. HENKIN. I believe a considerable amount. Secretary Laird and Deputy Secretary Packard agree, more importantly than I, with this. We have been trying here, of recent months, to develop a system to de-classify much more information, and we have been able in the last—we have in the last 18 months declassified a considerable amount of information, particularly academic research. We are moving now to greatly expand that project, that effort, and hopefully we will be able to announce something on this in the near future.

Mr. MUDD. Well, who are these people who keep classifying?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, you must—

Mr. MUDD. They work for Mr. Laird, don't they?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, you must remember that much information is classified over the years there's much information, for example, about World War II that is still classified, and we—going back 6, 8, 12 years, and we believe first, that much—a good bit of that information needs to be looked at and made available to the newsmen, to students, to educators—to the public.

Also, there is a tendency on the part of some to overclassify today, and we are trying to, as best we can, to make more information available. And, that is why, in recent months, we are discussing publicly certain activities of the Department of Defense, which were not discussed publicly before. For example, our air activities in Laos. Or, another example, is the story of our prisoners of war and missing in action. We have made much more information available about that subject than was the case several years ago. Yet, another is the information related to chemical warfare and biological research. We are discussing this much more evenly than it was the case before, and these are just some examples.

Mr. MUDD. It just occurs to me to ask you, Mr. Henkin, do you think the press did a good job on the My Lai massacre?

Mr. HENKIN. I would not want to comment on that at all. The—this is a matter that is still pending in the judicial process and for that reason I would decline any comment on that.

Mr. MUDD. Well, I didn't mean to pass on the innocence. I just—

Mr. HENKIN. I know you didn't.

Mr. MUDD.—the alertness of the press—

Mr. HENKIN. I know that.

Mr. MUDD.—in picking up the story.

Mr. HENKIN. Well, in order to protect the interests of all individuals and the interest of government, I feel that I should refrain from any comment on that.

Mr. MUDD. Okay.

Mr. HENKIN. And, this is a problem, Mr. Mudd, that I think that our country needs—needs to think about, is the problem of protecting the right of individuals, protecting the rights of the federal, state, local government in its judicial process. It is a very complex problem.

Mr. MUDD. Well you are as aware of the word as anyone, and that was the phrase "credibility gap." You, I am sure, have to live with it all the time. Have you succeeded—

Mr. HENKIN. Well fortunately, I'm hearing that word less. I am—I don't know about others.

Mr. MUDD. Are you, are you? Well, that was my question which you anticipated. Have you, and your people here, succeeded in closing the gap, if it ever did exist?

Mr. HENKIN. Well, again, this is an assessment that I think newsmen need to make. We feel that we have. We feel that there is a better understanding, or I feel I shall take the responsibility for that statement. I feel that there is a better understanding of mutual professional responsibilities of newsmen and military and civilian information people who work for the Department of Defense.

Mr. MUDD. Well, it occurs to me to mention this instance. If you recall, Secretary Laird has repeatedly, and you and your subordinates refer repeatedly to, our air cover, our air support in Cambodia, as being for the purpose of interdiction.

Mr. HENKIN. Interdiction, or harassing or in any other way interfering with the possible flow of men and material that could jeopardize the lives of our men in Vietnam.

Mr. MUDD. But the evidence from the free press over there is that it is much more than just interdiction; it is in fact supplying air cover and close support for Cambodian ground troops.

Mr. HENKIN. If our air activities have the ancillary effect of assisting Cambodian ground troops, so be it. But the primary mission, the primary objective of our air operations in Cambodia, is to interdict, thwart, harass—you choose the word—the flow of men and material that could possibly jeopardize American lives in South Vietnam. And this is particularly important as we continue to withdraw additional thousands of men from Vietnam.

Mr. MUDD. Well, the word that the Department uses is this interdiction, which doesn't quite include ground support—air support.

Mr. HENKIN. Secretary Laird has used a number of other words to describe our activities—to assay, interdict, harass, thwart, delay, prevent the flow of men and material in South Vietnam. And we have said—and I repeat here—that this—these operations may well have the effect of assisting the Cambodian forces. If it does, it does. But the objective is to save American and Allied lives in South Vietnam.

Mr. MUDD. The famous example was the fighting around Skun (?), I think, back in August when the word most used was interdiction of air supplies to protect South Vietnam and particularly the seaport when the actual action was about 115 miles from the seaport. Immediately, the press and the TV picked up that this is another example of Pentagon credibility.

Mr. HENKIN. Well, it is a two-edge sword. It is—I am particularly pleased that we were able to make the story of our operations along the Cambodian sanctuary so available, that we made access so easy, relatively easy for newsmen. With our—when our first troops went in, newsmen, American newsmen, newsmen from other nations, went with them. In fact, General Abrams made his own personal plane available around midnight one evening to move some newsmen from Saigon to the front. That is important to me, that there is this access by some 400 newsmen give or take, which there were at anytime, in Vietnam, to the story.

I think that credibility will be judged on their report.

Mr. MUDD. What comment would you make on the presence of the military band over

there at the Cambodian border when the first withdrawals occurred of U.S. troops from Cambodia, back into South Vietnam. That was laughed at considerably as a propaganda hoopla showboat.

Mr. HENKIN. I would make no comment on that because I just have nothing to do—or no real, first-hand knowledge of that. But if some commanders thought it might raise—up the morale of his men to be greeted by a band, I am in favor of bands.

Mr. MUDD. Especially when they are meeting the presidential deadline to get out.

Mr. HENKIN. Well, I am in favor of bands at any time. I think it lifts our spirits; we like to have our spirits lifted.

Mr. MUDD. I have a final question.

Thank you for your patience.

I have a final question. Why do you think, Mr. Henkin, that the military has become fair game for every critic whether serious, well-motivated, whether carping, whether unreasoned? Why is it that way now?

It does represent a change in our whole way of thinking, does it not? As a nation?

Mr. HENKIN. I don't believe that it represents a total change. I recall, and I am sure you do too, Mr. Mudd, times in our history where the military—particularly after a conflict—have been under attack—I think it is a healthy sign that the American public is interested enough to care about the military. If this means criticism from time to time, that is all right, too, as long as the criticism is constructive. I think the, because of our size and mostly because of our importance and the safety and security of our country—the survival of our country—it is essential that the press, the public, the Congress keep a close watch on the Department of Defense. I also note, that when the chips go down, and the chips go down mostly in my view, when Congress votes, what I perceive is a recognition on the part of the Congress of a need for a strong defense establishment and this support has been forthcoming and I would hope and pray that it will continue to be that way. And this support will be forthcoming because the public has access to what we are doing, right and wrong, and is keenly involved in our activities.

I happen to believe this.

Mr. MUDD. Okay.

Question 5. Was there anybody else in the grandstands at the fire power demonstrations besides the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference members? And have any of them complained that they were brainwashed?

Answer. Besides the 72 member JCOC party present at the Fort Bragg exercise where CBS filmed, other groups present included ROTC groups from Appalachian State University (40), Virginia Tech (50), N. C. State University (10), and Hanover High School (50) and Terry Sanford High School (50); local area Jaycees (25); Strike Command (15); Military Attaches (60); Military Counterparts of Military Advisory Council (20); 140 civilians from local area; and 346 Air Force personnel from nine Tactical Air Command operational and training bases.

To our knowledge, there have been no complaints of "brainwashing."

Question 6. Would it be possible under the Freedom of Information Act, as voted by Congress, for the Defense Department to withhold from the public any films which have been cleared for public release in past years? How many of the Defense Department films used as illustrations in the program were initially made for internal information programs, and how many were initially made solely for public release?

Answer. Under the Congressionally ap-

proved Freedom of Information Act, the Department of Defense does not feel it can withhold or suppress any films requested by the public which have been previously cleared for public release.

Of the seven films addressed specifically in the show (there are twenty-one, if one includes all those identified only by briefly flashing a title on the screen), only one, "The Eagle's Talon", was made in 1962 specifically for public release. All the rest were made for internal troop information and cleared for public release by previous Administrations.

Question 7. Why wasn't the former Air Force officer who bragged about deceiving CBS when he was serving in Vietnam fired for doing that?

Answer. We do not know that CBS was actually deceived, although the former officer inferred that to the narrator. The individual interviewed is no longer in the Air Force; he did hold information jobs—and other jobs—during 12 years on active duty.

There is no place in the Department of Defense for any official either military or civilian who deliberately deceives or dupes news media in contravention of the Public Affairs Principles of the Secretary of Defense of March 4, 1969, which are as follows:

PUBLIC INFORMATION PRINCIPLES

To assure that the American people are fully informed about matters of national defense, I intend that the Department of Defense shall conduct its activities in an open manner, consistent with the need for security. This means that unclassified information, other than that exempted by the Freedom of Information Act, must be readily accessible to the public and the press. Because of the importance I attach to this matter, I want to state certain principles which I expect to be followed in the conduct of public affairs activities of this Department.

1. Our first concern must be the security of the United States and the safety of our Armed Forces. Therefore, information which would adversely affect the security of our country or endanger our men should not be disclosed.

2. The provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552) will be supported in both letter and spirit.

3. No information will be classified solely because disclosure might result in criticism of the Department of Defense. To avoid abuse of classification procedures, we must adhere strictly to the criteria set forth in Executive Order 10101.

4. Our obligation to provide the public with accurate, timely information on major Department of Defense programs will require, in some instances, detailed public information planning and coordination within the Department and with other government agencies. However, I want to emphasize that the sole purpose of such planning and coordination will be to expedite the flow of information to the public. Propaganda has no place in Department of Defense public information programs.

Therefore, I direct that each addressee review all pertinent directives, policies and public information plans to insure prompt and complete compliance with these principles. Those which do not meet the foregoing criteria will be revised or rescinded.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) is responsible for advising and assisting me in the fulfillment of these public information principles throughout the Department of Defense.

MELVIN R. LAIRD.

Question 8. Does the Department of Defense know why the producers of the program chose to single out particularly Mr. Chet

Huntley and Mr. Walter Cronkite for opprobrium in that they were allegedly used by the Department of Defense in certain films? Have either Mr. Huntley or Mr. Cronkite requested the Department of Defense to withdraw the films in which they appeared from Department of Defense use?

Answer. We do not know why the producer singled out Mr. Huntley and Mr. Cronkite for specific mention in reference to their roles in narrating certain DoD films made some years ago. Nearly all the film production in which CBS expressed interest featured prominent newsmen and motion picture stars.

We know of no request from Mr. Huntley or Mr. Cronkite that these films be suppressed or withdrawn from use. We have noted in answer to a previous question the Freedom of Information Act considerations.

Question 9. How much of Mr. Friedheim's 11:00 news briefing at the Pentagon did CBS film? What portion of the briefing appeared on their show?

Answer. The entire 11:00 news briefing with Mr. Friedheim was filmed by CBS. Mr. Friedheim made nine announcements that day, and replied to approximately 34 questions from newsmen. CBS selected six questions and answers for the program, taking a total of one minute of air time. Three "no comment" type answers were included in the six used by CBS, the only three, incidentally, that Mr. Friedheim gave during the entire briefing. Had he responded to any one of the three "no comment" replies aired by CBS, he would have revealed classified national security information.

Question 10. Would answers to any of the questions from that briefing, which were carried on the show, have involved classified national security information?

Answer. Yes, to discuss sizes of possible multiple nuclear warheads on the Soviet SS-11 ICBM would disclose information damaging to the Defense interest of the United States.

Question 11. What are the facts concerning the so-called "traveling colonels" who are discussed in the program, and specifically, is it true that they are discussing foreign policy in violation of regulations as the program implied? What foreign policy direction is provided to these colonels?

Answer. The officers mentioned in the CBS show were faculty members of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. The group consisted of two Army colonels, one Navy captain, one Marine colonel, one Air Force colonel, and one State Department Foreign Service Officer. They appeared in Peoria at an event arranged and sponsored by the Peoria Association of Commerce—not the Caterpillar Tractor Company as CBS erroneously reported. We understand that an employee of Caterpillar, as a private individual, was chairman of the ICAF Seminar.

There is no Army regulation specifically prohibiting statements on foreign policy by Army personnel. The applicable directive, AR360-5, paragraph 9, prescribes that persons speaking in an official capacity must have their material cleared for accuracy, propriety, and consistency with national policy. The other Services have similar directives. All presentations by the faculty group were cleared by the Department of Defense and other appropriate government agencies, including the Department of State in the case of subjects dealing with foreign affairs or foreign policy. The one specific presentation at Peoria that dealt directly with the formulation of U.S. foreign policy was given by the Foreign Service Officer.

A CBS film team spent three days at the seminar recording various presentations and was briefed on the entire National Security Seminar Program, including details on the funding, costs, curriculum, military and

civilian participation, scheduling, and clearance procedures to ensure consistency with national policy. 79 seconds appeared on the air.

In the brief segment of the CBS show covering the presentation of a Marine colonel, comments were edited and rearranged by CBS, giving the impression that the words he used were his own. In fact he was quoting from his prepared and cleared text a 1967 statement by the Prime Minister of Laos: "If South Vietnam becomes communist it would be difficult for Laos to exist; the same goes for Cambodia and the other countries of Southeast Asia."

Question 12: I am aware that the Department of Defense budget provides so much money each year for use of ammunition in training of personnel and in unit training. Is the use of ammunition at fire power demonstrations, such as that for the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference members, part of the regular practice firing of troops and units or is it an additional use of ammunition for which additional funds have to be provided?

Answer. Use of ammunition at these demonstrations is a normal training expenditure. JCOC tours, such as that we assisted CBS in filming at Fort Bragg during Exercise Brass Strike, are scheduled to take advantage of previously scheduled training activities. In such cases, training firing would take place with or without the JCOC group's presence. While it is true that selected weapons are fired near grandstands to give the audience closeup views, there is nevertheless training value in this. Audiences also include viewing groups other than civilians. For example, the Brass Strike Exercise at Fort Bragg also included a group of foreign military attaches, and other groups.

We regard it as our responsibility and obligation to make it possible for members of the public to see the type of training their Armed Forces engage in and the defense capabilities this provides our nation.

Question 13. The program did show, in at least one case, small children observing demonstrations of killing tactics used by professional military personnel. I agree with the inference of the program that showing such things to small children is objectionable. Is it possible for the Department of Defense to take steps to prevent reoccurrences of this kind of action?

Answer. The exact nature of the displays and demonstrations at military open houses is largely the responsibility of local commanders. Local commanders do not, of course, control whether or not parents bring children to these public demonstrations.

Hand to hand combat has traditionally been a part of many of the demonstrations, particularly where such techniques are a major part of the training as with the infantry. Military demonstrations normally include a talk or lecture that explains what is occurring and why. It is not in any sense portrayed as gratuitous violence.

Nevertheless, the Department of Defense is in complete accord with your view that closer supervision is required, particularly when children may be present at open demonstrations. We have initiated a review and will take corrective action.

Question 14. Would you provide me with the breakdown of the budget for public information for the Department of Defense and for the several military departments?

Answer. Listed below are the costs of my office, the Defense agencies, the Joint Staff, and the cost of Service public information activities provided by the four Services. New fiscal procedures were initiated this year by OASD (Comptroller) to establish public information as a program budget item in order to improve fiscal control.

Fiscal year 1971, congressional limitation

Army	\$10,300,000
Navy/Marine Corps	10,400,000
Air Force	8,100,000
Office of Secretary of Defense ¹	² 1,200,000
Defense Agencies and Joint Chiefs of Staff ¹	400,000
Total	30,400,000

The limitation reflects a Congressional reduction of more than \$7 million from initial cost estimates for fiscal year 1971.

Fiscal year 1972 costs are estimated at:

Army	\$7,412,000
Navy/Marine Corps	9,677,000
Air Force	6,279,000
Office of the Secretary of Defense ¹	² 1,148,000
Defense Agencies and Joint Chiefs of Staff ¹	400,000
Total	24,982,000

¹ Applicable to "Operation and Maintenance" only. Military personnel assigned to these activities are subject to the limitation imposed on each of the Services.

² Excludes costs associated with security review operations which costs were exempted from the Congressional limitation.

Thus, Congressional reductions for public affairs activities in FY 1971 totalled more than \$7 million and FY 72 estimates reflect a further reduction of approximately \$5 million attributable to the Office of Management and Budget direction after allowable increases for such items as increased cost of materials and higher pay scales enacted by the Congress.

Question 15. During the course of our hearings on the extension of the draft and related legislation, I asked for a detailed breakdown on the money that will be spent for recruiting in connection with the department's aim to move toward a volunteer force. I reiterate that I would like a complete breakdown as to what outlets will be used in the spending of this advertising money and how much it is planned to spend with each outlet.

Answer. We have been advised that the ASD (Manpower & Reserve Affairs) is providing this information directly to you.

ON THE BOMBING OF THE CAPITOL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the cowardly act perpetrated against the Capitol last Monday cannot be allowed to force this Congress to become a legislative body in a goldfish bowl. Various recommendations have been made over the years to encase the visitors galleries of the House and Senate in bulletproof glass. Others have suggested we televise our sessions via closed circuit into reception rooms so that people cannot get too close to their legislators.

Either of these suggestions would do little more than further divorce the people from their representatives, whom many consider already too distant.

As a former law enforcement officer, I know quite well the difficulty of protecting another person. Moreover to protect them from those who skulk around in the night, planting explosive devices

that could maim or kill hundreds of people is quite impossible without the proper equipment.

We already have an excellent Capitol Police Force who, despite the recent criticism, have always performed admirably in an emergency. However, the Capitol and its surrounding buildings are difficult to guard. Thus I am now drafting legislation that would equip them with the proper tools to do the job better.

I would like to authorize the installation of metal sensors at every entrance to the Capitol and the office buildings. These are similar to the machines in use at airports to guard against hijackers carrying guns or bombs aboard a plane. Additionally, we should equip the police force with a closed circuit television network to further enhance their law enforcement and protection capabilities.

Such a twofold upgrading of the police force would still permit maximum freedom of movement for the countless thousands of Americans that tour the Capitol each year, and at the same time vastly improve the protection afforded Members of Congress.

I, for one, do not want to be locked up in a goldfish bowl. This body has remained the shining light of democracy in the world because of the close interaction of legislators with their constituents. Cut off this contact with people and you cut off democracy.

We need not turn this Capitol into an armed camp. Nor do we need to allow the perverted minds of the perpetrators of such cowardly bombing attacks on this building to rule over our lives. We need only insure the safety and security of the people and the hallowed Halls of Congress. Technology provides us with the means to that safety and security. Now all we have to do is use it.

JOHN RUBACK OF THE MANSFIELD, TEX., NEWS MIRROR WRITES ABOUT CANCER RESEARCH

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Mr. John Ruback of the Mansfield, Tex., News Mirror expressing his thoughts on cancer research. I am hopeful that this Congress can and will provide sufficient money to take this research to its finality and find the answer to this killer disease.

The article follows:

THOUGHTS

(By John Ruback)

We are told by people who are supposed to know that the war in Viet Nam is winding down. The President promises that our troops will be out as quickly as possible.

This should give us one more leg up on the fight against inflation. And we could use a little less inflation!

I have a suggestion, though—a sugges-

tion that I make really without regard to whether the war winds down or not.

Right at this moment about one million Americans are suffering from a disease that may kill at least two-thirds of them. The other third of these million people will survive because some of the answers are already known—medical science was in time for them.

Another three million people are closely connected with this disease. They are the families of this million people.

So four million people in this country are concerned and countless millions more will become concerned as time goes on. All are waiting for science to solve the riddle of why human cells go wild and kill.

The question cancer sufferers are asking each day of their life is, "Will research find the answers in time to save my life?"

When we look at all that science has managed to do in the short time since World War II—a way to prevent the dread disease of polio, computers which solve complicated mathematical problems and decide what the tensile strength of the wings must be in order to carry jet airplanes at speeds several times faster than sound, a way to put men on the moon and send space ships to other planets—if we can do all these things, surely it is not too much to ask that a real drive be made to find a cure for cancer.

If we can spend billions of dollars for researchers to find way to a better life, why can't we match this with billions more to find answers to preserve life?

I believe that a good part of the money that is now being spent on the war could well be diverted in the days ahead to an all out effort to find a cure for cancer.

Of course, the American Cancer Society has done a tremendous amount of good work with the donations they have received over the years but it is becoming obvious that there are not the funds available to pay all the scientists who need to be put to work on finding the cause and cure of cancer. Our continuing donations are needed—but we need to prod our senators and representatives to see that more money from the federal budget is made available so that there can be a real breakthrough.

DAV DAY IN CONGRESS: A TRIBUTE TO QUIET COURAGE

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a past commander of the first chapter of the DAV in Hawaii, I consider it a high honor to be able to join in this salute to the Disabled American Veterans on the 50th anniversary of its organization.

National organizations are especially effective, both in Congress and with the general public, when they are made up of dedicated individuals who know their work not only with their minds but also with their hearts. The DAV is an outstanding example of such an organization. It commands admiration and respect because its members and officers know through their own experience what the disabled veteran needs in order to attain a useful place in society today.

Since 1920, when the Disabled American Veterans was organized under the

leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, of Cincinnati, Ohio, who became its first president, and during the period since 1932, when it was recognized by Congress as the "official voice of the Nation's wartime disabled," the need for such an organization as the DAV has grown tremendously. Thousands of disabled veterans were left bewildered and lonely in civilian society at the end of World War II. They needed understanding and legislation which would give them the special benefits which they deserved from a grateful country. Congress provided the legislation. The DAV, to its eternal credit, was there to give these disabled veterans a helping hand and to smooth the difficult transition from wartime military service to useful civilian life.

This service, performed free of charge by the DAV national service officers, working with our war-disabled, their widows, and their orphans, on the one hand, and the Veterans' Administration and other Federal agencies, on the other hand, is today an indispensable part of the American scene. Its beneficiaries number in the millions. As a Congressman, I find it a source of considerable reassurance to know that the DAV national service program will extend into the future, helping other disabled Americans as it has in the past.

We salute today not only a great organization, but also the nearly 300,000 members of that organization who individually have overcome the disabilities of war and helped their families and persons with natural handicaps face the future with renewed faith and confidence. There is a lesson in quiet courage. It is a lesson which will continue to benefit all Americans and strengthen the moral fiber of our great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES FLETCHER

HON. K. GUNN MCKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen from the State of Utah has been nominated by the President to head the Nation's Space Program.

Dr. James Fletcher, president of the University of Utah, is well qualified to serve as head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. He comes from a noted family that has distinguished itself in many ways in its service to this country. He is an able administrator and has a varied background in private industry and in public service.

Dr. Fletcher is a native of Millburn, N.J., and holds degrees from Columbia University and the California Institute of Technology where he was the first recipient of that school's Distinguished Alumni Award. He has served on over 50 national committees in recent years and has acted as chairman of 10 of those committees.

In private industry, Dr. Fletcher or-

ganized the Space Electronics Corporation and was its president from 1960 to 1962. Prior to that time, he was associate director for the Guided Missile Laboratory of the Ramo-Woolridge Corporation. He has served often in the past as a Government consultant to the Defense Department, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and, the President's Science Advisory Committee.

Dr. Fletcher was, at one time, the chairman of the board of Space General Corporation and systems vice president of Aerojet General Corporation. In July of 1964, he resigned these positions to become the eighth president of the University of Utah, a position he has held to the present time. As its president, Dr. Fletcher has led the University of Utah through the most extensive program of change in the school's history.

Dr. Fletcher is a noted research scientist and developed patents in areas from sonar devices to missile guidance systems. He served as a member of President Johnson's Science Advisory Committee and also has been on several Presidential task forces, the most recent being the Task Force on Higher Education.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a distinct honor to Utah to have a man of Dr. Fletcher's caliber picked to head one of our Nation's most successful programs. He is very capable in every respect and I feel the President has made an excellent selection in nominating Dr. James Fletcher to head NASA.

HORIZON UNLIMITED

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I had the special pleasure to attend yesterday's White House Sunday service. It was one of the most inspiring and spiritually uplifting services that I have ever attended.

It was also a special day of recognition for the State of Alabama. Former Congressman and Mrs. James D. Martin of Alabama were special guests of the President, and several other Members of Alabama's congressional delegation and their wives attended the services.

After a hymn, sung beautifully by Mrs. Martin, Rabbi Joshua O. Haberman of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, delivered an outstanding message.

Rabbi Haberman stated that we cannot make significant moral progress unless each and every one of us will accept personal responsibility and quit shifting blame on society, the environment, and the establishment. He said:

The place from which we must build the good society, the place where the revolution must begin, is within ourselves.

That is sound advice for all Americans. I want to share the rabbi's entire

text with my colleagues and hope that all shall take the opportunity to read his important and timely message:

HORIZON UNLIMITED

Mr. President, Mrs. Nixon, Distinguished Guests, Fellow Worshipers, the poet, Carl Sandburg, once opened a speech by saluting the people with two words: fellow worms!

In a flash, the relative status between God and man had been defined. In our ultimate humiliation is exaltation, said Rabbi Hillel in the Talmud. There is no true act of worship without humbling oneself before the Almighty. It is the glory of the human spirit that we are capable of transcending our natural egocentricity, that we can see ourselves, our personal concern, our power, in the perspective of the eternal: "Our little systems have their day," said the poet. (Tennyson)

As an American I rejoice in this hour in which the head of our government, from the very center of global power, replaces the call to *argument*: "Come now, and let us reason together." (Isaiah 1.18) with the psalmist's call to *worship*: "Oh, come let us worship together." (Psalm 95.6)

Ultimately, the problems which have baffled human reason for millennia can be solved only by spiritual force, such as may be tapped in the act of worship.

In January (20th) 1969, the President took the oath of office on a Bible which was opened to a text from the Prophet, Isaiah, Chapter 2.

It is from the same prophet that I have chosen a text for this morning. It is a passage which defines the major problem of civilization.

What is civilization? Civilization is pushing back the wilderness. Civilization is cutting a way thru the trackless jungle. All this is implied in Isaiah's challenge to man:

"Build up, build up

Prepare the way

Remove the stumbling block out of the way of my people."—(Isaiah 57.14)

Let us understand these words figuratively, symbolically: man's destiny is not merely growing along with nature, but building and creating. Progress does not happen. It is an artificial product. Culture is a breakthrough of order into chaos, a treading out of paths in the wilderness for, "nature red in tooth and claw" knows no order and no law.

Prepare the way: This refers to the central task of religion, to mark the main roads for the good life. One of the key words in Judaism is "halacha" which means a way of walking, a pattern of conduct which has been sanctioned by the moral consensus of the teachers.

But there is a difficulty: Remove the stumbling block out of the way of my people.

What is the stumbling block? What is this major obstacle in the way of human progress?

When Isaiah gave his talk, the audience understood immediately what he meant. The stumbling block? It was sin! Do we understand the meaning of sin?

Let us admit that for many this word has become a tired, meaningless expression.

There was a time when *sin* was a solemn, frightening word. It suggested deep-rooted evil in man, an offense against God.

Nowadays, most people use the word casually and empty of conviction.

Who was it that took the sting out of sin?

It happened 200 years ago in one of the great intellectual revolutions of all time. Jean Jacques Rousseau, in the middle of the 18th century changed our evaluation of nature and led us into an estimate of man which did away with the whole idea of sin.

At the age of 29, Rousseau arrived in Paris where he was shocked by the artificiality and

unfairness of society. After years of study, he wrote his famous "Social Contract." Some sentences of that book became the slogans of the century, such as:

"Man is born free, but everywhere he is in chains."

The stumbling block was redefined by Rousseau. Man, he said, is not sinful by nature. On the contrary, he is naturally good and would remain so if only society did not corrupt him. The stumbling block was not in man but in social institutions. The answer, therefore, was social reform which later came to mean social revolution.

Well, if Rousseau returned to the scene today, he would find society radically altered. Material standards of life have risen beyond wildest dreams. The mental blight of illiteracy is practically eliminated in the western world. The normal life span of man has been doubled since the days of Rousseau.

Yet, with all of this social progress, has the millennium come? Has man reached the perfection of which Rousseau held him capable? Why do you lock your door at night? Why do you want a policeman to patrol your block? Why don't you trust human nature?

Because underneath our theories and abstractions about noble human nature, we have made a realistic estimate of man. On the basis of our day by day experience, we know that there remains a big stumbling block, a major obstacle to confidence between man and man. There is overwhelming evidence of our moral failure. Despite all external improvements, we have an unimproved man. Some said: the caveman has not disappeared He has learned to wear a tuxedo.

Sin we have explained away;

Unluckily, the sinners stay.

A century ago, in Boston, Horace Mann said crime could be eliminated by increasing the size and number of schools in America. Surely, Princeton University is a fine school with students from excellent backgrounds. I remember reading a few years ago a report published by the Princeton University book store, announcing the loss of 200,000 dollars within four years due to shoplifting by a large number of students.

Could it be that, despite vast improvements of the social environment, the natural goodness in man just won't come out automatically? Was there something wrong with Rousseau's formula? What is the stumbling block?

I suppose many of us still hesitate to call it sin. I suppose many of us, upon seeing wrong or misconduct in a man or a woman, would blame it on a complex, neurosis or frustration. Unmanageable youths are called "maladjusted". The cause of marital friction is given as "incompatibility," and infidelity is attributed to "indiscretion" or "emotional immaturity." Any good psychiatrist can sell us one of these words for 50 dollars per hour.

Complex, neurosis, maladjustment, emotional immaturity, frustration.

In defining one of these terms, an anonymous poet intimated what we have done:

FRUSTRATION

"I never have frustration

The reason is, to wit

If, at first, I don't succeed

I quit."

We have found new labels for the old evils.

Why all this verbal masquerade? What are we trying to hide? I'll tell you what it is we're trying to hide: Responsibility. Nobody should get the blame. We are resisting responsibility with might and main. We are resisting the concept of accountability, the idea of sin, which would locate the stumbling block of evil within ourselves.

To blame our calamities on others is almost second nature with us. It has been said:

Every man needs a wife because a lot of things go wrong which you can't blame on the government.

People will come up with the most incredible excuses rather than admit their own fault:

An 88 year old man in Oklahoma City, driving a motor scooter without a license, explained his misdeed to the traffic court:

"I did not apply for a license because I thought you had to be accompanied by a parent."

We all blame our troubles on others. What's wrong with the world? The leaders, of course, the statesmen, the diplomats—it's always "they," those others, who are making trouble.

One of America's wisest old men was Judge Learned Hand. He died ten years ago at the age of 89. One of his last interviews with a reporter turned to William Shirer's book, "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," which had troubled him very deeply. What did you think about the book, asked the reporter. Judge Hand stared into space with the patient wisdom of his age, and he answered:

"You know, the trouble is that it isn't just the Nazis. It isn't just the Russians. It's human nature. Human nature through the centuries. We all have totally unreasonable and cruel ambitions."

The stumbling block is in human nature, in our defective and delinquent human nature.

I believe that I am safe in the assumption that every one assembled here in this room shares a profound concern over the mood of a large number of our youth. We ponder the meaning of such statistics as the 500,000 kids who ran away from home last year, or, the one and a half million juvenile arrests reported in a single year. The generation gap is not just a handy phrase. Something approaching an exodus from the home is taking place. Thousands are wandering off into communes. More and more of our single sons and daughters are choosing to live in separate residences, underscoring the moral and spiritual separation from the values of their families. At the extreme end are the cop-outs who have turned their backs on our whole way of life. These are grave symptoms of mutual rejection between the generations. In explanation of this phenomenon, one powerful line of argument would fault our system. We are alleged to be an oppressive society. The favorite villains are now the military-industrial complex and the CIA. Suddenly, we have developed a passion for self contempt and self abuse. The label "ugly American" was pinned upon us not by aliens but by our own native critics.

It was the so-called "ugly American" who saved mankind in World War II from the greatest menace to life and freedom in all of recorded history. When the war was over, this "ugly American" dug deep down into his pocket and paid for the rebuilding of devastated lands and industry of friend and foe through the Marshall Plan. Throughout the war and post-war tensions, the "ugly American" expanded civil rights, raised living standards, shared wealth among a larger proportion of its citizens than has ever been done in any part of the world, and tolerated dissent and protest even by extremist groups.

This land of ours is unsurpassed in its humanitarian response to smaller nations, seeking freedom and self-determination. We are moved and gratified by the President's reaffirmation of peace with justice in the Middle East and his understanding of Israel's unique problem of survival.

What would not the Jewish people in the Soviet Union give if only they could live under laws as tolerant and liberal as ours! If only they had the protection of the First Amendment, the right to practice and teach their religion.

It would be idolatrous to give America a blanket endorsement. We do *not* say, "my country, right or wrong." It is to the credit of the US that our army officers must stand public trial for alleged war atrocities.

If proven guilty, we shall have to live with this horrible blot on our national honor and conscience. Though the Mylai massacre is by no stretch of the imagination a case of genocide, no act of national atonement at this time would have greater compensatory, moral value than quick ratification by the U.S. Senate of the Genocide Convention which the President has already endorsed and recommended. We must reaffirm reverence for human life as the cardinal doctrine on which our whole democracy is based.

Like every other nation, we, too, need to purge ourselves through honest, critical soul searching. But, it would be the biggest moral cop-out if we blamed all of our problems on the so-called "system." What's wrong with the world is what's wrong with each of us multiplied three billion times. Wars are the boils in which the moral imperfections of mankind have come to a head. There are no political panaceas, no easy solutions, no clever strategies. The communist theoretician, Milovan Djilas, who broke with Marshall Tito, concluded:

"The fact is, we now see that a revolution cannot change a nation, its tendencies, and qualities and traits."

The major stumbling block, my friends, is not in any system or form of government but in the character and nature of human beings. We shall not make significant moral progress unless each and every one of us will accept personal responsibility and quit shifting blame on society, the environment and the establishment. The place from which we must build the good society, the place where the revolution must begin, is within ourselves. The inner man is the basic battleground between good and evil:

Here, a little child I stand
Lifting up my eager, hand
One is dirty, one is clean
I am the problem in between

Good and evil are the choices placed into our hands. We may rebuild the world if we remove the stumbling block within:

Build up, Build up
Prepare the way
Remove the stumbling block out of the way
of my people. Amen.

MURDER ABOLITION MOVEMENT GROWING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in recent years many controversial legislative proposals, extending from the extreme to the sublime, have been enacted into law not only by the Congress but by State and local legislative bodies. But never did I think that a measure legalizing the murder of innocents would be made a law. Yet, that is what has occurred in New York, California, Hawaii, and in some other States. I am referring to laws permitting abortion as a right.

The right to life is declared by the word of God in the Holy Bible and is also proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

Yet there has been a well-organized campaign nationwide in scope to prevent

and limit birth of people by such means as contraception, sterilization, and now even abortion. The movement to limit and destroy life, which has hitched on to the ecology and pollution fright bandwagon, is being publicized widely and frequently by the mass communication media.

Life is so precious and procreation is such a sacred duty that I find it incredible that any legislator would vote in favor of making abortion a lawful act.

Apparently, those who vote for legalizing abortion have a different conception of the meaning and purpose of life than I have. A husband and wife cooperate with God in bringing children into the world. The soul—a creation of God—of the unborn child is infused by God in the unborn child within the mother's womb.

What other purpose can there be in a moral life than to give honor and glory to God by knowing, loving, and serving Him in this world so as to be happy with Him in eternity in the life to come. It is a sin against one's creator and a crime against humanity to murder an unborn child, thereby denying it a chance to strive to fulfill its destiny.

A question to ponder for those who favor legalizing abortion for disposing of unwanted babies is this: Are you unhappy that your own mother did not have an abortion when you were inside her womb?

In our lifetime we are reminded of the guilt assessed against the German people—those responsible as well as those uninvolved—for the alleged execution of 6 million persons. Are we in America to sit back in acquiescence and have our posterity accuse us of doing nothing while a minority executes millions of innocent unborn children? In both instances the executioners can claim to have acted in a lawful manner.

Abortion like all murders solves nothing since it goes to an effect and not to a cause of the problem. In this instance the undesired effect is a child said to be unwanted by the mother. So the mother, to solve her problem, is given a license to execute her own baby. Few animals are even guilty of such bestiality.

The problem, in most instances, comes before the abortion impulse. That is through illicit sexual relations. We as humans are said to be victims of our own environment. If so, look at the generated atmosphere of sex, promiscuity, lewdness, pornography—and even in some schools and churches our young people are being sexually turned on prematurely by sex education, family planning, and overpermissiveness; in our homes lack of parental guidance and discipline is often the case; and slick magazines, TV, and movies bombard young people with such hullabaloo as sexual freedom and the right to sex.

The causes that induce abortion are traced back to immorality, sex, and sensuality which are taught or learned through environmental exposure.

If immorality like abortion can be taught, then a solution is to teach morality, pride in parenthood, and the beauty of virginity and to encourage our youth to reject a sexually inducing environment. In addition, we should strive

to rid our environment polluted by pornography, obscenity, and indecency with clean and wholesome surroundings, thereby establishing an ecological condition conducive to morality.

The abortion threat is a very tragic one. The intentional murder of thousands of innocent unborn children is worsened by the populist clamor to make the foul deed respectable and socially acceptable. We, as a people, must adhere to the word of God by enacting laws to expose and prohibit abortion for what it is—premeditated murder. The wrath of Almighty God will surely fall upon those who remain silent simply because they feel they are uninvolved.

A program of education concerning this threat and prayer for morality and human value of life should be undertaken in cities and towns throughout the land so that people are given a chance to become informed and take action to mitigate or solve the problem. Abortion should be considered an issue in the election of public officials, especially of lawmakers.

I was pleased to learn that Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, in a letter to the faithful of his Archdiocese, called attention to this immoral condition and has designated March 7 as Right to Life Sunday in the Archdiocese of Washington. I commend this outspoken religious leader for his forthright and timely action. I insert the Cardinal's letter at this point in my remarks:

ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1971.

DEAR FRIENDS IN CHRIST: I am addressing this message to you on the right to life of every individual. Life is the first among man's inalienable "rights" in the Declaration of Independence. The right to life is guaranteed every individual by the Constitution of the United States. This right begins when a child is conceived in his mother's womb and extends through childhood, youth, adulthood and old age. Each of us has a moral obligation to safeguard this right.

The helpless and innocent unborn has the right to be born. A child has the right to protection, love, support and an education. A youth has the right to expect understanding and guidance from those who have this responsibility. An adult has the right to life assured by the laws of God and man. The aged person has the right to essential care and comfort he cannot provide for himself.

Yet we see these rights threatened and violated on every side. In the District of Columbia and Maryland, there are those who would make slaughter of the unborn easier of accomplishment by the further liberalization of the existing laws on abortion. This is both morally and legally wrong.

In order that we may direct our attention to this alarming and dangerous development in our midst, I am asking all the faithful in the Archdiocese of Washington to observe the "Right to Life Sunday" on March 7. On this occasion, I urge all of us to give serious and prayerful thought to the evils of abortion, and resolve to exert every effort to stem the current movement to legalize abortion on demand.

Praying God's blessing upon you, I am
Faithfully yours in Christ,
PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE,
Archbishop of Washington.

A constituent recently sent me a newspaper which is largely devoted to a discussion of the abortion problem. The

newspaper is called the Educator, of Fullerton, Calif., and is edited by Mr. James Townsend. The Educator is an excellent newspaper in that it promotes morality, patriotism, free enterprise, constitutional government—those ideas, concepts, and practices which have made America strong spiritually as well as materially.

It is encouraging to know that Right-to-Life units are being formed across the Nation and to learn about what concerned mothers are doing to protect the rights of the unborn.

The articles on abortion are most enlightening. I urge that they be widely read.

I insert articles from the Educator following my remarks:

The right to life is guaranteed in the United States Declaration of Independence as an unalienable right "endowed by their (man's) Creator" along with the right to liberty and the right to the pursuit of happiness.

That right to life, has been recognized by the courts as applying to a person from conception to death—although some would deny the person his right with laws permitting abortion of unborn human beings and the practice of euthanasia or so-called "mercy killing" on those human beings who have reached older years and perhaps harder times.

Across this land Right To Life Committees are being formed to combat the genocide prone abortionist and their fellow traveling, lawmaking stooges.

What kind of people make up the leadership in these Right To Life Committees? The Educator cannot of course, list chairman from the hundreds of areas where these committees have formed, but a profile of Dr. John Grady, chairman of the Florida Right To Life group, will give you an idea.

Dr. Grady is a 30-year-old family physician who has 10 years experience in obstetrics and is Chief of Staff at Glades General Hospital in Belle Glades.

He is mayor of the city of Belle Glades and a member of the executive committee of the Palm Beach County League of Municipalities, and past president of the Belle Glades Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. Grady is a director of the Palm Beach County unit of the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association and a medical examiner for the State Attorney's office.

He and his wife, Carol, are the parents of two sons and a daughter.

U.S. JEWS SPLIT OVER ABORTION ISSUE

NEW YORK.—The abortion issue is no respecter of ethnic lines. American Jews, like other race and language groups, are split over the question.

One of the leading pro-abortionists is Miss Merle Goldberg of New York. She is executive director of a group that sponsors the Women's Abortion Clinic in that city.

Speaking after the death of an abortion patient, Miss Goldberg said she hoped the fatality would not deter women from seeking abortions if necessary.

However, Rabbi Joseph Karasick, president of New York's Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, and Rabbi Bernard L. Berzon, president of the Rabbinical Council of America, took a less liberal tack.

The Orthodox leaders said that to terminate a pregnancy for arbitrary reasons was "literally for man to play God and is religiously blasphemous and socially destructive."

A joint statement issued by the two rabbis stated, no woman is the "final arbiter about the disposition of her body and the embryonic human life flourishing therein. Doctors, too, must face up to the moral dilemma; whether they can play havoc with the basic

worth and dignity of human life when they freely perform abortion."

In an added explanation, after issuance of the statement, Rabbi Karasick quoted the Talmud, "who so shed the blood of man within his blood shall be shed." This passage has been traditionally interpreted as constituting a commandment against killing of unborn children," he said.

The statement was aimed at New York's permissive abortion law that went into effect July 1.

DOES THE FETUS HAVE A SOUL? THE BIBLE ANSWERS

(By Sam Campbell)

When national and state legislators throughout the country began a synchronized push for easy abortion, they stepped into the religious arena.

Persons of Roman Catholic and fundamentalist Christian convictions are especially concerned, but they are not the only ones.

Orthodox Jews likewise are perfectly aware that the new permissiveness runs directly counter to Biblical teaching and culture.

It will come as a surprise to many that the most vocal spokesman against child killing was neither Christian nor Jewish, but Moslem. He was, in fact, the founder of Islam—Mohammed I. The prophet declaimed mightily against the then common practice in the Mideast of burying girl babies alive when the parents preferred a boy.

BLOODLESS KILLING

This practice was a sort of returning to the womb, or post-natal abortion, regarded as permissible because the killing did not involve the shedding of blood. This strained reasoning left the parent with the impression that his hands were clean.

One of the touching stories of Mohammed's era is the account of a fierce Bedouin chief who was said to have shed his first tear when his tiny daughter brushed a clod of sand from his beard as the father was placing her living body into a desert grave. To Mohammed's fiery preaching goes the credit for persuading his contemporaries that they were committing a hideous abomination; thereafter the crime was greatly diminished in Moslem areas.

In this country, of course, most people of religious faith are either Christians or Jews. The doctrines of major influence upon their culture come from the Bible. This elaborate document embraces an estimated 6,000 years of experience. Directly or indirectly, these Scriptures speak on every conceivable human problem and lay down principles for their solution. The Bible speaks both directly and indirectly on the question of abortion.

EYE FOR EYE

For example, the ancient law "eye for eye, tooth for tooth" is familiar to most persons, but few would recall that such law was specifically to deal with a type of abortion. The complete quotation (Exodus 21:22-25) gives the context:

"If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follows; he shall be surely punished, according as the woman's husband will lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine.

"And if any mischief follows, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."

The context clearly deals with an abortion that takes place in the course of other violence where the parties involved do not take care to avoid harm to an expectant mother and to the child that she carries. The crime is unthinking neglect that causes the loss of an unborn infant. When you bring this picture up to modern times, in which the abortion is performed by a doctor in a hospital, the chief

moral change is that the deed was committed intentionally instead of accidentally. It is settled law that willfulness does not mitigate a crime.

Abortions performed by qualified medical personnel with the consent of the mother do raise a question of whether there is a stage at which the fetus is only an attachment to the mother, and does not have an identity apart from her. Obviously, there is a period in early gestation when the fetus cannot live without its host. Does the fetus, being attached to another physical body, yet have a distinguishable soul?

The question of the separate identity of the fetus is the key to a moral decision on the abortion issue. For if the fetus does not have a soul of its own, but rather is only a fleshly appendage to the mother, then its removal would have no more moral implication than an appendectomy. On the other hand, if the unborn child has a soul independent of the soul of its mother, the bodily dependence upon the mother is not the only factor involved, and, from a non-material moral standpoint, is not the major consideration. What does the Bible say on this subtle, but critical point?

IDENTITY BEGINS EARLY

According to the Scripture, the separate identity of the fetus begins very early. Some faiths hold that there is a pre-life, or in other words that the soul existed even before its eventual body was conceived. Psalm 22:9 says, "I was cast upon thee from the womb; thou art my God from mother's body." The prophet Isaiah in a series of passages refers to the life of the soul even in the fetal stage, notably "Thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, who will help thee . . ." (Isaiah 44:2).

Those are quotations from the Old Testament. The Christian Scriptures are vivid on the same point. Luke, a physician of the times, writes of a visit that Mary who was to become the mother of Jesus paid to Elisabeth who was to become the mother of John the Baptist.

"And it came to pass," Luke wrote (1:41-44), "that, when Elisabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. And she spoke out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And why is this granted to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy greeting sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy."

As a doctor, Luke noted the lengths of the respective gestations. John the Baptist was then six months toward development, and Jesus had been conceived a matter of a few days previous to the meeting of the mothers. The manifestation on the part of John was evidence of his identity, apart from his mother, and was a response to another identity; namely, that of Jesus.

Let us explain that not all persons accept the Scripture as precise. The object here is not to argue the matter, but to note that the traditional Roman Catholic does place a literal and specific interpretation on the Bible, and the non-Catholic fundamentalist does likewise. The two combined are not an inconsiderable segment of society, either in numbers of influence. Both would conclude from the quoted passages that the soul joins the body at an early point in development, perhaps at conception.

DISASTER FOR POLITICIANS

This much would be certain to a wider number, that if a doctor willfully kills a baby a second after it's born, he is a murderer. If he does the same thing two seconds earlier, he may be legally clear under the new laws, but his moral guilt is not removed. In Christian sight, the body and soul of an unborn

infant are not less significant than those of a grown man because Christ paid the same price to redeem both.

State and Federal legislators have involved themselves, therefore, in a religious war. Political survivors of religious controversy are most notable for their scarcity. The battle will be long, without quarter or compromise, extremely costly and ruinous to the ambitions of many.

FETUS IS KNOWLEDGEABLE, SCIENCE NOW CLAIMS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Medical science has caught up with the Bible in showing that the unborn infant is an independent human form.

Up to the 17th century, medical men accepted Aristotle's teaching that 40 to 80 days after conception the fetus underwent a transformation that placed him in the human class. In other words, the view was that the fetus changed in kind about six to twelve weeks after conception.

Holy Writ, however, sets the beginning of identity even earlier.

The Gospel according to Luke (Chapter I) in the New Testament describes the reaction of John the Baptist when he was in the sixth month in the womb of his mother. At that time, according to the physician Luke, he did "leap with joy." The occasion of his joy was the presence of the person of his Saviour, Jesus, then but a few days from conception. So, in the view of Luke and of all those who accept the Christian Scriptures as literal truth, not only did John the Baptist have a soul three months before his birth, but Jesus Christ did also nearly nine months before His birth.

From the Christian view, the identity of the unborn is a measureable factor since Christ left his royal estate, took human form and submitted to a public execution in order to save "whosoever believeth in him." The life of Jesus, therefore, is the price that God is willing to pay for a human soul.

In the mid 1960s, the relatively recent science of fetology served to confirm Dr. Luke's insights. In a volume titled "Modern Motherhood," two pioneering fetologists, Dr. Lilley and wife, stated:

"The fluid that surrounds the human fetus at 3, 4, 5 and 6 months, is essential to both its grace. The unborn's structure at this early stage is highly liquid, and although his organs have developed, he does not have the same relative bodily proportions that a new born baby has.

"The head, housing the miraculous brain, is quite large in proportion to the remainder of the body and the limbs are still relatively small. Within his watery world, however where we have been able to observe him in his natural state by closed circuit x-ray television set, he is quite beautiful and perfect in his fashion, active and graceful. He is neither an acquiescent vegetable nor a witless tadpole as some have conceived him to be in the past, but rather a tiny human being as independent as though he were lying in a crib with a blanket wrapped around him instead of his mother."

A psychologist Dr. Hellegers in "Fetal Development" adds his testimony to the same point. In addition to studying motion-picture X-rays, he watched direct simulation and reaction of the fetus. Specifically a means was found to tickle the embryo with a hair. The unborn baby reacted. Here are Dr. Hellegers' own words:

"After the second week of pregnancy the zygote rapidly becomes more complex and is now called the embryo.

"Somewhere between the third and fourth week, the differentiation of the embryo will have been sufficient for heart pumping to occur, although the heart will by no means yet have reached its final configuration.

"At the end of six weeks all of the internal organs of the fetus will be present, but as yet in a rudimentary stage.

"The blood vessels leading from the heart will have been fully deployed, although they too will continue to grow in size with growth of the fetus.

"By the end of seven weeks tickling of the mouth and nose of the developing embryo with a hair will cause it to flex its neck, while at the end of eight weeks there will be readable electrical activity coming from the brain. The meaning of the activity cannot be interpreted.

"By now also the fingers and toes will be fully recognizable. Sometimes between the ninth and the tenth week local reflexes appear such as swallowing, squinting, and tongue retraction.

"By the tenth week spontaneous movement is seen, independent of stimulation.

"By the eleventh week thumbsucking has been observed and X-rays of the fetus at this time show clear details of the skeleton.

After twelve weeks the fetus, now 3½ inches in size, will have completed its brain structure, although growth of course will continue."

ABORTED BABY COMES OUT ALIVE, SURVIVES 11 HOURS

LOS ANGELES—Investigation into an abortion has ended here with no criminal charges being filed.

The investigation hinged on the death of a three-pound baby girl who lived 11½ hours after the intended abortion that was triggered by a physician's needle.

According to Inspector John W. Powers of the Los Angeles Police Department's Central Homicide Division, a "misconstruction as far as the length of gestation" led to the therapeutic abortion which resulted in the child's death.

Except for the length of gestation, the abortion was carried out under the provisions of the Therapeutic Abortion Act of Nov. 8, 1967 introduced by State Sen. Beilenson (D-26th).

Powers said the "misconstruction" was made by the doctor who conducted the abortion, John Jacob Hale, 22554 Ventura Blvd., Woodland Hills.

The misconstruction as to the length of gestation was partially explained by the 16-year-old mother of the aborted child.

According to the District Attorney's rejection of the complaint report, the mother indicated that "she told (Hale) the date of her last normal menstrual period was Dec. 27, 1969."

The report continues, "abortion was performed on April 29, 1970. Two days later a girl was born and determined to be in the sixth month of gestation."

Other evidence indicates the Wolfe baby was even further along.

The police report indicates that the abortion method was the saline technique. In this procedure a salt or sugar solution is injected into the womb. The effect of the salt concentration is to draw water from the body of the unborn child, in other words to dry the fetus out and cause it to shrink.

If, therefore, the Wolfe baby weighed three pounds in a shrunken condition, it may have weighed even more before the abortion procedure was begun.

Normally, a baby will triple its weight in the last two months of gestation. In such cases, an infant weighing nine pounds at birth would be seven months in gestation at three pounds weight.

Had the date of the last menstrual period been correct, the gestation period would have been just over four months.

According to the child's death certificate, she died of atelectasis, insufficient development of the lungs. "Doctors at the Canoga Park Hospital indicated (that) any doctor

should have been able to tell she was further along in the pregnancy than (the mother) claimed," the report said.

"In this situation, two doctors examined the victim and accepted her statement regarding her last menstrual period. Another doctor said she may be further along than she claims; while two other doctors claim, after the birth of the child, that any doctor should have known."

Dr. Louis Schneidman, 360 N. Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills, performed a psychiatric examination of the young mother. The report said he "recommended a termination and stated (that) she appeared to be further advanced than she claimed."

Schneidman is also a staff doctor at the Canoga Park Hospital.

The report concluded that there was insufficient evidence to support criminal charges.

HOW THE PRO-ABORTIONISTS DEFEND THEIR CASE

(By James Townsend)

Don't think for a minute that the abortionists lack an argument.

You will hear such arguments not only from the abortionists themselves, but from the legislators they control, from the press, and from the thousands on thousands of confused persons whom they influence.

Some people are confused merely because they have not thought about the subject long enough to discern the spiritual issue involved. In fact, the editors of *The Educator* were surprised to discover how deeply they had ventured when they began to assemble information for this issue. Other persons are confused even though they know the spiritual issue because they lack spiritual commitment, and hence are blown this way and that by every plausible wind.

Plausibility and half-truth are the chief tools of Satan. He puts pleasing speech on the lips of pleasant people, not infrequently of even good people. And so many are misled thereby.

The most frequent argument in behalf of abortion is the rape argument. The reasoning goes that a woman should not be compelled to bear a child from a union in which she was an involuntary participant. This argument finds a sympathetic reception normally from the sheer horror of the idea that a mother must needs be reminded of her assailant even while she cares for the infant in her arms.

Once a concession is gained in favor of abortion of pregnancy resulting from rape, the abortionists then push forward with other arguments—the right of a woman to command her own body, the right of parents to determine the size of their family, etc.

So far as the rape argument is concerned, ordinary judgment supplies the answer. First, many cases of so-called rape have been proved in court to be morning-after remorse on the part of the supposed victim; seduction would be a more accurate description of the crime. There are, of course, bona fide cases of rape. Of these, many and perhaps most are statutory, not actual copulation, but a touching of an unwilling woman for that purpose. Though the crime justifiably is described as "rape"—and legally is rape—pregnancy does not result because there was no sexual union.

In the relatively rare case of an actual consummated rape, medical science tells us that pregnancy would be unlikely because of the extraordinary trauma and the terror of the moment on the part of the woman. As any parent would understand, that is not the condition conducive to conception. Even then, the woman who has been raped knows what has happened and can be expected to seek prompt medical treatment before the fertilized ovum, if any, begins to develop. With the chemicals available to modern medicine for such treatment pregnancy under

this set of conditions is virtually unknown. In all the literature that we have read on the subject, we have not heard of a single case. Certainly, there is less warrant now than ever before to use rape as a pretext for repeal of the law that forbids murder of the unborn.

Laying aside arguments that rest primarily on emotion and going to the sheer right and wrong of the matter, the abortion question turns on whether the fetus has an identity or whether it is simply a fleshly projection of the mother. This is a religious question, and *The Educator* discusses it from that standpoint under the heading "What the Bible Says About Abortion" in this issue.

From the rational viewpoint, Robert Lefevre, president of Rampart College (Santa Ana, Calif.), states the question provocatively in the fall, 1970 issue of *RAP*, a college magazine. He writes:

"No matter how the question of pregnancy and abortion is examined, the fact remains that a bald statement that the pregnant woman has a right to remove the fetus or even embryo, proclaims in effect the concept that the child has no rights at all. Yet a reverse statement, which says that the pregnant woman may not have an abortion unless her social peers approve, is to deny the woman the rights she naturally has over her own person. How can this apparent conflict of rights be resolved?"

Yet, if God is the author of all rights (God being completely consistent and free of all contradiction), how can His decree of what is right come into conflict? Mr. Lefevre is reluctant to say that rights actually collide, but he does say that "whenever human rights APPEAR to be in collision, a state of conflict ensues." He classes unwanted pregnancy as "a natural condition in which it appears that human rights may be in collision." He writes:

"What appears to be the case, as I look at it, is that both the life within the womb and the life of the mother are morally justified. Both have their rights. And, therefore, pregnancy, from the moment of conception until delivery, is a condition wherein the rights of two human beings appear to be in conflict. If the mother wants the child, there is no conflict. If she doesn't, then what?"

Mr. Lefevre illustrates the dilemma with a less emotional example. He gives an imaginary case where a father brings home a pony and gives it to his twin sons, saying to each, "This is your pony." The father, in this hypothetical case, then dies, removing the possibility that he can be consulted and thus alter his decision. How is such a matter to be judged? Lefevre says, "There are only four possible solutions to any conflict in which rights appear to be opposed. You can win. You can lose. You can compromise. Or you retain the conflict. No other possible solutions exist."

Then he relates this APPARENT collision of rights to the woman who finds herself with an unwanted pregnancy. And he renders his decision:

"Suppose a woman decides to have an abortion. Let us admit that this may very well be an immoral act. Let the woman as well as the man involved, carry the burden . . . Rather than passing laws permitting abortions under certain conditions or preventing them in others, suppose we simply abolish all laws relating to pregnancy?"

What Mr. Lefevre has done in his gracious manner is fail to solve the problem. Mr. Lefevre believes in absolute property rights and that problems can be solved on the proposition that you find the boundary line that separates those properties. What is on one side belongs to A. What is on the other side belongs to B. In actuality, he failed to apply his own philosophy.

The woman's body is her own, by gift of God, until she engages in activity that invites a guest to share it with her for a period

of time, roughly nine months. Having entered into that solemn obligation, she is bound by the law of God and nature not to disturb the tenant. She had a property right in her body and she, for a consideration, voluntarily relinquished a part of that right to another. Her body no longer is completely her own. That is what pregnancy means.

Mr. Lefevre's conclusion "suppose we simply abolish all laws relating to pregnancy" can be defeated by the very example he cited—the case of the twin boys having an undivided interest in one pony. Mr. Lefevre says that situation has four, and only four, possible solutions: win, lose, compromise or keep fighting. Applying his reasoning on abortion to the pony conflict, we must suppose that one twin kills the other, and society should look on helplessly while the crime takes place.

So we can imagine that Mr. Lefevre would pen another article in his charming libertarian manner. We envision him as writing: "Suppose that a twin decides to commit murder. Let us admit that this may very well be an immoral act. Let the surviving brother as well as any accessories involved carry the burden . . . Rather than passing laws permitting murder under certain conditions or preventing them in others, suppose we simply abolish all laws relating to human life and the retention thereof."

Proponents for abortion and fellow apologists may argue themselves and others into utter confusion, but the answer always comes up the same. When you look at the fetus that has been removed from the sanctuary that it occupied by God-given right, you see a human form. The taking of human life is a matter of moment to society for to regard human life lightly sets a precedent that poses a potential danger to every member of society.

Furthermore, it is almost impossible for the mother to have removed the life form by herself. She had to have the help of a medical agent. So she involves a third party, a member of society not directly related to the pregnancy. She enlists him to do the killing that she had not the skill to perform. Even though the act is committed in secrecy, that is no more a claim for justified privacy than that stealth is a good excuse for murder. Yes, the answer always comes up the same. It is always spelled with the same six letters. It always comes up murder.

LIBS SHIFT POSITION WHEN THEY HEAR ABOUT L.I.F.E.

Pro-abortion supporters and their elected political lackies, have just begun to realize the powerful force the anti-abortion groups have mustered against them.

In Orange County, a group called LIFE has become a force that politicians must reckon with. Headed by an attorney, the group membership already exceeds 1,000 members.

Like hundreds of other groups across the country opposed to abortions, Life has made a number of political candidates back off their stand for abortion.

Veteran congressman Blank now seeking a 5th term in office, found it necessary to repudiate his own party platform as a result of their stand on abortion. Blank, already in danger of being defeated by candidate Blank, evidently thought Life and their membership, would finish his political career. Therefore, Congressman Blank, wanted no part of a pro-abortionist tag.

Blank's attempt to disassociate himself from the democratic party, "pro-abortion stand," may have come too late to save his seat in Congress. A Life spokesman told the *Educator*, "we don't trust him as far as we can throw him, and this twelfth hour attempt to save his floundering campaign, just won't work."

The Life spokesman also took Assemblyman Kenneth Cory, Anaheim, to task, claim-

ing, that Cory voted in favor of SB 542 on August 17, 1970, and then after he saw the bill passed with more votes than was needed, asked for and received permission of the Assembly, to change to a no vote.

Cory did the same thing, according to the Life spokesman, on August 21, 1970, when he first voted yes on SB 543, and then, after the bill passed, received permission from the Assembly to have the record show a no vote.

If Cory thinks Life Members and their supporters will be fooled by his political chicanery, the anti-abortion spokesman said, he is in for a surprise.

Life is headed by Robert L. Sassone, and is located at 615 W. Civic Center Drive, Santa Ana, California, phone 547-9167. Other officers are, Ernie Cody, a scientist, Vice Pres., Rev. Ritz Tadema, a Protestant minister, Mauvis Mills, flower shop owner, and Nicki Scott, a legal secretary.

Life sends out trained speakers with hand-outs and audio-visual aids, upon request. Life also helps train speakers for other groups, church, etc.

Life maintains an abortion library and can answer tough questions relating to abortion, population expansion, pollution and practically anything else in that field.

The Santa Ana group works with other anti-abortion groups around the country, plus all the local ones. Their fight against the abortionist, has already resulted in several thousand democrats being re-registered into the republican party in protest of the democratic party's stand on the abortion issue.

The *Educator* would not be the least bit surprised to find many veterans now holding office via their election as Democrats, go down to defeat in November over the abortion issue.

If Life and other anti-abortion groups carry out their threat to vote against any candidate supporting the abortion issue, office seekers in both parties may find themselves looking for another job after the votes are tallied in November.

HOW MEDICS KILL UNBORN INFANTS

Webster's dictionary defines abortion as "the expulsion of the human fetus prematurely, particularly at any time before it is viable."

The definition no longer is adequate legally or medically.

Under the liberalized abortion laws, passed by many state legislatures and under consideration by others, the time element is not a factor. In some of the legislation, the fetus could be expunged a few moments before birth, and the baby's death would qualify as an abortion instead of a murder.

Medically, abortion is no longer limited to expulsion of the fetus. The unborn can be removed in other ways.

Principal methods are (1) suffocation, (2) crushing, (3) incision, (4) saline solution, (5) quartering, and (6) dilation and curettage (D & C).

Suffocation technique—A tube resembling a small vacuum cleaner is inserted into the mother. It sucks up material in the womb including the fetus. The vacuum is sufficient strong to tear the limbs of the child in some cases, but the common result is suffocation.

Crushing technique—Entrance to the womb is dilated. A large forceps is inserted. Working by touch alone, the surgeon locates the fetus, or parts. According to Dr. H. P. Dunn, a Fellow of the Royal Colleges of Surgeons and of the Royal College of Gynecologists and Obstetricians, the surgeon "gives a tug—a tiny arm comes away; then other fragments of the body. The head is always difficult; the skull gets crushed; the eyeballs protrude. All the time the bleeding is profuse."

Incision technique—Dr. Dunn describes

the method as follows: "The woman has a general anaesthetic, an abdominal incision, the womb is incised from top to bottom and the baby lifted out. It makes some weak movement of its arms and legs, and tries to breathe. Sometimes it manages a pathetic cry like a kitten; then after a few minutes it dies an asphyxial death and dies coldly in a stainless steel bowl."

Saline solution—Dr. Dunn description: "A large needle is inserted through the abdomen into the womb and a strong solution of salt or glucose is injected. The baby can be felt to make a few convulsive movements, and within a few minutes it dies. In about 24 hours labor starts and the already disintegrating baby is delivered."

Quartering—This consists of drawing a deep x in the baby's mid-section or neck with a knife.

Dilation and Curettage—This operation sometimes issued in cases not connected with abortion. In the case of abortion, Dr. Charles E. Rice in "The Vanishing Right to Live" quotes Dr. Alan Guttmacher of the World Population—Planned Parenthood Association: "A sharp curette is then inserted to the top of the fundus with very little force, for it is during this phase that the uterus is most likely to be perforated. Moderate force can be safely exerted on the down stroke. The whole uterine cavity is curetted with short strokes, by visualizing a clock and making a stroke at each hour. The curette is then withdrawn several times bringing out pieces of placenta and sac. A small ovum forceps is then inserted and the cavity tonged for tissue, much like an oysterman tonging for oysters . . . In pregnancies beyond the seventh week, fetal parts are recognizable as they are removed piecemeal."

HITLERS BORN, NOT MADE, UNESCO SCIENTIST CLAIMS

PARIS—The U.N. Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is considering abortions as a method of eliminating fetuses that might, in its judgment, turn out to be Hitlers.

Dr. David A. Hamburg, Stanford University psychiatry professor, told an international scientific meet that research had linked the presence in mothers of abnormally high amounts of testosterone, the male sex hormone, with aggressiveness in their children. Reuters news agency reported the meeting.

Hamburg envisioned the time when a doctor and his patient might choose abortion to prevent the birth of an extremely aggressive individual.

JAPAN PUSHING TO AVOID A DECLINE

TOKYO—Japanese politicians and economists, after 25 years of unrestricted abortions, have suddenly started to worry about a nation of old people with a built-in labor shortage.

Following World War II, Japanese politicians afflicted with the Atom Bomb syndrome, adopted the attitude now pushed by the people depopulators in the U.S., namely, that a woman was the only one that had the right to control her body.

The results of this permissive thinking resulted in so many abortions that it staggers the imagination. It has been estimated that over 50 million babies have been aborted in Japan since 1945.

Estimates of the Japanese population in 1945 were around 95 million people, and 25 years later, the population is estimated at 103.5 million, a gain of approximately 8 million. In only 10 years, the U.S. population advanced over 20 million.

Japan is a country almost exactly the same size as California and yet, with a population of five times that of California, they are worried about a declining birth rate.

Last year Governor Saburo Kamaru of Kagoshima province began a "more babies" campaign in an effort to stem the declining birth rate.

The official aim was to get Kagoshima women to have at least three children, Governor's aides admit the campaign has not yet caught on.

A MOTHER BATTLES FOR THE CHILDREN OF ALL

BEVERLY HILLS, Calif.—A Beverly Hills mother is carrying the hopes of concerned parents throughout the state as she battles for a seat in the California state senate.

Meeting with supporters from Orange County towns ranging from Anaheim to Corona del Mar, and all stops in between, Mrs. Shipp said the reason for her widespread support—financially and morally, since countians cannot vote for her—is due to the "anti-God measures placed before the Senate by my opponent, Anthony Bellenson."

Specifically, Mrs. Shipp was talking about Bellenson's liberal abortion bill that is now up for consideration in Sacramento, although Mrs. Shipp added that her opponent is "also against tax exemption for churches, has voted against every single anti-pornography measure and most of his other bills have been on the side of anti-family, anti-church and anti-God."

Bellenson's bill, which would virtually wipe out any laws dealing with abortion, has caused a statewide furor, with citizen committees being formed statewide to fight the measure.

For instance, two committees were formed in Orange County specifically to help defeat the Bellenson bill.

One of the committees is made up largely of members of St. Barbara's (Roman Catholic) parish in Santa Ana, in tandem with other citizen groups that were originally designed to fight other issues.

A second committee, formed just this week, is a broad based organization made up of residents of the city of Anaheim, a committee that includes clergymen and physicians of both Protestantism and Catholicism, as well as laymen from a variety of church backgrounds.

Mrs. Shipp, a member of the Episcopal Church, is a resident of the Cheviot Hills section of Beverly Hills and has been active in literally dozens of clubs and civic organizations including Boy Scouts, Episcopal Church lay work; Chamber of Commerce; Ebell Club; Cheviot Hills Garden Club; Music Center Building Fund Blue Ribbon Committee; Children's Hospital Auxiliary; American Guild of Authors and Composers; Cheviot Hills Homeowners Association; Junior Philharmonic Committee; United Republicans of California; Neighborhood Youth Association and various Republican groups.

"I never dreamed I would be running for political office," she told an admiring group of women who met with her at a bayside home in Newport Beach Tuesday to pledge their support in her campaign.

Supporters in the county rationalize their participation in her campaign by stating that Bellenson, her Democrat opponent, is soliciting help from throughout the state, "especially in the San Francisco area."

"Furthermore," she said, "the bills submitted by Bellenson directly involve every taxpayer in this state."

In that sense, she said, the state Senate office is always a "statewide" office rather than regional as far as the welfare of the voters is concerned.

Mrs. Sharp drew a laugh from her audience when she told them that her husband has always been somewhat negative about her involvement in civic activities but is backing her completely on this issue.

"He told me it was the only important thing I've ever done," she said, adding that

she thought the birth of her two children was fairly important, also.

The 26th district in which Mrs. Shipp is campaigning embraces such diverse areas as Venice, Beverly Hills, Exposition Park and Baldwin Hills.

However, it is the very diversity of the area that encourages her.

"The Beverly Hills area is generally very liberal," she said, adding that even there she has begun to receive support from some surprising circles.

At the same time, she said, she feels she will run very well in the Negro areas of Baldwin Hills and Exposition Park, "since they see abortion and family planning as a genocidal attack upon their race," she said.

With Conrad Hilton as her campaigning treasurer, Mrs. Shipp said she is confident that she will "be able to raise the \$80,000 it will take to beat my opponent."

ABORTIONS ACCOUNT FOR ONE OF FIVE PREGNANCY DEATHS

LOS ANGELES.—New legislation, proposed on behalf of the abortion mills, characteristically cite health of the mother as justification for the operation.

The implied assumption is that abortion is safer than pregnancy.

Official vital statistics, however, fail to sustain that common notion.

An analysis is contained in a brilliant appeal brief filed by Attorney Robert L. Sassone or behalf of an amicus curiae in "The United States vs. Milan Vuitah," U.S. Supreme Court, for the October 1970 term.

The details of the case are prolonged and will not be recited here. The statistics presented by Attorney Sassone are pertinent and stand on their own feet.

Mr. Sassone begins by pointing out the basis of the belief that abortion is not as risky as pregnancy. U.S. Vital Statistics, he explains, indicate a death rate from pregnancy of 0.5 persons per 100,000. The same source reports 0.1 deaths per 100,000 are caused by abortion, leaving 0.4 deaths per 100,000 caused by complications of pregnancy other than abortions.

"Superficially," Mr. Sassone states, "it appears that pregnancy is four times as dangerous as abortion." So many persons are likely to be misled until they get the rest of the story. Here are the facts that have not been disclosed to the public print hereto.

"The white death rate from pregnancy," Mr. Sassone continues, "is less than 30 percent of the non-white death rate from pregnancy, showing that proper medical care would greatly reduce the 0.4 per 100,000 death rate from pregnancy."

This one sentence stands as a strong indictment of the medical care accorded in obstetric cases to the Negro population, that is the target of the current genocide-through-abortion campaign.

In other words, out of 10 million white pregnancies, you can expect 12 mothers to die of complications therefrom. But out of the same number of Negro pregnancies, the rate would be 29 deaths. If Negro deaths were reduced to the white level, the death rate from pregnancy would be cut drastically.

Yet a more important piece of the jigsaw puzzle is that the abortion-death rate is unduly low for the reason that the legal standards hereto were more stringent and the number of abortions was kept down. Even so, deaths resulting from abortion were running at one-fourth the deaths resulting from pregnancies. As the number of abortions per 100,000 climbs, the number of deaths per 100,000 can be expected to climb also.

The first month of New York City's experience under the liberalized law was three deaths in the first 1,000 operations. There is no way to apply these figures on a per 100,000 population basis. New York health authorities indicated they would tolerate three deaths per 100,000 operations (not per 100,-

000 population) so the abortion death rate there for that one month was 100 times greater than the highest tolerable limit.

A NURSE'S STORY: "I WOULD NEVER BE ABLE TO CLOSE MY EYES AT NIGHT . . ."

(By Pat Jones, R.N.)

(Editor's note: Mrs. Robert Jones is a wife and mother as well as a nurse. She has assisted at many births. She told The Educator she cannot separate the sight of any baby from the thought of her own children. "I would never be able to close my eyes at night," she said, "without that little face flashing through the dark. My conscience would never let me help an abortionist." In the following article she explains in detail.)

I am a nurse. All my life I have been devoted to preserving health.

Women come to the medical profession carrying babies in their arms—and carrying babies under their hearts.

Married and unmarried alike, they come—with the married mother leaning on the strong arm of her husband.

But for the unmarried mother there is no such strength for her weakness, no thrill of joy that life is about to come into the world—and my heart goes out to her, my heart often breaks for her, because she cannot share life's greatest moment with the one she loves.

How beautiful is that moment of newly created life—when lungs take air for the first time and the cry of the child announces triumphantly that he has arrived, whole and well and eager to start the great adventure.

It is then that I turn away and weep, silently perhaps, but nonetheless I weep for the mother who cannot hold that bright new life up to the wondering eyes of her husband—because she has no husband.

THAT NEW LIFE IS STILL A BABY

But still, that new life is the same as the life produced by the mother whose husband is waiting to take the lively new infant home to those shiny new toys.

There is the baby, beautifully formed, lying securely in the arms of his mother—married or not.

The child knows nothing about his father—he knows only that he is loved by one, and for now, that is all that matters.

But how many babies will not lie warm and secure in the arms of their mothers—because their life has been terminated, violently, horribly terminated by abortion.

Suffocated, crushed and dismembered, the beating heart of the tiny child is mangled and torn in an act called abortion.

Abortion. It sounds clinical and impersonal, like an appendix removal or a tonsillectomy.

But there is this difference. That tiny child—expelled by force from its warm and secure place inside its mother's body—is flushed down the drain, incinerated or tossed into a stainless steel bucket, there to slowly suffocate and die—alone and unloved.

Without the cool efficient hands of the abortionist, that miniature human being might still be functioning perfectly within its protective environment at the moment it takes its last strangled breath.

SUDDENLY THE ENVIRONMENT IS DESTROYED

It might still be functioning when the surgical instrument crushes its skull inside its protecting environment, or cuts through its flesh as arms and legs are mangled, torn and dismembered one by one.

You say it is not a child. Ah, but have you watched one cry out as it is disposed of as waste through hideous mutilation?

Have you looked at it and realized that it could even survive, despite the cruel shock of being torn from its protecting place, if it were to receive skilled medical care—because

it has reached the age when the possibility of surviving in the world is a fact.

It doesn't matter to the child if there is a father waiting for it—it only knows, or will one day know, that it somehow survived the ghastly ordeal.

But the abortionist is not interested in preserving the tiny breath of life, for now his skills are used to exterminate life, to kill.

Yes, abortion is a coldly clinical term—and the proposed or enacted laws allow the mother to decide for herself, exclusively, if that child is to live or die.

No one asks the father. No one asks the unborn infant. No one asks the creator of us all.

My heart goes out to the unmarried woman who is pregnant—but it goes out also to the baby that will never grow to feel the sun and the rain on its face, that will never know the warm glow of love or the terms of sorrow, that will never bounce a bright rubber ball down a flower filled hill.

I am a nurse. My life is dedicated to saving of the lives of others. Pray with me for the restoration of the sanity of healing.

LIBERAL RC PRIEST CAUGHT IN DILEMMA

Granfield is a liberal Roman Catholic priest who is caught on the horns of a real dilemma over the matter of abortion and abortion laws.

Through a lawyer who is licensed to practice in both Massachusetts and before the Supreme Court, Granfield must, by the very nature of his full time vocation, take a slightly different tack than would generally be the case with a barrister of liberal persuasions.

However, after weighing all the pros and cons of the matter, Granfield comes to the conclusion that though over population may be a serious future problem, man should not solve his problem by the wholesale slaughter of people—including the unborn infant.

Mankind, he decides, has usually solved its problems—such as the insane, ill, old, etc.—by something other than mass euthanasia, and the population problem will have to be solved the same way if man is not to become so brutalized that he loses all conscience and human life in general becomes worthless and tenuous at best.

As a matter of fact, the priest cites impressive statistics to show that the United States is so far from over population as to make all the alarms sounded by the ecologists a laughing matter.

He proves conclusively—from a variety of sources both inside and outside religious circles—that the taking of a human life is definitely involved in abortion, and as such it is simply murder, no matter the fancy therapeutic labels attached to it by the apologists for infanticide.

Warning that abortion is a new tool for social engineering, Granfield makes the salient point that the worse part of abortion may not be the simple taking of the life of a helpless, unborn baby—it may be the opening gate to allowing the state to think of people as expendable units of social utility.

That, of course, is the charted pathway to a horror the like of which the world has never seen, and one that no nation would want to voluntarily walk.

GREEK CHURCH RAPS LIB LAW

NEW YORK.—The 20th biennial clergy-laity congress of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America has declared against liberalized abortion.

"We must give a clarion call to all the people of our nation warning them of this serious violation of the reverence for life by the indiscriminate exercises of abortion," the convention declared. The Greek Orthodox constituency represents 1.8 million in the Western Hemisphere.

RACE DISCRIMINATION IN NATION'S CAPITAL

PORTLAND, OREGON—U.S. Senator Blank has offered a bill that would authorize abortions for the densely Negro areas of the District of Columbia.

The Blank bill does not mention the race factor, but specifies a geographic area of the country that is heavily Negro in population.

The Republican cited "over population" as one of the primary causes of an environmental crisis facing the world today.

Blank said his legislation was an effort "to ease the strain on an overtaxed environment," referring to large Negro families in the nation's capital.

For other areas of the country, and not limited to Negro-populated Washington, D.C., Blank proposed a tightening of the federal income tax laws so that a family could have exemptions for only three children.

Anti-abortionists in Los Angeles characterized Packwood as the Blank plan as a "federal Bellenson law."

The Senator had the backing of U.S. Senator Blank.

OVERPOPULATION MYTH EXPLODED BY BISHOP

BURLINGTON, VERMONT—Roman Catholic Bishop Robert F. Joyce of Burlington exploded the overpopulation myth.

Referring to the vast numbers of persons in urban centers, Bishop Joyce said the real problem is overconcentration, not overpopulation.

In his column in the Vermont Catholic Tribune, Bishop Joyce quoted the words of U.S. Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel, "We don't have too many people. The trouble is that they're concentrated in the wrong places."

The bishop said 80 per cent of the 200 million population of the country is crowded into cities which constitute about 10 per cent of the land area. He said there are now 11 acres of land for every man, woman and child in the U.S., "But most people live on only a few square yards."

"So the easy solution is offered of preventing life or destroying it," the bishop wrote. "Respect for life, for human nature, for profound human values and instincts, these are considered secondary and totally irrelevant."

The bishop said the country has been bombarded in recent years with much population explosion propaganda, "much of it based on loose thinking, with all kinds of connections with pollution, birth control, abortion, and other current issues."

ED REINECKE ON RECORD OPPOSING LIB LAW

SACRAMENTO.—Lt. Gov. Ed Reinecke is on record here that liberalization of California's abortion statute would "cut at the very fiber of our people."

"To place in the hands of a prospective mother, with or without nominal medical consent, the future existence of a life already conceived is to stretch beyond rational bounds the traditional, the moral or the religious convictions of a spiritual person.

"Therapeutic abortion is acceptable under strict and multiple consent of the medical profession for reasons determined to be valid, but the indiscriminate, selfish egotistic decision by man or woman to take the life of unborn child begs the question of the very existence of God," Reinecke said.

A California law (SB 462) opened the floodgates for abortion in 1967. In part, the law provides that abortions may be performed in hospitals when a medical committee finds there is risk to the mother's physical or mental health or when the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest.

The procedure for the finding of rape or incest is minimal, amounting to little more than affidavit verified by the opinion of the

district attorney. The new abortion statute does not provide for a qualified person to serve on the medical panel in the finding of risk to mental health.

In one section, the 1967 statute defines "mental health" to mean exactly the opposite. Section 2594, newly added to Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code, reads: "The term mental health as used in Section 25951 means MENTAL ILLNESS to the extent that the woman is dangerous to herself or to the person or property of others or is in need of supervision or restraint." (Emphasis added by editor.)

The measure does forbid abortions after the 20th week of pregnancy.

BOY SAW BABIES IN JARS, THAT MADE HIM A FIGHTER

ANAHEIM.—Mark White Jr. is 16 years old. He opposes legalization of abortion for a variety of reasons.

"It seems to me a doctor's duty is to save life and not to destroy it," he said Tuesday. "By performing abortions, a doctor is actually going back on his creed."

Recently they had jars on display at his parish with "aborted babies" in them.

"I just can't describe it," he said, "except to say they looked just like human babies except they are smaller."

"If God didn't have a purpose for that child," he said, "he wouldn't have created him. Each child has a purpose in life and by legalizing abortion we would be interfering with God's plans."

Mark said he believes the primary purpose of the pro-abortion individuals is to "cut down on population, but that's not the right thing."

On the day Mark was interviewed, the state assembly had just passed a bill allowing 13 year old girls to be sterilized without their parents consent or even knowledge.

He was encouraging everyone to wire their assemblymen and protest the passage, and to encourage them to vote against the bill that same afternoon because it was coming up for another vote count on request of Assemblyman Robert Badham-R, Newport.

LABOR PAPER LABELS LIB LAW BRUTAL

CHICAGO.—The Butcher Workman, published by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, characterized permissive abortion laws as "abominably brutal."

An editorial in the July-August issue said something must be done about the population explosion. It added:

"We are not opposed to the pill, and dozens of other precautionary measures, including restraint to prevent conception. We shall never, however, favor outright murder to stop the over-inhabitation of the earth."

TWO PRO-ABORTIONISTS DEFEATED

ALBANY, N.Y.—Two of New York's leading pro-abortionists will not be back to vote on more permissive abortion laws.

They are Democratic Assemblyman George M. Michaels of Auburn and Republican State Sen. D. Clinton Dominick.

Michaels' was the key vote that put the abortion-on-demand law to clear the assembly. Dominick piloted the same measure through the State Senate.

Both were defeated in the June 23 primaries.

LEGISLATORS WHO PUT THE BABY IN THE BUCKET!

Since 1961, eight bills have been introduced in the California legislature that bear on the subject of abortion.

Of these, six were introduced by State Senator Anthony Bellenson, Democrat representing the 26th Senatorial District, com-

prising Venice, Beverly Hills, Exposition Park and Baldwin Hills. The two other bills were introduced by Assemblyman John T. Knox, Democrat of the 11th District in Richmond and by Assemblyman Craig Biddle, representing the 74th district in Riverside.

Of the six Bellenson bills, three were introduced prior to 1966 when the author was in the Assembly, and three were introduced after 1966 when he was in the Senate.

The later three Bellenson bills are numbered as follows: SB 462 (1967), SB 1029 (1968), and SB 544 (1970). They provide, in general, for a loosening of restrictions on abortion.

The Bellenson abortion bill of 1970 (SB 544) did not stand alone, but was accompanied by five other bills related to family life and medical intimacies. The bills bore numbers SB 541, SB 542, SB 543, SB 545, and SB 546. Together with SB 544 they came to be known as the "Bellenson package."

Because of space limitations, we will discuss here only the bills that were passed by the Legislature. These were the 1967 measure SB 462 and SB 542. The content was as follows:

—SB 462 provided that a hospital medical staff may authorize abortion in cases where the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest, or in which there is "substantial risk that continuance of the pregnancy would gravely impair the physical or mental health of the mother." No proof of the rape or incest was required, but only an affidavit from the district attorney. No psychiatric qualification was required in the case of the medical panel that was to judge of the mental health.

—SB 542 permits a female child who is unmarried to be sterilized or aborted without the consent of the parents.

RELUCTANT UNTIL 1967

The record indicates the California legislature was generally reluctant to involve itself with legislation to ease restrictions on the killing of unborn infants until 1967. The key measure of that year was the Bellenson bill SB 462. The measure was couched in plausible terms that made it defensible before a public that was not then overly inquiring. Experienced legislators, however, would have had no problem divining the intent and direction of the measure. As related above, the measure ostensibly set the mother's life as the chief matter of concern in an abortion. A careful reader will note the deception, however. SB 462 offers to protect the mother against the danger of pregnancy, but gives no balancing protection against the danger of the abortion.

Aside from the grave moral implications, the bill was technically deficient. The legislation requires only an affidavit from the district attorney as to rape or incest. The bill authorizes abortion in instance when there is "substantial risk that continuance of the pregnancy would gravely impair the physical or mental health of the mother." These terms are so broad that it excludes no one; the sole qualification is pregnancy. Any woman who has a baby is gravely impaired, at least for a time; the legislation sets no minimum duration for the impairment.

Such loopholes are glaringly obvious even to a layman. Clearly SB 642 was a wet finger held up to the winds of public opinion. The forces behind the abortion drive were ready with another boatload of laws.

And SB 462 did pass.

In spite of glaring technical deficiencies, SB 462 got 48 votes in the Assembly against 30 noes. The measure passed the Senate 21 to 17.

"YES" ASSEMBLYMEN

Assemblymen voting in favor of SB 462 included the following who also are members of the 1970 legislature:

William Bagley, R-7th, San Rafael; Carlos Bee, D-13th, Hayward; Craig Biddle, R-74th,

Riverside; Yvonne Brathwaite, D-63rd, Los Angeles; Willie L. Brown, Jr., D-18th, San Francisco; John L. Burton, D-20th, San Francisco; Charles J. Conrad, R-47th, Sherman Oaks; Kenneth Cory, D-69th, Anaheim; Earl P. Crandall, R-25th, San Jose; Robert W. Crown, D-14th, Oakland; Waddie P. Deddeh, D-77th, Chula Vista; James W. Dent, R-10th, Concord; Gordon W. Duffy, R-21st, Hanford; John F. Dunlap, D-5th, Vallejo; March K. Fong, D-15th, Oakland; Bill Greene, D-53rd, Los Angeles; Leroy F. Green, D-3rd, Sacramento; Harvey Johnson, D-58th, El Monte; Ray E. Johnson, R-4th, Chico; Walter J. Karabian, D-45th, Monterey Park; William M. Ketchum, R-29th, Bakersfield; John T. Knox, D-11th, Richmond; Frank Lanterman, R-47th, Pasadena; John J. Miller, D-17th, Oakland; Bob Monagan, R-12th, Stockton; Don Mulford, R-16th, Oakland; Carley V. Porter, D-38th, Compton; Walter W. Powers, D-8th, Sacramento; Leon Ralph, D-55th, Los Angeles; Newton L. Russell, R-62nd, Burbank; Leo J. Ryan, D-27th, South San Francisco; Alan Sieroty, D-59th, Los Angeles; Kent H. Stacey, R-28th, Bakersfield; Victor V. Veyssey, R-75th, Brawley; Charles Warren, D-56th, Los Angeles; Pete Wilson, R-76th, San Diego; Edwin L. Z'berg, D-9th, Sacramento; George N. Zenovich, D-32nd, Fresno; Jesse Unruh, D-65th, Inglewood.

SENATORS WHO VOTED "YES"

Yes votes in favor of SB 462 were cast by the following Senators who also are members of the 1970 Legislature.

Alfred E. Alquist, D-13th, San Jose; Anthony C. Bellenson, D-26th, Los Angeles; Clark L. Bradley, R-14th, San Jose; Clair W. Burgener, R-38th, La Mesa; William E. Coombs, R-20th, Rialto; George Deukmejian, R-37th, Long Beach; Ralph C. Dills, D-32nd, San Pedro; Mervyn M. Dymally, D-29th, Los Angeles; Donald L. Grunsky, R-17th, Watsonville; John L. Harmer, R-21st, Glendale; Fred W. Marler, Jr., R-2nd, Redding; James R. Mills, D-40th, San Diego; George R. Moscone, D-10th, San Francisco; Nicholas C. Petrils, D-11th, Oakland; Albert S. Rodda, D-5th, Sacramento; Lewis F. Sherman, R-9th, Oakland; Alan Short, D-6th, Stockton; Walter W. Stiern, D-18th, Bakersfield; Stephen P. Teale, D-3rd, Sacramento; Howard Way, R-15th, Exeter.

One of the "aye" votes is no longer serving in the Senate, but since 20 of them continue there, the skirts were greased for additional legislation of this type.

After his success with SB 462, Senator Bellenson began a shotgun attack upon existing laws to safeguard the family relationship. Bellenson called for contraceptives to be paid for out of state funds, for additional income tax to be heaped upon families with more than two children, and to limit the discretion that a hospital staff has to curb sterilizations. SB 542, permitting sterilization and abortion of female children without consent of parents, passed both houses of the Legislature.

SIX VOTED "NO"

In the Senate, SB 542 went through with only six votes against it. All opposition votes were cast by Republican Senators. On the other hand, 10 Republicans teamed with 15 Democrats to put it over—25 yes and 6 no. Five Republicans and six Democrat Senators did not vote.

Between the time of the Senate vote and the SB 542's appearance on the house floor, the legislators began to feel the ground swell of public opinion. In fact, the Assembly took two roll calls and there was considerable switching of position that clouds the true feelings of the legislators involved.

In the first go round, 21 Republicans voted for the bill along with 21 Democrats to give passage—41 yes, to 33 no. Twenty-one Republicans and 12 Democrats voted no. One Republican and five Democrats did not vote.

The second roll call—on a motion to reconsider—showed 38 Assemblymen opposed to SB 542, or at least favorable to studying the matter for a longer period. Twenty-six voted to the contrary, a sufficient number to block reconsideration.

In the second vote 26 Republicans teamed with 12 Democrats to seek reconsideration. Seven Republicans teamed with 19 Democrats in favor of the Beilenson bill. Thus the first decision stood.

CORY SWITCHES

Among those changing positions was Assemblyman Kenneth Cory, Democrat of the 69th District in Orange County. He voted against SB 542 the first time when it passed by a heavy margin. But when opponents of legalized abortion picked up strength on reconsideration, he abstained from voting. Seven other Democrats and eight Republicans abstained, also.

In spite of the seeming confusion in the SB 542 roll calls, The Educator was able to identify hard-line pro-abortionists by comparing the 1970 votes with the 1967 votes on the first successful abortion bill.

Those Assemblymen who voted pro-abortion straight down the line on SB 462 of 1967 and SB 542 of 1970 are as follows (the district number precedes the name):

3. Leroy F. Green, D-Sacramento; 4. Ray E. Johnson, R-Chico; 5. John F. Dunlap, D-Vallejo; 7. William T. Bagley, R-San Rafael; 8. Walter W. Powers, D-Sacramento; 9. Edwin L. Z'berg, D-West Sacramento; 11. John T. Knox, D-Richmond; 12. Bob Monagan, R-Stockton; 14. Robert W. Crown, D-Oakland; 15. March K. Fong, D-Oakland; 17. John J. Miller, D-Oakland; 18. Willie L. Brown, Jr., D-San Francisco; 20. John L. Burton, D-San Francisco; 21. Gordon W. Duffy, R-Hanford; 26. Carl A. Britschgi, R-Redwood City; 28. Kent H. Stacey, R-Bakersfield; 29. William M. Ketchum, R-Bakersfield; 32. George N. Zenovich, D-Fresno; 53. Bill Green, D-Los Angeles; 55. Leon Ralph, D-Los Angeles; 56. Charles Warren, D-Los Angeles; 59. Alan Sieroty, D-Los Angeles; 61. Henry A. Waxman, D-Los Angeles; 63. Yvonne W. Brathwaite, D-Los Angeles; 75. Victor V. Veysey, R-Brawley; 76. Pete Wilson, R-San Diego.

On the Senate side the diehard pro-abortionists are:

3. Stephen P. Teale, D-Sacramento. 5. Albert S. Rodda, D-Sacramento; 6. Alan Short, D-Stockton; 8. Lewis F. Sherman, R-Oakland; 10. George R. Mascone, D-San Francisco; 11. Nicholas C. Petris, D-Oakland; 13. Alfred E. Alquist, D-San Jose; 15. Howard Way, R-Exeter; 17. Donald L. Grunsky, R-Watsonville; 18. Walter W. Stiern, D-Bakersfield; 20. William E. Coombs, R-Rialto; 22. Tom Carrell, D-San Fernando; 26. Anthony C. Beilenson, D-Los Angeles; 29. Mervyn M. Dymally, D-Los Angeles; 32. Ralph C. Dills, D-San Pedro; 37. George Deukmejian, R-Long Beach; 38. Clair W. Burgener, R-La Mesa.

Many will be shocked and saddened that legislators in whom they have reposed confidence are exposed in this edition of the Educator, irrespective of party. But the facts cannot be altered. These are the men who withdrew the state from prosecution for murder of the unborn. These are the lawmakers who put the baby in the bucket.

IOWANS IN THE PEACE CORPS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Des Moines Sunday

Register Picture magazine contains a story telling of the efforts of Iowans in the Peace Corps in South America. These young men and women are certainly to be commended for their unselfish and meaningful contributions to the furtherance of better understanding among the nations of the world. I must, of course, note that one of the young men discussed, Mr. Michael DeVine, is from Bettendorf in my district.

I include the article as follows:

HOW IOWANS HELP SOUTH AMERICANS TO A BETTER LIFE

(By Don Muhm)

Peace Corps officials estimate that about 85 per cent of the 7,000 or so Volunteers they have scattered about the world in 60 countries work in rural areas. And the bulk of these Volunteers wind up in some field of agriculture, because so many of the developing nations lack sufficient food. After nearly 10 years, the Peace Corps has developed a new emphasis on locating trained and skilled people for overseas assignments. And officials are finding the demand for skilled people is growing.

"We want our Volunteers to be not just a friend of the people in the developing countries," points out Leo Gallarano, who served with the Peace Corps in Africa and who is now in the Corps' assignment division in Washington, D.C. "We want them to be helpers as well."

AN IOWA STATE GRADUATE WHO BUILT A NEEDED CANAL

Gallarano points out: "You can't expect to pick a man, and turn him into an expert in hog production in a few months. This is why we have emphasis on skills. We're more concerned today with the skills of the Peace Corps applicants than we are with the numbers of applicants. And we're doing more specialization in our recruiting seeking out these skills."

An example of this new selectivity is Brent Parker, an Iowa State University graduate who worked for the Soil Conservation Service. During Parker's two years in Ecuador his chief claim to fame was construction of an irrigation canal being used to grow more and more diversified crops.

A pair of Drake University graduates, Louise and Peter Gregg, are sociologists working in southern Bolivia on a tuberculosis program. The Greggs, from Ohio, received special training in Los Angeles for their tuberculosis detection program they now operate in a broad area of the tropics. The husband-wife team arranges vaccinations and lines up cure treatments once tuberculosis is verified.

FROM AN IOWA NURSERY TO THE FORESTS OF CHILE

Another "specialist" is Eric Rund of Champaign, Ill., who grew up raising Hampshire and Chester White hogs on his father's farm. Now Rund is a Volunteer in charge of a swine reproduction center in Ecuador where U.S. Hampshire hogs donated by Heifer Project, Inc., are being produced for mating with native swine.

Michael DeVine of Bettendorf spent his spare time working at his grandfather's nursery at Pleasant Valley in eastern Iowa. This experience resulted in a forestry assignment in Chile where he was a Peace Corps Volunteer the past two years, and will probably figure into his new work in Paraguay with the Corps.

But while some of the Volunteers "fit" in their foreign assignments, others have had to adapt to a role not in line with their university studies. Lee Arbuckle of Alzada, Mont., is a Dartmouth College economics graduate who now supervises the work of 38 Volunteers in central and eastern Bolivia

where the emphasis is strongly agricultural. But after two years working in Colombia and two more in Bolivia, Arbuckle has adjusted to the agrarian task.

Pete Stubben of New York City received a potato assignment in Bolivia where fertilization experiments are being conducted. "I was astounded to see that the potato seed was the potato itself" Stubben confided about his lack of potato production knowledge.

CONSERVATION TERRACES IN SOUTHERN PARAGUAY

A Parsons College mathematics graduate, Pedro H. W. Tichauer, has a general assignment for World Neighbors, a private group that works at the village level to help Bolivians raise more gardens, combat disease and harvest more fish. This group is not related to the Peace Corps, and Tichauer is not a Volunteer.

"Our work is essentially the same," the Parsons College graduate said. "We're trying to help people grow more food, so they don't have to spend as much money for something to eat, and to help improve diets."

Bill Saint of Erie, Pa., majored in psychology at Oberlin College, Ohio, but for the past four years has worked in rural areas in Paraguay helping with all kinds of projects—ranging from banana and corn production experiments, to hand-shoveled soil conservation terraces in southern Paraguay and a bridge he is helping to build across a fast-flowing river.

His wife, Candy, a native of Chicago, studied theater at the University of Denver. Also a Peace Corps Volunteer, Candy Saint has had her most recent "success" in helping a farm wife build a new kitchen stove.

"A KITCHEN RANGE HERE IS REALLY SOMETHING"

This Paraguayan mother had cooked her meals over a campfire built on the floor of her humble home. "Now she can stand while she cooks," Candy Saint explained. "That may not sound like a big deal back home, but a kitchen range here is really something—no more kneeling over the fire to cook meals."

Peace Corps Volunteers tackle all kinds of assignments—in agriculture, education, professional services, the sciences and skills and trades, according to Frank Pixley of Washington, D.C., who works in recruiting.

"Agriculture offers the chance to make a showing—to do something that people can see," Pixley, a former New York farmer, explained. "It may be a new breed of hogs or cattle, or a fertilizer plot. But these things offer dramatic opportunities to demonstrate what can be done to fight hunger and poverty."

"And our two big problems about the world are hunger and poverty."

TESTIMONY OF NATIONAL COMMANDER OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1971, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs heard testimony from the National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Cecil W. Stevenson.

Commander Stevenson presented his legislative program for the 92d Congress.

I think it is important that this entire body be made aware of some of the needs of this group of veterans who so valiantly served our Nation in time of peril.

I include in the RECORD the following transcript of Commander Stevenson's testimony:

STATEMENT OF CECIL W. STEVENSON, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 3, 1971

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to come before you to speak on the 1971 Legislative Program of the Disabled American Veterans.

I thank you, too, on behalf of our National Officers, our State Commanders and Adjutants who are here with us this morning. Our mutual interest in veterans' affairs brings us together again in the Nation's Capitol for formal discussions on programs and plans of our Organization for the current year.

It would be derelict on the part of the Disabled American Veterans, Mr. Chairman, if we did not at the very outset pay special notice . . . and give congratulatory appreciation to you and the members of your Committee who have made it possible for the 91st Congress to be remembered as the "Best Veterans' Congress in Years."

That quote is not mine, ladies and gentlemen . . . but it has been used to describe the 91st Congress in the newspapers, service organization publications, and in the *Congressional Record* itself.

We know you made it possible for the new legislation now on the books . . . new laws . . . that make life easier for the disabled war veteran, his dependents and survivors. We are especially grateful that you gave your all-out support to have the new compensation law become effective on July 1, 1970 . . . instead of January 1, 1971 as originally scheduled.

In addition to the generous increases in compensation rates, the 91st Congress substantially improved and expanded the programs of education and training, dependency and indemnity compensation, disability and death pension, and the hospital and medical care program. Indeed, every major benefit program for veterans and their dependents was dramatically improved and expanded.

These and other actions . . . all of which cannot be covered here . . . provide more than three quarters of a billion dollars in increased benefits and represent achievements of outstanding significance by this Committee and the 91st Congress. I know that the Committee will . . . as it has always done in the past . . . continue to give serious recognition to veterans' problems as it undertakes its work in the 92nd Congress.

We of the Disabled American Veterans look forward to working with you, and providing you with whatever assistance we can in the coming months. I wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the dedicated members who continue to serve on this great Committee and to say a very warm word of welcome and congratulations to the newly assigned members. I know that all members will find us ready and available at all times so that with our joint efforts . . . we may continue to give all help . . . reasonable and proper . . . to those of our fighting forces who bear the scars of battle wounds, or the marks of injuries or illnesses incurred while on active duty.

Before proceeding further, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should take this occasion to explain to the new members the principal purpose for which the Disabled American Veterans was created. That purpose in part urges all of us "to uphold and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States; to realize the true American ideals and aims for which those eligible to membership fought; to advance the interests and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured and disabled veterans; to cooperate with the United States Veterans Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and ad-

vancing the condition, health, and interest of all service-disabled veterans."

In accordance with these principles, the DAV, as part of its National Service Program, is making a special effort to seek out returning war veterans to advise them that our Organization stands ready to offer assistance in securing for them all benefits to which they may be entitled. For this purpose, the DAV maintains 150 National Service Officers—46 are Vietnam veterans—located in Veterans Administration Regional Offices and Centers across the Country. These dedicated, specially trained national employees—all of them disabled as the result of wartime service—assist the veteran in the preparation and presentation of claims for compensation, pension, hospitalization, medical treatment, education and vocational training, and sundry other benefits available under law.

As National Commander of the DAV, Mr. Chairman, I have a genuine pride in our Service Program and the high status it has attained through the efforts of our National Service Officers. In this connection, I recognize that the success of their efforts often depends upon the sympathetic understanding that you and your Committee members have consistently given to our Legislative presentations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and honorable members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, here are the 1971 DAV Legislative Objectives.

I want to say at once, ladies and gentlemen, that it is not the purpose of the DAV to come here and make extravagant demands upon the Committee and the public treasury. The generous record of veterans' benefits enacted in the 91st Congress would, in any case, constrain us to keep our program within reasonable and equitable limits. However, with your indulgence, I should like to cover in general terms certain areas of veterans' programs to which the DAV is addressing itself this year.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

With respect to the VA disability compensation program, Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize that the DAV, throughout the years, has been deeply impressed with the interest and concern this Committee has consistently shown for those veterans who have suffered disability as the result of service in our armed forces. We are most grateful to the Committee for repeatedly exercising initiative and leadership in the development of programs to meet the growing needs of these deserving war veterans.

Traditionally, it has been accepted that payments for service-incurred disablement should be adequate to meet the special circumstances of the veteran. This is particularly so in the cases of the very severely disabled, whose income consists solely of compensation and where very often the recipient is so disabled that he cannot work. Accordingly, it is the feeling of the DAV that the maintenance of the purchasing value of compensation payments must continue to be a major factor in the established compensation policy.

We are confident that the Committee will, as it has steadfastly done in the past, keep the disability compensation program under close and continuing study. The constant rise in the cost of goods and services offers, we think, a real and compelling reason for the Committee to do so.

Since Disability compensation is a matter of fundamental interest to the Disabled American Veterans, it is only natural that a number of resolutions touching on this program be considered and approved by our National Conventions.

Among those adopted by our most recent National Convention is a resolution calling for a long-delayed and well-deserved increase in the statutory awards payable to disabled veterans for the loss or loss of use

of a single extremity or body organ. The Veterans Administration has persistently opposed this proposal, giving as its reason that they "have been engaged in the preliminary steps" of a study to obtain data for use in validating the disability Rating Schedule. This study has been going on now for well over a decade, and we cannot see it as a valid excuse for delaying action any longer on this worthy proposal.

Although the basic rates of disability compensation have been increased at more or less regular intervals over the years, the monthly rates for the statutory awards have remained constant since July 1, 1952, at which time there was granted an increase of \$5 a month over the rate prevailing since September 1, 1946.

Inasmuch as the costs of goods and services have risen substantially during the 1952-1971 period, we believe a generous increase in these statutory payments is wholly justified. We urge the Committee's favorable consideration of this pending proposal.

Another DAV resolution associated with compensation would authorize an annual clothing allowance of \$300 to veterans who, because of service-connected disabilities, are forced to wear prosthetic appliances which tend to wear out or tear their clothing.

The proposal is a most reasonable one, is inexpensive, and its enactment will give recognition to the value of military service and the difficulties these veterans endure daily because of the special nature of their service-connected disabilities. We urge the Committee's approval of this deserving and appealing measure.

The DAV also proposes a modification of existing law to extend the full range of wartime benefits to a very deserving group of VA beneficiaries.

Enactment of the Cold War G.I. Bill (P.L. 89-358) in March of 1966, and the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967, expanded significantly the wartime benefits program for veterans who have served in time of peace under wartime conditions.

There still remains, however, a group of disabled peacetime veterans who are paid disability compensation at wartime rates but who are not, under existing law, entitled to other wartime benefits.

The DAV believe that a veteran who sustained a disability under wartime conditions, while performing extra-hazardous service, should have a fundamental entitlement to the same benefits provided for war veterans who became disabled under similar circumstances.

In the spirit of fair play, we heartily recommend that equal treatment be accorded these deserving veterans and that they be provided with the full range of wartime benefits.

The DAV National Convention last August adopted a number of other resolutions on the subject of disability compensation. Included are proposals to authorize concurrent payment of compensation and pension under a special formula; dependency allowances for veterans whose disabilities are rated less than 50 percent; dependency and indemnity compensation for widows of veterans rated 100 percent service-connected disabled for 20 or more years; and to authorize aid and attendance allowances for dependent parents of veterans who die as a result of service-connected disability.

VA MEDICAL PROGRAM

The DAV, by its very nature, has a deep and abiding interest in the Veterans Administration's Hospital and Medical Care Program. We strongly support the position that the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery maintain its prominence in the entire field of medical care.

The DAV is deeply indebted to you, Mr. Chairman, for conducting the surveys last

year which resulted in a better understanding of the hospital and medical needs of disabled war veterans. Indeed, information aduced by the surveys was instrumental in securing additional hospital funds which brought about improvements in the VA Medical Care Program.

As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, much discussion is going on within and outside the Government to establish a National Health Insurance Program. There is a variety of health care legislation of both large and small scope pending before the Congress. Proposals to improve the distribution of physicians, dentists, nurses, technicians, and other allied health personnel are under consideration. Some of these proposals have a laudable purpose because the national shortage of doctors and other health professionals is severe and worsening.

The DAV recognizes that the problem of health care for the general population is swelling rapidly and that legislation is needed to deal realistically with all aspects of the health issue, including the plight of medical education.

The question arises as to what role the VA will play in any proposed National Health Care Program. In this connection, the VA Chief Medical Director stated recently that all health systems "must link their resources, talent, and knowledge." It was further stated that "no component of the Nation's Health Care system as large as that represented by the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery can consider itself, or be considered, in isolation—no matter how splendid."

The DAV senses here the beginning of a subtle effort to assimilate the VA medical system into a National "unified health plan" under the jurisdiction of HEW or some other social agency. As the Chairman and members of the Committee know, HEW has already proposed that 8 of its Public Health Service hospitals and 30 out-patient clinics be closed. It is indicated that if the closings occur, public health service patients will be transferred to VA hospitals.

Despite all of the plans being advanced for the operation of a National Health Program, we believe that the welfare of the disabled war veteran and the debt his nation owes him dictate aggressive action to make certain he receives a high level of medical service as a matter of right, that he be considered apart from the general population, and that he must be given total priority with respect to health care benefits. In our view, the principle of first-rate medical care for wounded and otherwise disabled war veterans is at once so just and indisputably right that the Government is under a strong moral obligation to continue to effectively operate the VA Hospital and Medical Care system as it is presently constituted.

In this regard, the recently published VA budget for fiscal year 1972 indicates an increase of \$124.7 million over fiscal year 1971 for medical care. Upon reviewing the immediate and massive needs of the Program, it becomes evident that this increase is unrealistically low and will necessarily result in the loss of 5,500 hospital beds. At the same time, reports received from across the country reveal that applications for VA hospital and out-patient treatment have been on the increase, the demands for all hospital and medical services have reached an all-time high, that the number of veterans seeking nursing home care is rising. The reports, in fact, reflect an increased need for across-the-board services to psychiatric, medical, and surgical patients.

The VA can go forward with positive programs that provide greater health services to more patients with increased effectiveness. But, again, this can only be done with a level of funds far higher than that requested in the budget for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Chairman, several resolutions relating to the VA Hospital and Medical Care Program were adopted by our National Convention. Included are proposals to provide an Aid and Attendance allowance for service-connected totally disabled veterans who are confined to a nursing home; to provide complete medical services to veterans who are rated 50 percent or more disabled; to authorize hospital care for the widows and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities and for wives and children of veterans who have service-connected conditions rated as totally disabling.

As you know, under the terms of the Military Medical Benefits Act, hospital care is made available to dependents of retired military personnel and to the widows and children of servicemen who die while on active duty.

It is the feeling of the DAV that dependents of totally disabled service-connected veterans and the survivors of veterans who die of service-connected causes should be placed in a position comparable to that enjoyed by dependents of military retirees.

Over the years, this Committee and the Congress has consistently recognized that the widow of a man who dies of service-incurred disease or injury is in a very select category and deserves the special gratitude and assistance of our nation.

This is reflected in the passage of legislation that has established programs of death compensation payments, provisions for home loans, and for educational assistance benefits to war orphans and widows. We believe that authorization for hospital and medical benefits would be a logical and natural progression of a grateful nation's efforts to fulfill in a greater degree the needs of survivors of those who contributed so much to preserve America's security in time of war.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The subject of national cemeteries has been a long-standing priority concern of the Disabled American Veterans.

Several bills pending before the Committee would consolidate Federal cemeteries into one system administered by the Veterans Administration. The DAV strongly supports this proposed legislation, for we see it as a means of eliminating the confusing and uncertain condition currently associated with the cemetery program.

The DAV has National Convention resolutions calling for increasing the burial allowance to \$400, and to establish a National Cemetery in every state. With regard to the latter resolution, we recognize that for practical purposes this proposal may have to be modified. Some heavily veteran-populated areas may require several sites. There is no easy solution, but we are sure that the members of this distinguished Committee recognize this. We know, too, that the Committee has, through the years, constantly held to the view that veterans who have faithfully and honorably served our country should be entitled to the secure knowledge that there is a carefully drawn plan governing cemeteries for veterans—a plan that is equitable now and will sustain in the future.

I want to say again, Mr. Chairman, that the DAV is solidly behind the proposal to transfer control of national cemeteries to the Veterans Administration. It represents, in our opinion, a major step toward the fulfillment of the doctrine that "every veteran should have the right to burial in a national cemetery situated reasonably close to his home."

GUARANTEED AND INSURED HOME LOANS

As you know, Mr. Chairman, since the inception of the Home Loan Program, the interest rate has risen from the original 4 percent to last year's all-time of 8½ per-

cent—a cost of financing that has priced most of the nation's veterans out of the housing market.

The members of our Organization have always held that in order for the Home Loan Program to be a meaningful benefit, the interest rates on these well-secured, Government guaranteed loans must be set at a reasonable level which is within the reach of the average veteran. We, therefore, welcomed the recent actions which started the downward trend in interest rates, and we are hopeful that the present 7 percent rate will soon go even lower.

While encouraged by the lowering of the interest rates and the extension of the Loan Program to cover mobile homes and condominiums, Mr. Chairman, we were dismayed to learn that the Veterans Administration apparently intends to get out of the "direct loan program." The news that there were no funds available in the 1972 VA Budget request for this important Program came as a shock, and must have been especially discouraging to that small group of severely disabled veterans who, by an act of Congress last year, were made eligible for direct loans to purchase specially adapted housing. Veterans who will benefit from this new law deserve every consideration and should be assured of this benefit without regard to where they live or the availability of other possible sources of mortgage credit.

Eliminating the direct home loan program runs counter to resolutions adopted by the DAV National Convention. These resolutions urge that the Program be expanded, that the maximum direct loan amount be increased to \$25,000, and that such loans be made available in metropolitan areas.

We view the hasty and ill conceived decision to eliminate direct loans as an arbitrary abuse of Executive authority, and we respectfully request that this distinguished Committee exercise its power of legislative oversight to reassert the will of the Congress that "direct loans" in any area be made available to disabled veterans who are entitled to assistance in the purchase of specially adapted housing.

Other DAV legislative recommendations associated with the Home Loan Program provide that the specially adapted housing benefit be extended to veterans who have suffered the service-connected loss, or loss of use of an upper and lower extremity; that the exercise of strict controls over the discount rate be maintained in order to prevent lenders from artificially increasing the maximum interest levels by the charging of excessive points; and that the National Service Life Insurance reserve fund be used to provide home loans for veterans at reasonable interest rates.

Mr. Chairman, my statement has covered some of the major aspects of our 1971 Legislative Program. There are other matters of equal urgency which will receive our attention during the course of the 1st session of the 92nd Congress.

The Committee has been furnished a complete set of resolutions adopted at the 1970 DAV National Convention held at Los Angeles, California. Bills relating to most of these proposals have already been introduced, while others are presently in the drafting stage.

When the Committee holds hearings on specific pending legislation, we hope you will allow us to present more detailed reasons why we feel that these and other proposals in which we are deeply interested should be given early approval by the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to express our grateful appreciation for giving me the opportunity to come before you and present our views on matters of vital importance to the people whom we serve—the wartime disabled, his dependents and survivors. I also want to

March 8, 1971

take this occasion to pay special tribute to the staff members of this distinguished Committee and to thank them for all the competent help, advice, and practical assistance they have given us throughout the years. I am pleased to commend and thank them for their splendid cooperation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another high-point of our Conference this year. This afternoon the Senate and House of Representatives will salute the Disabled American Veterans on the Anniversary of its fifty years' of service to America's disabled war veterans and their dependents.

The highly respected ranking majority member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. Dorn, will act as Co-Chairman of this event in the House. It is my hope that other members of the Committee will participate in this very special event.

The final activity of our Conference will, of course, take place this evening when we have our annual reception honoring all members of the Congress. I shall look forward to meeting with you on this festive occasion which begins at 6:00 P. M. in the Presidential Ballroom of the Hotel Statler Hilton.

THE RISING COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I have a very interesting letter I would like to insert in the RECORD. It is an answer to a TV program concerning rising costs of all hospitals and care.

I believe William Esson has done a terrific job at the Youngstown Hospital and by his letter knows his job thoroughly.

The letter reads as follows:

DEAR MR. DOWNS: On the Tuesday morning "Today" show February 16, 1971, you interviewed an individual identified as "a medical writer"—Mr. Selig Greenberg, who apparently had just published a book devoted to the matter of medical care in this country. During your interview reference was made to costs of medical care, etc.

Having been associated for 25 years or more in the management of hospitals in this country the interview was appreciated. There was some emphasis upon the rapid increase in hospital costs today in America. Because of the nature of the hospital, people must be on the job 365 days a year, 24 hours every day. Coupled with this are the many services now required to meet the medical needs of patients referred to hospitals by doctors. It is necessary for hospitals, such as the one of which I am now Executive Director, to employ 2½ persons per patient, per day to do this. In other words this means that we have to pay for 20 hours of labor per patient, per day.

Within the last five years it has been necessary for the hospital service industry, if it can be called an industry, to adjust wages and salaries which were far out of line when compared with fellow workers in other industries and activities in this nation. Wages and salaries are still not comparable in many cases with workers in other fields. However, great strides have been made to reduce this margin and this accounts in a large measure for the rapid rise in hospital costs. Out of every dollar we spend in hospitals in this country more than 65c goes to meet payrolls.

In a wage settlement reached within the last day or so ago between United Steelworkers and one of the can manufacturers (according to Mr. Abel, U.S.W. President), there was a wage increase of \$1.00 per hour, plus other adjustments and improvements in fringe benefits. . . . Mr. Downs, you can readily see, therefore, that if in the "hospital industry" within the next year we are required to adjust our wages and salaries by \$1.00 an hour then hospital costs would rise at least \$20 per day, per patient.

All of this chatter and discussion about blaming doctors or Blue Cross or somebody else for the rising costs of hospital care in this country today becomes somewhat tiring after a while to people such as myself who have been in the hospital business for many years. It is almost so much nonsense to assume that the cost of hospital medical care is going to be reduced by some magic formula when those who work in other industries continue to receive pay increases that are such as mentioned in this letter. It is obvious that hospitals must keep pace in order to retain their employees, otherwise we would find ourselves before too long without any employees and no hospitals.

Incidentally the writer you interviewed referred to the Kaiser Program as being an exemplary medical care system. You might like to know that the Kaiser Program is an excellent one, but it should not be compared to a community oriented type of hospital organization such as The Youngstown Hospital Association. We operate two large general hospitals; 4½ miles apart in this community, designed to care for the acutely ill who will stay in a hospital a relatively short time. Our Governing Board is made up of a fifteen-member Board, all of whom contribute their time as Board Members free of charge. We depend entirely on patient revenue generated by caring for patients and require them to pay for the services provided. Many are covered by programs such as Blue Cross, Welfare programs, Public Agencies, etc.

The Kaiser-Permanente program provides medical and hospital services for subscribers to the program. It covers only individuals or groups who are able to pay for the cost of the subscription or premium. The Kaiser program does not take care of those who cannot pay for their care and are not subscribers (emergencies excepted). Hospital programs such as ours accept any patient who might be referred to the hospital. The cost of providing care for those who cannot pay, or can only pay part of the cost, is passed on as part of the charge made to the patient who is able to pay their way, and to those covered by Blue Cross and other such agencies.

I don't believe there is any such thing as an ideal system, but to say that the American hospital and medical system in this country is a poor one is an incorrect and unfair position to be taken. It is true that there are many problems involved in this business of providing medical care for those who need it, but they will be solved. If they are to be solved, however, our society must be prepared to pay the cost for it.

Those of our society who continue to receive substantial wage increases must accept the fact that equal wage increases will occur for those who work in hospitals and the cost will continue to rise. There is no way to make this available to society without cost, unless, and until, all of our suppliers of drugs, food, light, heat, power, and the labor of physicians, nurses, technicians, dietitians, mechanics, laundry of linens and all of the people needed to staff the modern hospital, make all these things (goods, services and labor) available free, to hospitals and to the society in which we live.

SO WHEN IS THE MONEY COMING?

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, RICHARD HANNA, recently delivered an address before the annual meeting of the Southern California Association of Governments on the subject of President Nixon's revenue sharing proposal.

I believe that Congressman HANNA's observations add a great deal of information to the subject, and I recommend them highly to the Members.

The speech, entitled "So When Is the Money Coming?" follows:

"SO WHEN IS THE MONEY COMING?"

(A speech delivered before the annual meeting of the Southern California Association of Governments by Congressman RICHARD T. HANNA)

Ladies and Gentlemen, some of you may remember the old Rosemary Clooney song that went:

"If you wanta be a friend of mine
Getta your money on the line—"

So when is the money coming? I'm sure at this moment that is the collective question being asked by virtually every mayor, city councilman, supervisor, and state legislator in the room. To be candid, I don't know the answer to that question. I doubt if anyone does.

As consolation, I'll attempt to inform you of the latest developments on the revenue-sharing front as well as offer some of my own personal observations on the subject.

Of course, revenue-sharing is not a very new concept. The Federal Government has been sharing its revenue with the States ever since the founding of the Republic. Debts incurred by the States during the Revolution were assumed by the Federal Government in the latter half of the eighteenth century. In 1836, the Federal Treasury was authorized to divide its surplus among the states. More than \$28 million was eventually distributed through a formula based upon each State's proportion of the electoral vote.

Times have changed. Although the Federal Government today distributes more than \$30 billion to the States and cities through more than 400 categorical grant programs, it also collects 9 out of every 10 personal income tax dollars. This leaves local units of government dependent upon the overburdened property and sales tax methods. Considering the demands for local services, cities and states cannot raise the needed revenues from the sources available to them.

Local finances are near catastrophe. California faces an unconstitutional deficit of at least \$124 million. The County of Los Angeles is running a deficit of \$59 million, and the city of New York is approaching bankruptcy. Unless something substantial is done, the projected net deficit in local expenditures, for all States, cities and counties in the United States, will be \$12 billion in the year 1975. Without Federal assistance, the financial future of many States and cities is bleak. The only alternative, especially in urban areas, is increased property taxes, and this is so unpalatable, particularly in light of so many recent heavy increases in the property tax rate, that it must be considered unrealistic.

The only current viable solution to the financial dilemma faced by local units of government lies in Washington. The question now is will that solution be revenue sharing?

Daniel Webster once said that Alexander Hamilton "smote the rock of the national resources and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth . . ." In a modern Hamiltonian gesture, President Nixon is hammering at the Congressional rock with the hope that "streams of revenue gush forth." Sixteen billion in revenue to be exact.

And while I am sure that few if any of you here today are rooting for the "rock", I am as equally certain you share my concern for the course the "stream" will take.

During this session, Congress will be creating new political relationships. Massive revenue-sharing, as envisioned by the President, will substantially alter the present methods of Federal-state relations.

Such readjustments in the fabric of our institutions cannot be done casually. They require careful and considered examination. Although there is a national campaign underway to pressure Congress into accepting the Administration's plan, do not expect anything to happen quickly.

I realize many of you can point to a number of modern revenue-sharing schemes that have been before Congress for quite awhile, including the Heller-Peckman plan first unveiled in 1964. This, of course, is true, but there are two circumstances that make 1971 different. First, revenue sharing concepts will get hearings this year. Congress will be seriously considering the idea. Second, the President's proposal is a massive one, much different from his modest 1/2 billion dollar recommendation made to the 91st Congress.

Less than one week ago, the President sent his first detailed revenue sharing message to Congress. It is still being digested.

The first message deals with the \$5 billion, no strings, portion of his program. We still have no idea what he plans for the much larger \$11 billion portion of the program, the portion that redirects \$10 billion in present categorical aid into block grants with an additional one billion in new funds.

Let us first take a look at the general revenue sharing portion of the President's proposal. It provides that the States shall receive 1.3% of all personal federal income tax received. This, the President estimates, will be \$5 billion in fiscal 1972.

Revenue will then be dispersed to the States based upon a formula that multiplies population by the revenue effort of each state, and then is divided by the sum of all the States' population and revenue effort. In English, this means that California will receive \$590 million under the President's program.

Through an equally euphemistic process that includes such juicy considerations as a "pass through formula," and a "local distribution factor," the Administration plan would insure approximately 50% of the State's share to cities and counties. California's 380 plus cities and towns and 58 counties, if they meet the population requirements, will split about 290 million.

If anyone is interested in the formula that will determine their share, you can contact my office. I also understand that someone in the deep recesses of the White House basement has already worked out tables which show how much every city, county, and town is entitled to receive.

What I've described only pertains to 90% of the \$5 billion. Ten percent is being reserved as an incentive to those states that create their own pass through formula. A state plan has to have the approval of enough local governments that in total, contain at least a majority of the State's population.

The second half, or the block grant section, of the program has not been spelled out. The

only details we are now aware of are that the Administration proposes diverting \$10 billion in existing funds for functioning categorical aid programs into six broad areas, and then divide the funds among the states. The six areas include: 1) urban development, 2) rural development, 3) education, 4) transportation, 5) job training, and 6) law enforcement.

An additional one billion dollars in new revenue for block grants will be thrown in to sweeten the pot.

The President's program does have much to commend it. But it also lacks a great deal.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I support the concept of revenue sharing. I will work to help pass a generous program during this Congress. I, however, cannot support the Administration's plan as it has been outlined so far.

There are deficiencies in both parts of the President's program. In the general revenue sharing portion, the formulas for distributing funds de-emphasize, and discourage needed regional planning. The proposal therefore will have a substantial impact upon SCAG. Many of the statutory foundations that helped create SCAG are circumvented, avoided, and downright ignored in the President's concept of revenue-sharing.

Anyone familiar with the conditions in Southern California realizes the serious need for regional cooperation. To create new financial and political relationships that mitigate against regional planning in highly urbanized areas is unwise. Yet this is exactly what the President's program will do. The key "pass through" formula literally passes right over regional mechanisms.

My central complaint against the Administration plan is that it not only discourages one of the more innovative and important developments in local government—regional planning and cooperation—but it offers no inducements, no compelling reasons, for local governments to pursue new methods for streamlining cumbersome practices. In other words, the program accepts what exists and assumes it to be sufficient to handle the problems.

In fact, what exists at most local levels is inadequate. To be really helpful, a revenue sharing program should encourage local governments to deal with their inadequacies and offer incentives to those who make the attempt.

The President's proposal will simply hand money to many jurisdictions that have no other claim to it than they are already raising a lot of money. Need will play a small role. I'm sure the equity of providing significant revenue shares to such places as Vernon, the City of Commerce, and Beverly Hills will be subject to question. And without a utilization factor as part of the formula, money will flow where it is not particularly needed.

To me the key in any sharing scheme must be how the funds are utilized. While I agree general revenue-sharing should be without strings, there must still be some guarantee, some incentive to insure that States, counties and cities make maximum utilization of the federal revenues they receive.

To do this, and to maintain the "no strings" concept will require new thinking at the Federal level. We are presently unequipped, both intellectually and technically, to share revenue, demand optimum utilization, and not attach conditions.

I believe that a utilization factor must be built into a revenue sharing formula. By utilization, I simply mean that a local unit of government, in order to share in Federal revenues, must demonstrate its ability to efficiently use these funds for its priority needs. This means that the unit of government must first set priorities for its needs, and then create mechanisms, including regional institutions, which can most efficiently service the needs.

To require such change at the local level

without demanding corresponding changes in thinking at the Federal level is naive. Nothing could be more remote from my recommendation than the image of the Washington bureaucrat quibbling with a city council over whether it has accurately put into priority its needs and sufficiently streamlined its operations to insure servicing those needs. Unfortunately, this happens now in some categorical aid programs. It must not be allowed in any new revenue sharing effort.

What is needed at the Federal level is fresh thinking. We need new methods of measuring utilization of federal funds. Not only do we need new methods for the new program, but for existing categorical grant programs as well.

New indexes of performances are required, indexes more in harmony with the realities of our complex problems, and how they are dealt with at the local level. Through new monitoring capabilities we will be better able to understand what we can reasonably expect to accomplish by sharing Federal revenues.

I'd like to now turn, for just a brief moment, to my concerns for the second section of the President's program—the portion which will divert \$10 billion in present categorical grant programs into block grants to the States. While there is still very little detail on the program, I do have some doubts about the idea itself.

My first concern is similar to my reservations about the President's general revenue sharing program. Will the States be able to effectively utilize, once again the key word is utilize, these great sums?

In a number of cases I frankly doubt it. The fact is, in some instances, such as urban development, few States are even in the business. Up until two years ago, the California Legislature didn't even have a Committee on this subject.

We may be enacting a whole new, and totally unneeded urban development bureaucracy. In a rush to strengthen the State we may in fact paralyze it, while shelving regional and local bureaucracies that have a more compelling jurisdiction.

Secondly, in the transition to block grants we can expect a corresponding decrease in the impact the present program is having without anyone picking up the slack. Even after the transition, there is no guarantee that the various programs will ever reach the level of impact they have today. After all, we are only transferring bureaucracies, not concepts. Categorical money is spent at the local level whether it originates in Washington or Sacramento. It would be naive to believe that present money, already allocated, will be redistributed simply because the States will be distributing it.

My question is can we afford, given the terrible pressures of modern problems, the luxury of a transition?

My other questions on this portion of the program will wait until I have more details.

Although I have raised some personal reservations about the President's revenue sharing program, and have offered my own suggestion for revising it, I am still committed to a program before the end of the 92nd Congress. Since you know where I stand, your next question must of course be what are the chances of some reasonable program getting through the Congress at all?

That is quite a question. And I'm frankly going to hedge on its answer, because it largely depends upon who you've talked to last.

The Administration has marshalled a formidable array of support. From virtually every council chamber and legislative hall in the country, Congressmen are being intensely lobbied by their fellow office holders.

However, the opposition on Capitol Hill is

equally formidable. Wilbur Mills, the well respected Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, is strongly opposed to revenue sharing whether it be Mr. Nixon's plan or any other. And Mr. Mills rarely ever loses a fight.

In this particular battle he has as an ally the ranking Republican on the Committee, John Byrnes of Wisconsin. This substantial bi-partisan opposition on the Committee has usually been enough to kill off any bill. Joining them is Hale Boggs, House Majority Leader, thereby making the opposition to revenue sharing very potent indeed.

Opposition to, and support for revenue sharing does not simply confine itself to a convenient Party label. Democrats and Republicans are all over the map on this issue. Although I expect many Democrats to specifically oppose the President's program, there is an alternative plan, not too dissimilar from Mr. Nixon's, that has been introduced by such well known Democrats as Senator Hubert Humphrey, and Congressman Henry Reuss.

Most of the members, however, I believe are caught somewhere in the middle. Supporting the concept on the one hand, while trying to rationally construct a meaningful framework for distribution is the dilemma that I, and I believe a majority of Members of the House, face.

We realize the pressure you are under. You must very shortly reconcile increasing expenditures with overburdened tax sources. You expect relief, and deserve it, and hopefully it will be forthcoming soon. But please do understand that we are serious about what we are doing, and don't want to create more problems than we solve. I am sure the complexities of the issue will not deter us from being responsive. But we also want to be right.

A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE REVISION OF ANTITRUST LAWS

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently studied H.R. 3997, a bill introduced by my colleague, Representative ROBERT PRICE of Texas, which would create a National Commission on the Revision of Federal Antitrust Laws. I heartily endorse the proposal and urge the House to give it serious consideration.

The Congress has two basic responsibilities to the people of the United States. The first is to enact new legislation to meet new needs. The other is to insure that law already on the books continues to meet the purposes for which it was passed and is in keeping with changes or new developments in the life and business of the Nation.

In terms of antitrust, we have not completely fulfilled this latter responsibility. The basic antitrust law was formulated in late last century and the early part of this 20th century. It was designed to correct ills of those periods, and, while it has been updated piecemeal fashion throughout the years, it has not remained totally responsive to current needs.

No segment of our society has undergone such radical change in the past 50 years as has the business community. It is a tribute to our free enterprise system that industry and commerce have

been successful in readjusting in form, structure and methods of operation to meet the growing demands for goods and services. But our antitrust laws have not kept pace. They are still attuned to the robber baron days and are not only ineffective in properly curtailing abuses, but in many cases are serving as a deterrent to legitimate business progress.

In addition, outdated laws and regulations carry with them the inherent danger of being misinterpreted as persons charged with their administration try to stretch and twist them to meet situations or conditions not contemplated at the time of passage.

Therefore, I think the introduction of the bill setting up a national commission is timely and should demand our urgent attention. Prominent professional economists, distinguished representatives of the business community, and eminent professors of law could sit on this Commission. They will be given the authority to thoroughly review our antitrust statutes in the light of present business conditions and the economic realities of the marketplace. Recommendations made by them would lead to revisions in the law which would be more satisfactory and reasonable for consumer and business alike. I support and hope my colleagues will also support H.R. 3997 which will set up such a Commission.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of U.S. News and World Report carried two articles on the Selective Service System which should be of interest to all my colleagues as we consider the extension of the present Selective Service System.

The first article presents some arguments presented by military experts on this subject and the second deals with the experiences of Britain and Canada in their attempts to muster an armed force composed strictly of volunteers.

Both of the articles which follow appeared in the March 1, 1971, issue of U.S. News and World Report.

IF U.S. TRIES AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY— SURVEY OF MILITARY EXPERTS

(The battle lines are being drawn in Congress on one of the most explosive military issues in years: Will an all-volunteer service meet the needs of the nation? Strong arguments are being mustered on both sides.)

President Nixon's latest plan to end the draft and recruit, instead, an Army of volunteers appears to be heading for stormy going.

Both in Congress and among the military, powerful opponents are lining up against the proposal. Among the reasons for opposition—some stated publicly, others not—are these:

Problems of recruiting enough volunteers for combat forces—infantry, artillery and armored units.

Difficulty of maintaining a "high quality" Army under present standards that permit

enlistment of men who are educationally deficient.

Arguments that "liberalization" designed to make Army life less rigorous for enlisted men could lead to dangerous breakdowns of battlefield discipline.

Assertions that even with higher pay, a volunteer Army would attract only the poor.

Contentions that an all-volunteer Army would be disproportionately black.

Charges such as those—to which the Administration says it has the answers—are sure to arise again and again in congressional hearings that are just getting under way.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

Key issue in the hearings is the President's request—in line with his target of mid-1973 for abolishing conscription—that the draft law, due to expire June 30, be extended for a period of only two years instead of the usual four.

Mr. Nixon also is asking for a 1.5-billion-dollar boost in military pay, in addition to the 1.2 billion that went into effect January 1. The new increase, the President said, "would move us substantially closer to the goal of an all-volunteer force."

Besides raises in basic pay, the Administration now proposes bonuses of \$1,000 to \$3,000 for enlistees in combat branches, plus "proficiency" pay.

Some military officers say that the bonus program would be "catastrophic." One high-ranking officer contends that the Government would have to spend "vast sums on manpower and, given the budget limitations, would have fewer men than needed."

DOUBTERS' GROUNDS

Those military experts who doubt that the U.S. can achieve an effective all-volunteer force point to findings such as these:

An Army survey of 336,000 volunteers on active duty at the end of 1969 indicated that 50 per cent had enlisted because they were about to be drafted anyway, or because under the three-year volunteer program they could select a particular job skill.

During the first half of 1970, the Army surveyed 71,342 volunteers. Of these, 43,705 signed up for three years to exercise their options in military occupational specialties. Only 2.5 per cent of this group selected combat arms.

Chiefs of all the services stress the need for "high quality" manpower.

But it is pointed out that 24 per cent of all the men entering military ranks in the three years after Oct. 1, 1966, were accepted under "new standards"—that is, they scored well below average on the Armed Forces Qualification Test.

For the most part, these men were educationally deficient—previously considered unqualified for military service except in time of grave national peril. The reduction in standards was imposed upon the military by the then Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara.

Of the total of 246,042 "new standards" men, 53 per cent were volunteers and 41 per cent were black. The Army, which took 162,342 of the men listed in the educationally deficient category, assigned 66,560 of them to the combat arms, mostly as infantrymen. The Marine Corps took 26,712 and assigned 14,958 to combat occupations. The Navy and the Air Force used very few in combat roles.

A question nagging each of the services is this: Can an all-volunteer force—smaller and with a need for higher efficiency—still use "new standards" men?

One thing stands out as manpower experts study feasibility of an all-volunteer force: Few men with college training volunteer to serve in the enlisted ranks.

Between mid-1965 and mid-1968, years of the great U.S. build-up in Vietnam, college men represented only 1.6 per cent of volunteers. In 1969, as draft deferments began to run out for many, this same group accounted

for 4.2 per cent of those who enlisted—and 11 per cent of those drafted.

THE AIR FORCE FINDINGS

Only one service—the Air Force—has conducted an in-depth study of what kinds of men volunteer as enlistees. Among findings in a survey of 41,098 basic airmen, completed last August:

At the time of enlistment, 71 per cent were supported by parents working at non-professional jobs, including 14.7 per cent whose fathers were laborers and 31 per cent whose fathers were skilled craftsmen.

Only 4 per cent had graduated from college, though 80 per cent were high-school graduates. The rest were dropouts.

41 per cent came from homes valued at between \$10,000 and \$20,000; 27 per cent from homes valued at less than \$10,000; 24.5 per cent from homes valued at more than \$20,000, and 7.3 per cent from apartments. A large majority came from comparatively small communities.

Of the 41,098 airmen studied, 97 per cent said they regarded the Air Force and the Navy as "safer" services than the Army or Marine Corps.

DEBATE IN CONGRESS

On Capitol Hill, the debate over the President's plan for doing away with the draft is creating some strange political alliances between "conservatives" and "liberals" on both sides of the issue.

For example, Senator John C. Stennis (Dem.), of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee—a "conservative"—says the objective of a volunteer army "is a flight from reality unless the size of the armed forces is to be reduced in the years ahead far below any figures I consider our minimum requirements."

Adding that he has talked with hundreds of GI's and junior officers, the Mississippi Senator says:

"To at least 95 per cent of these men trying to maintain a combat Army without a draft was a pure joke, and they said so."

Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Dem.) of Massachusetts—a "liberal"—is opposed to ending the draft while the U.S. remains involved in Vietnam. He argues that sons of the well-to-do could not be induced by money to volunteer and maintains that with an all-voluntary force "you would have poor people fighting a rich man's war."

On the opposite side, arguing for creation of a volunteer Army even faster than Mr. Nixon proposes, are such Senators as Barry Goldwater, Arizona Republican, a "conservative," and George McGovern, South Dakota Democrat, and Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon Republican, both "liberals."

Introduced on February 17, a bill backed by 82 Congressmen would boost military pay by 3.1 billion dollars instead of the 1.5 billion asked by Mr. Nixon. It would hike a recruit's pay from \$134 a month to \$301—compared with \$201 requested by the President.

NEW INDUCEMENTS

Roger T. Kelley, Assistant Secretary of Defense, emphasizes that if the goal of ending the draft is to be achieved, pay increases, a bonus system to attract volunteers and the addition of proficiency pay to hold them all are essential.

Mr. Kelley adds that improvement of conditions in which troops live and work is even more important than cash incentives.

Pentagon officials say that what the Administration wants is a post-Vietnam volunteer Army of 13½ divisions of highly trained men led by well-qualified officers. A conventional infantry division has a strength of 14,500.

The Army plans to speed the flow of able young officers into the service by increasing Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships.

Planners believe they can surmount an obstacle that has been raised—antimilitarism on campuses which has forced withdrawal of the ROTC program from a number of colleges and universities.

INTENSIVE TRAINING

Some career officers maintain that a professional, volunteer force is what is needed to meet the requirements of technological warfare, which call for intensive and prolonged training on the sophisticated weapons systems planned or now in use.

Others, however, say that the draft has helped the Army by broadening its outlook and bringing it closer to civilian life.

To those who maintain that a volunteer Army would be made up largely of blacks, officers at the Pentagon cite studies leading to estimates that Negroes would form no more than 16 to 18 per cent of a voluntary force. The present percentage of blacks in the Army is estimated at from 11 to 12 per cent, roughly the same as the percentage of Negroes in the total population.

A main argument advanced by proponents of a volunteer force is that far fewer men who receive job training in the service will be returning to civilian life just when they begin to be most productive.

WHEN TWO REPLACE THREE

Manpower experts also contend that two "dedicated" volunteers will be able to do the work of three draftees.

A trimming of American commitments around the world is considered a certainty over the next few years. As this comes about, the Nixon Administration maintains, a smaller, volunteer Army is entirely feasible.

But it is Congress that must make the decision. And Congress still seems unconvinced.

MILLIONS WHO AVOIDED THE DRAFT

Pentagon computers have divided into groups the millions of young Americans who, by one means or another, escaped the draft during the Vietnam-war build-up.

One group includes 1.4 million men who managed to evade full-time military service—or any service at all—by taking advantage of loopholes in the law.

Another group includes 1.8 million undergraduates granted college deferments during the height of the manpower build-up, between 1965 and 1969.

In the same period, the number of Americans holding various occupational deferments as schoolteachers, graduate students, members of the Peace Corps and apprentices in certain job areas, jumped from 220,012 to 491,998—an increase of 124 per cent.

Those holding dependency deferments climbed from 3,766,117 to 4,194,756. This represented a gain of 428,639, or 11 per cent. For the most part, these dependency deferments went to men who married and quickly became parents.

THE RESERVES

After it became clear in 1965 that there would be no general mobilization of the reserve forces—and that membership carried an automatic draft deferment—810,000 physically fit, draft-eligible men signed up through 1969.

A study made for the Army found that 83 per cent of those joining the Army's reserve forces did so, by their own admission, to avoid being drafted. Of those who enlisted in the Air Force Reserves, 86.5 per cent said they wanted to "beat the draft." Half of those who entered the Marines' Reserves and 75 per cent of those who selected the Navy conceded they did so to escape full-time military service.

"This information," the study noted, "might provide ammunition to critics who allege the reserves are a haven for draft dodgers."

SOME REVISION

President Nixon drastically changed the draft rules on April 23, 1970, ending a variety of exemptions. By Nov. 1, 1970, the number of men holding occupational, student and dependency deferments declined by nearly 662,000.

A Pentagon manpower analyst said: "If you take a close look at those who avoided military service, you would find that most would rank above average in intelligence. What we are talking about are men with the greatest stake in the democratic process who sought to avoid its application to themselves."

There is one group of college students the Pentagon's statisticians single out with pride. Between mid-1965 and mid-1970, 101,882 men, all volunteers, were commissioned from the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. All were called to active duty and 40 per cent were assigned to combat duty.

HOW TWO ALLIES FARE WITH VOLUNTEERS WITH NO MILITARY DRAFT, BRITAIN AND CANADA MUST MAKE DO WITH FEWER MEN AT HIGHER EXPENSE. ONE MAJOR WORRY: GETTING THE RIGHT RECRUITS FOR TODAY'S SPECIALIZED FORCES

When it comes to shifting to an all-volunteer army, there is a lesson to be learned from the experiences of two close allies—Britain and Canada:

Only by chopping down on the size of military forces far enough, and raising the pay high enough, is there a chance of making it work.

But a volunteer army is not without headaches, even then.

BRITAIN'S EXPERIENCE

Britain has been at it for 10 years. Morale and efficiency are better than with a draftee army, but the problem of recruiting enough qualified men—even with higher pay—may prove insurmountable.

Since abolishing conscription in 1960, Britain has made determined efforts to reduce both its armed forces and its global commitments to match realistic recruiting targets.

Britain's military forces stood at more than 700,000 a decade ago. Today they are down to 340,000.

Still, enlistments are running roughly 10 percent below minimum manpower requirements. That represents a substantial improvement since 1969, when the armed forces faced a disaster situation because of a 25 percent shortfall in recruiting. Now officials say they see no practical way of closing the remaining manpower gap any further.

SERVICE REFORMS

In an effort to attract the 43,000 enlisted volunteers needed each year, the British have introduced two major reforms—

The minimum period of enlistment has been reduced from six to three years. Aim is to overcome the reluctance of young men to join the services for a long period without any experience of military life and without a chance to leave if they dislike it.

A radical new "military salary" plan has been introduced in the past year to make pay competitive with wages in comparable civilian jobs. When this plan is fully implemented in April it will mean an increase in a private's pay of about 95 per cent—from \$19.75 weekly to \$37.80. It will also mean an increase of 28½ million dollars in Britain's defense bill.

In the year that the new pay plan has been in effect, enlistments totaled about 39,000—a rise of 5,000 from the previous year.

The manpower shortages are felt acutely in some of the most critical fields—medical officers and administrative and technical specialists. The Navy has trouble recruiting seamen for a career that takes them away from home much of the time.

There is an accompanying failure to attract

qualified young men as career officers for the Army. Sandhurst, the West Point of Britain, has only 510 cadets this year, with nearly 400 openings unfilled.

Even with a higher pay scale, Britain faces these problems—

There is widespread antimilitary sentiment, a political and psychological climate that regards "defense" as of little importance.

The "old Army" image of "spit and polish" keeps many recruits away.

Physical and mental standards are so high that 50 per cent of volunteers are rejected

CANADA'S EXPERIENCE

The Canadian all-volunteer defense force has four applicants for each opening—but it is still in trouble. The big reason. Too few are qualified for the "specialist" ratings a modern military force requires.

Canada's armed forces are small and getting smaller. Hacking away at manpower has been going on since 1964, when there were nearly 120,000 in uniform. Now there are 90,000, and the goal of about 82,000 is expected to be reached by 1973.

The country has gone a step further than an "all volunteer" force. It has integrated its forces, even to ordering all elements into the same uniform. This unification move is to save the Government an estimated 500 million dollars a year.

HIGHER PAY, BUT—

In Canada, a private can now make up to \$527 a month, a sergeant \$840 and a chief warrant officer \$1,065.

There are other advantages: the privilege of living off the military post, the opportunity to become a physician, dentist or dietitian at Government expense.

But the U.S., working toward an all volunteer force, could well ponder Canada's experience. As summed up by Gen. Frederick R. Sharp, Chief of the Defense Staff—

"In a small, professional military force, selectivity is important. The forces have to attract men who can learn to use the newest and most sophisticated equipment. For that caliber, the forces have to compete with private industry.

"Men have to be given the same advantages in pay, opportunity and professional challenge as they would get outside the military establishment.

"After we get through training a man, we have to compete with private industry to hold him."

BERNADETTE DEVLIN ABUSES GUEST PRIVILEGES

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Statue of Liberty stands proudly in New York Harbor to welcome all foreigners to our great country, and no country on earth has offered more to the oppressed that come to our shores to start a new life. It is, therefore, a sad instance when one comes as a guest to our country and subjects our people and Government to the ridicule and indignities such as that espoused by Northern Ireland's fiery leftwing leader and extremist, Bernadette Devlin, during her recent speaking tour at American colleges.

Freedom of speech is a right cherished by most Americans but it is inexcusable that some of our citizenry abuse this right by practicing subversion in the

name of freedom of speech. To me it is more intolerable when a foreign visitor disregards the fact that entering this country is a privilege extended by our Government officials and people, and then proceeds to disregard this right.

There is no justification for American officials to sit idly by as Miss Devlin harangues our system of government and our President, while at the same time applauding Angela Davis, and avowed Marxist Socialist and revolutionary whose dedication is to destroy our American system of government.

An editorial by Mr. Peter Wallenberg in the Fort Lauderdale News recently, properly expresses dismay at her outrageous conduct. I would like to share this editorial with you and include it in the RECORD as follows:

WHY PAY RABBLE ROUSERS TO RUN DOWN AMERICA AND INCITE REBELLION?

Over the years, a motley crew of foreigners have come to our shores to tell us what's wrong with us and, to boot, make us pay for the doubtful privilege of listening to their low opinions of us.

Mind you, we believe in welcome wagons for foreign dignitaries and just common people. We listen to them with respect even when we don't share their ideas. We heartily applaud them for the courage of their convictions. And often, we believe, our guests return home with less bias than they had when they entered.

But every once in a while, we really play host to a lulu. One such, having found out some time ago that Americans gladly reach into their pocketbooks to aid almost any cause, recently returned to our land to rake us over the coals at so much per head.

Her name is Bernadette Devlin, booked as a Northern Irish civil rights leader, here to address American college audiences on the subject of Irish civil strife between Catholics and Protestants. She represents the former and is a Northern Irish member of the British parliament in London.

Just exactly where the money she collects goes isn't quite clear, and even some of her fellows in what, no doubt, is a good cause, wonder about that.

Recently, Miss Devlin addressed 2,500 persons at Oregon State University eager to hear what the civil strife in Northern Ireland was all about. They obtained quite a good education on the matter.

She told them that American interests and military bases should depart from Ulster and that American industries there should be nationalized.

"Just leave them, we'll run them for you," said the young lady, adding that capitalism was the enemy of the Irish people and that the civil strife there as a class struggle, not a religious war.

"Capitalism killed our fathers. Capitalism killed our children. We have a right to survive. We'll kill capitalism."

Thus, Miss Devlin gave us hell for believing that religion had anything to do with the unfortunate events in her home country.

"The fight is over the fact that both Protestants and Catholics need houses, need work, need food," she said. She didn't quite explain just why Catholics and Protestants should fight each other if both had the same aim.

But explaining the Irish situation was not enough for Miss Devlin. With great courage, she delved into American matters. Like "Angela Davis was not faced with criminal charges including homicide so that she could be jailed; Angela Davis was guilty of being a black militant communist organizer."

Miss Devlin went on that Miss Davis was

arrested under a law covering persons who purchase guns used in homicides (slight errors in facts may be excused now and later, we suppose), but "President Nixon uses tax money to buy guns which kill in Vietnam."

Having done away with our great problems in minutes, Miss Devlin took on women's lib. She said she favored it if it were part of the struggle to overthrow oppression of the working class.

"But I have no time for middle-class American women who do not think they are being well-treated by middle-class men," she opined. And then, figuratively speaking, she passed the collection plate.

Verily, Miss Devlin is a lulu. And the patience of American audiences is wonderful, indeed.

LET'S DIGNIFY OUR FLAG

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, entitled "Let's Dignify our Flag," was written by Mr. Chet Shore, editor of the Montana Legionnaire and published in the June 1970 issue. Mr. Shore has been notified by the Freedoms Foundation that the editorial is to receive the Honor Certificate Award for 1970 from the National Awards Jury of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

This will be the second editorial by Mr. Shore to receive such a national honor within 6 months. Mr. Shore received the William E. Rominger Memorial Plaque for the best editorial in a Legion paper at the 1970 National Legion convention at Portland, Ore., last September by the American Legion Press Association.

Inasmuch as I am cosponsoring legislation making Flag Day a legal holiday, I feel it appropriate to include this editorial in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

FLAG DAY

Flag Day, June 14, should be a day of gratification for all true Americans who love their country dearly and would lay down their lives for it. It's also a time to dignify our flag.

Do you recall where this scene took place: "An American flag torn from its flagstaff was passed through the crowd and furiously torn to pieces. Tear it, kill it, it's dead, the flag is dead!" a young girl screamed.

Sickening isn't it? This happened in front of the Justice Department in our nation's capital during last November's moratorium demonstration. The Vietnam Moratorium was organized by the so-called "New Mobe" whose key leaders, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, are "co-ordinating their activities with international communist elements."

In this day when the American flag is enduring so much disrespect, all Americans should determine to elevate it to the place of dignity it rightly deserves. This worthy emblem is being lowered, burned, torn apart, trampled on and spat upon. This, by that minority who have lost respect for our country and themselves.

It is high time that we dignify our flag by giving it a place of distinction, ennoblement and elevation. We should continue to treasure Old Glory as a symbol to which humanity aspires.

How very far we have come as a nation when a group of people can burn our flag,

tear it to pieces, or trample it underfoot? It would almost seem to the bystander that we are being tormented and dared to see how much we will condone.

The majority of people are not involved. Very few, considering the numbers of our population. The question still remains: Why should anyone be allowed to bring even momentary disgrace to the President of these United States, or even his invited guests?

Loyalty is not a cloak to put on or off at will. It is a whole way of life! With no spaces in between!

SEAT BELTS SAVE LIVES

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, located in the National Bureau of Standards is an office of great importance to our efforts to reduce death, injury, and property damage on our Nation's highways. I refer to the Office of Vehicle Systems Research headed by Paul J. Brown. I have had numerous occasions to call on Mr. Brown and his excellent staff for assistance on various aspects of highway and vehicle safety. The assistance which they have provided, has always been prompt and of the highest caliber. In some respects, this would not be regarded as unusual since we are all well aware of the high degree of competence at the Bureau of Standards. However, it is unusual in the field of vehicle and highway safety as dealt with by Government agencies. At least in the past, there has been too much of a cloud nine approach to solving these problems. This is certainly not true of Paul Brown's operations and other Government agencies operating in this area could do well to emulate Mr. Brown's operation.

The following article further amplified on a current area of research in Mr. Brown's office:

AUTOMOBILES RESTRAINTS TESTED

A reliable topic to move the conversation in any social gathering is automobile seat belts. Mention their use, or nonuse, or safety attributes or discomfort and from each respondent will come a different opinion.

"There are so many myths about seat belts today," said Paul J. Brown, chief of the Vehicle Systems Research Office of the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) in Washington. "We are convinced people are not using them, and we are equally convinced of their necessity—they do save lives and prevent injury, even in low-speed accidents."

Most available statistics support his belief; yet, says Brown: "People always quote the one in a thousand who says he is alive today because he did not wear a safety belt and thus was thrown clear of his demolished and/or burning car. They never quote the other 999, because they are all dead."

And the danger of accidents worsens as highway congestion increases, Brown adds: "Automobile growth is staggering in the U.S. Statistics show that 33,000 new cars are added to our highways each day while only 1,000 a day are junked."

Brown directs an engineering-scientific staff of over 50 who are developing design and safety criteria for total vehicle-restraint systems, including occupant restraints, braking

systems and tires. The results of their research are fed to manufacturers and to the National Highway Safety Bureau of the U.S. Department of Transportation as base data for establishing manufacturing rules and regulations.

But Brown admits that although his group has contributed heavily to seat belt improvements, there is little it can do to convince the American public to wear safety restraints while driving. User estimates in the United States vary from 20 percent to 34 percent; an AB Volvo study over a long-term period determined a figure of only 26 percent for Sweden.

NBS initiated seat belt research with a staff of three following passage of seat belt and brake fluid laws in 1964. In 1966 the National Traffic and Motor Vehicles Safety Act and the Highway Safety Act were enacted. Out of these bills came formation of the Transportation Department (DOT) and an inter-agency agreement with the Commerce Department in 1967 retaining NBS services for total restraint system research and development. The NBS research office is funded by DOT at about \$1.5 million annually, according to Brown.

Indicative of the slow start by DOT in this field is the fact that the manufacturing standards in force today for vehicle seat belts are those written by NBS and published in the *Federal Register* in August 1966.

Nourished by DOT funds, the NBS group was expanded and in 1967 and 1968 it sponsored a restraint system test program through the 6571st Aeromedical Research Laboratory at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico. There, researchers used both human volunteers and anthropomorphic dummies on the Daisy Decelerator, an experimental test sled on a 240-foot track.

Thrusters of 5 to 185 feet per second was achieved by the sled from an air piston and deceleration forces up to 30 gravities was obtained using a water brake. Using only 120 feet of track, volunteers experienced simulated impacts to nearly 17-g; dummies were subjected to the full 30-g loading. New commercially available seat belts were employed on each test run and the results were meticulously photographed and measured with a variety of sensors.

From the 75 human test runs, NBS obtained the first and only available data on the character of seat belt restraints on a living subject. For the first time, it was learned that loads experienced by even the most sophisticated dummy exceeded that by man, for the latter counteracts some deceleration effects through his legs and feet planted firmly on the floor.

In the dummy tests, seat belt loads were determined to vary by as much as 150 percent; the greater the articulation and pliability of their trunks, the lower the seat belt loads imposed by the standard-weight dummy (162 pounds for the 50th-percentile man). Tests also provided impact pulse shapes, critical angles of impact and the effect of anchorage locations or angles.

It was a good beginning but testing had to be continued in the Washington laboratory. Brown's staff set about the design of a low-cost test sled. The result is the new NBS dynamic seat tester that reverses the approach used at Holloman: To simulate deceleration, the sled is accelerated backwards.

To achieve this, a very heavy flywheel, rotating rapidly, briefly engages a radical cam that reels in a strap attached to the sled. The cam shape establishes the impact pulse, a half sine wave, such that the 400-pound sled goes from 0 to 30 to 0-g in only 19 inches of travel before being stopped by a cable and disc brake.

Thus, a test sled was built for less than \$50,000 equal in performance to those costing 10 times more, and it can be reproduced for less than \$20,000, Brown asserts. The short

travel simplifies both the installation of transducers for measurements and the photographic recording of tests.

Present studies center on strength of seat belt materials, new inertial-locking retractors and improved child restraints, such as the Ford Tot Guard that provides full body cover with a padded, molded-plastic form.

The inertia reel shows high promise for the future. Worn like a conventional T-seat belt, it affords freedom of movement to the occupant as long as he moves slowly. However, under any sudden movement exerting a force of over ½-g on the straps, the retracting mechanism locks instantly.

DOT has given auto makers until July 1, 1973, before they must install in new cars automatic crash-protection systems. These must be passive and must allow front-seat occupants to survive, without serious injury, a head-on collision with another vehicle, both travelling at 30 mph.

So far, the favored crash envelope seems to be an air-bag system that inflates on impact with great speed (0.03 seconds). But, Brown feels the present state of development leaves a lot to be desired before such systems are employed as seat belt replacements.

He notes, for example, that one requires use of a compressed-air bottle under a pressure of 3,500 pounds per square inch. When the air is released, the noise level is resounding—"like firing a 12-gauge shotgun in a confined room." The pressure of the bag on the driver can cause loss of steering control and the protection offered against an oblique impact is negligible, he declares.

Brown places more faith, at least for the foreseeable future, in belt restraints. A recent study tends to support his belief.

At the Society of Automotive Engineers annual meeting in January, General Motors released a report of the performance of four-point-anchored front seat belts. Using a data base of 186 accidents occurring at speeds of over 50 mph, only two fatalities were registered—one front seat and one rear seat passenger in a car were killed because a telephone pole sheared through the vehicle. All others survived without serious injury.

DRUG ABUSE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body is fully aware of the dangers of drug abuse in this country and, I believe deeply dedicated to doing all that we can to end this national tragedy which hits hardest at our young people.

In this effort, I think we can be justifiably proud of the Bureau of Customs in the Treasury Department which, under the stewardship of Myles J. Ambrose, is compiling an excellent record of achievement in the fight against drug abuse.

It has been my privilege to work closely with the Bureau for the 12 years I served on the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, and with Mr. Ambrose since his appointment in August 1969. I have always been impressed by the talent and dedication of our customs agents and their expertise and effectiveness have grown under Mr. Ambrose.

In the January 1971, issue of the Po-

lice Chief, Commissioner Ambrose has written a very concise article entitled "How U.S. Customs Fights the Drug Traffic." This excellent article deals not only with the successes his Bureau have achieved, but also with problems overcome and other obstacles ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the reading of this article to all my colleagues and I insert it in the RECORD at this time:

HOW U.S. CUSTOMS FIGHTS THE DRUG TRAFFIC

Participating in this dramatic case, which broke up an international drug smuggling ring, were U.S. Customs, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the California State Narcotics Bureau, various European government operating through a multi-nation Interpol alert, and others.

It provided an example of what can be accomplished when efforts are pooled on an international basis, and when local, state and federal efforts are combined in a common cause!

When the final report on this case is published—after the loose ends are tied together—it will be a tribute to the courage and perseverance of the agents involved but above all to the effectiveness of joint investigative work by many agencies and at least nine governments.

What are we doing to stop the illicit drug traffic which has brought so much misery and suffering to the youth of this country and a national inflation in crime?

The federal government has mounted an intensified program of cooperation with friendly governments and international organizations at three levels in a common effort: (1) to encourage, through diplomatic channels, those countries where illicit drugs are cultivated to control the practice; (2) to eliminate illegal manufacturing and processing facilities, and (3) to control drug smuggling and trafficking.

On the diplomatic level, promising results can be anticipated in the State Department's stepped-up drive to persuade producer nations such as Turkey to eliminate the production of opium where small farmers have been growing it for centuries.

On the level of manufacturing and processing, elimination of illegal processing in such areas as southern France, where the opium, grown in Turkey, is converted into heroin by small mobile laboratories before being shipped to the United States, has been the subject of discussions between the two governments at the diplomatic level.

Just a few weeks ago, at the Western White House in San Clemente, California, the U.S. Customs Service was host at a three-day conference with Mexican and Canadian Customs officials. In a spirit of complete cooperation and mutual understanding, we agreed upon improved anti-smuggling procedures, exchange of intelligence and other related activity.

Mexico has taken significant steps in the eradication of marijuana and opium growth despite problems of terrain, and is working closely with our government in border surveillance and related investigative operations. The United States has provided Mexico with a million dollars for the procurement of helicopters, light spotting planes and other equipment which can be used for the destruction of marijuana and poppy fields in the almost inaccessible hills and mountains of the country.

Canada, where the drug problem has been growing in seriousness, as in many other nations, is exchanging and developing meaningful and essential intelligence information with the United States. We have been working together on the problem of intercepting smuggling operators using Canada for trans-

siting illicit drugs. Cooperative programs are being increased and intensified and will continue to expand along our common borders.

On the level of control of smuggling and trafficking, in carrying out the mandate of President Nixon to the Treasury and Justice Departments, the Customs Service has introduced many radical changes in its usual procedures. These changes, some of which are described below, have been coming extremely rapidly, and they will continue as we mobilize our increased manpower and resources with the objective of frustrating and disrupting the giant smuggling syndicates, hopefully we may then be able to bring their ringleaders to book, and cut off the illicit drug supply in our country.

The big question confronting us in law enforcement is: Can we—federal, state, county and international law enforcement agencies—functioning together, do the job before it is too late?

NOT AN EASY TASK

We in the Bureau of Customs have a significant role to play in the overall effort and we are determined to improve our performance. With 250 million residents, foreign visitors and others coming into the United States each year, the task of making the necessary customs inspection of these people and their baggage has become gargantuan. When you add the immense quantities of imported merchandise which must be inspected, it can easily be realized that a Customs force which had not increased materially since the 1920's simply cannot do the job as mandated by Congress.

The President and the Congress realized that fact, and during the 1970 fiscal year a supplemental appropriation of \$8.75 million was approved for the U.S. Customs Service to beef up its programs. With these funds, we have augmented our force of agents and inspectors by more than 900. We have acquired our own aircraft, boats and vehicles for stepped up surveillance and enforcement work, and we are modernizing our agency from top to bottom.

Can the smuggling of these narcotics actually be stopped? Perhaps not completely, but they can be reduced substantially.

Effective border controls can result in crippling the efforts of smugglers to use what has heretofore been the simplest routes for the introduction of drugs into the United States, either on the person, in accompanying baggage, in planes, ships, vehicles, etc. Our action forces professional smugglers to resort to more bizarre and open methods of smuggling and requires them to snare more and more members into the conspiracy at greater cost and danger of detection.

It is our belief, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Eugene T. Rossides has stated, that we may have already turned the corner. The professionals are not entirely unaware of the risks they run, the penalties they face, the efforts we are making.

To illustrate how some of the "non-professionals" operate, in a recent two-week period, Customs officers dug out dope and other contraband in talcum powder cans, hollowed-out books, cosmetic kits, neckties, a splash pan of a truck, brassware shipments from Bombay, a stereo set, laundry bags, a canvas bag with a false bottom, the headlight of a motorcycle, and even from false table tops.

When the Customs Service was formed in 1789, its duties were to collect the revenue on imports and to prevent violations of the laws governing the delivery of merchandise into this country. There have been many new laws since 1789, and the functions of Customs have been greatly magnified, but we are still basically concerned with the collection of duties and taxes and the interdiction of contraband.

President Nixon has characterized drug abuse as a problem of epidemic proportions.

In his July 14, 1969, message to Congress, the President referring to the control of dangerous drugs and narcotics said:

"The Department of the Treasury, through the Bureau of Customs, is charged with enforcing the nation's smuggling laws. I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate a major new effort to guard the nation's borders and ports against the growing volume of narcotics from abroad. There is a recognized need for more men and facilities in the Bureau of Customs to carry out this directive."

Customs is working in closest cooperation with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. Some of their agents are assigned to our offices to work together in our efforts not only to stop the entrance of illegal drugs and narcotics, but also to catch the people involved in the distribution of these mind- and body-killing substances. We have stationed agents in various BNDD foreign offices to enable both organizations to gather and disseminate information about smuggling operations.

We are gradually tightening our inspection and enforcement activities all along the northern and eastern borders, and at all major gateways to our country. We are checking more baggage, people and cargo more thoroughly than ever before, at more ports of entry with better results than ever before.

The results of the program have been impressive but are still far from our objectives. From June 1 to August 22, there were 1,361 arrests and over 1,400 seizures. Almost 46 pounds of cocaine, nearly 14 tons of marijuana, and over a quarter of a million five-grain units of dangerous drugs were seized by customs. Fourteen tons of marijuana, if converted into cigarettes, could have produced about 38 million cigarettes; the dangerous drug "tabs," liquid and powder LSD, could have produced 4.5 million illegal doses. The fourteen pounds of heroin could have provided about 98,000 injections for addicts, possibly more.

We also seized almost 1,100 pounds of hashish during this period. When you realize that it requires 625 pounds of marijuana to produce one pound of hashish, the total is the startling equivalent of over 337 tons of marijuana.

We estimate that the drugs seized during this period have a value of about \$20 million on the street market. In addition, we detained 463 vehicles and two airplanes, with a value of over a million dollars. From any point of view, Customs' intensified enforcement is yielding handsome results.

"Intensified enforcement" is not a short-time affair. It is an escalating program involving the use of computers, an electronic network, aircraft, ships, detector dogs, chemicals, and a wide range of other devices. Some of these devices are being tested, some are in the planning stage, and others are on the calendar for the future.

The Customs Data Processing Intelligence Network (CADPIN) is currently in operation along the Mexican border, and also at such ports as Detroit, Champlain, Buffalo, and the airports at Boston, New York, and Miami. CADPIN was launched with the co-operation of the State of California, but now we have our own computers at San Diego, which have stored in their electronic "brain" the records of known smugglers and cars involved in smuggling. In a few seconds, a check can be made that will let a Customs officer know whether or not the car is on a suspect list. CADPIN is being gradually expanded and perfected and its input will soon be available on an instantaneous basis at any Customs port, giving us a new dimension in our work.

Since its inception, CADPIN has yielded many productive "strikes" leading to the seizure of marijuana, heroin, dangerous drugs, and many arrests.

REORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATIONS

The Customs Agency Service, the investigative arm of our Bureau, under the direction of Assistant Commissioner Harold F. Smith, has been reorganized and modernized, enabling it to move more effectively against all violations in this fast-moving world.

There are 20 newly established districts in the United States, with a Special Agent in Charge at each of them, all reporting directly to headquarters in Washington. The tighter liaison between the field service and the Bureau headquarters has already proved its worth.

We are receiving vital support from the local police and enforcement agencies, the value of which cannot be exaggerated.

Public support is a vital element in the program. We are receiving this support and our efforts are acknowledged by concerned Americans from all walks of life. Let me quote from just one of thousands of letters received by the Bureau of Customs from anxious citizens:

"Mr. R. and I just returned to the U.S. from Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, on Monday, August 3rd.

"We just wanted to write you and your department a word of thanks. I'm sure you receive many complaints for the delays you cause. Being the mother and father of a nine-year-old boy and a twelve-year-old girl, we could not be more pleased with all the precautions now being taken to keep narcotics out of this country . . .

"The American people should be thankful to have men who really care for this country and the safety of our children."

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT
CONSTITUENTS, MARCH 8, 1971

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the last of three report on the Nation's growing welfare crisis:

REMARK BY CONGRESSMAN LEE H. HAMILTON

It is commonplace, now, to describe the Nation's welfare system as a colossal failure. Our present system is costly and almost impossible to administer. It often degrades the recipient. Its benefits fluctuate wildly from state to state. It breaks up families and drives millions into the slums of the cities. It provides no benefits for the "working poor," and for others, benefits are too meager to meet basic human needs.

While I agree with the assessment of failure, I hasten to add that I am not critical of those who work within the system—the caseworkers and the administrators whose job it is to deal compassionately with the last, the least and the lost of society.

To recite the wrongs of welfare is easy. To suggest meaningful reforms is not. Everyone agrees that much is wrong. But those who are critical without offering positive and realistic reforms are giving approval—intentionally or not—to the welfare system in its present form.

Several proposals—all of them complicated and some of them drastic—have been offered to alter the whole approach to welfare and poverty. The broad choices apparently are the President's Family Assistance Plan (FAP), a form of federal takeover of the welfare system, or the continuation of the present system.

The President's plan would establish an income floor under all poor families. It would require that all recipients, except those exempted because of age, physical disability or to care for infants, register for employment or job training. Failure to comply would mean loss of benefits.

Under the plan, any family of four, with an income of less than \$3920 would be eligible for benefits, up to a maximum of \$1600. It would make food stamps available to all recipients, and it would eliminate the Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) program, the most costly welfare category.

Critics of FAP say the plan does not provide incentives for welfare recipients to work their way off welfare. The Congress has returned the plan to the President several times, insisting that the work and training requirements be strengthened to encourage recipients to work, and to discourage "free-loaders." The President's plan still offers no guarantee that jobs will be available, particularly in times of high unemployment.

The Congress also is concerned that the FAP does not offer an improved administration of welfare. Under the President's plan, welfare would continue to be administered by states under contract to the Federal government. In the past, this system has spawned miles of red tape, regulations, and rules creating frustrations for the recipients and for the welfare workers.

Additionally, the FAP has been censured because it does not deal with the wide variations of welfare payments from state to state. The day care centers, which the FAP proposes to permit mothers to work, also has been criticized as being disruptive to family unity.

The federalization of welfare, the gradual assumption of costs, and administration of the welfare program by the Federal government, has been getting increasing attention as an alternative to FAP. However, unless accompanied by reforms, the only advantage to this approach would be fiscal relief for State and local governments. Reforms are now being discussed.

It begins to look as if a new welfare plan will emerge, patterned after the FAP, with increasing Federal funding and responsibilities for administration, with strong incentives for welfare recipients to work or train for work, and with restrictions on the number of recipients and the amount of benefits in order to keep total costs within acceptable limits.

ELECTRIC POWER—MORE OR LESS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, most people recall very vividly how long and hard Americans worked to rise above the daily drudgery of life without the modern conveniences we now take for granted. We all know that electricity plays a vital role in making our conveniences possible.

Our national concern is now more with newer problems such as water and air pollution, and some people have talked about cutting back on the availability of electricity in order to control pollution.

I have noted a speech made a short time ago by Mr. John W. Simpson, president of Westinghouse Power Systems Co., pointing out that a cutback in power production would cause even greater

problems than we now face. Mr. Simpson points out that, with the help of present and foreseeable technology and through proper management of energy resources, electric power production will not only meet the needs of our population growth, higher living standards, economic expansion, and agricultural production, but also help solve environmental problems. "Massive amounts" of electric power will be needed for pollution control—for recycling and the operation of waste treatment plants, as examples.

Mr. Simpson said:

We must direct our efforts not towards reducing our use of electrical energy but rather towards providing an adequate supply of that energy and at the same time minimizing the adverse effects involved in its production.

Mr. Simpson's speech to the St. Louis, Mo., Electrical Board of Trade on February 9, 1971, discusses many of the problems related to the "energy crisis" and pollution abatement in thoughtful perspective:

ELECTRIC POWER—MORE OR LESS

Years ago, as an engineer, I learned to think about electricity in terms of its polarity—that is, a negative or a positive charge. Now, I've become more concerned about a polarity of attitudes about electric power—positive or negative, for or against.

Everybody seems to be polarized these days, no matter what the issue. Politics, law and order, war in Indochina, breakfast cereals and women's skirts. You're either for or against, positive or negative, and polarization on some of these issues absolutely refutes an old law of magnetism that says opposites attract.

The production of electric power has become such an issue, and a lot of people are charged up negatively against it, saying that we've got to cut back on our use of electricity and stop building power plants and transmission lines.

Environmental pollution is probably the greatest single issue in the country today. Power generating plants pollute the air and release waste heat. Let's cut back on electric power to stop this pollution before we choke.

Electric power plants take up space. It has been projected that if we continue to double our demand for power every decade and continue to build new plants to meet that demand, well, in about 200 years, power plants will take up all available space in the country, leaving none for us humans. Let's cut back before electric power plants push us into the ocean.

Transmission lines right of way already occupy about four million acres of land. By 1990, transmission lines will take up space equal to more than twice the size of the state of Connecticut. Let's cut back before we have transmission towers walking through our living rooms.

The production and use of electric power also involve the generation of quantities of heat. If we release enough heat, which builds up in the biosphere, we might change the climate of the world. A few degrees warming could bring about a melting of the polar ice caps and resultant flooding throughout the world. Let's cut back on electric power before we're all flooded.

Now, there are some of the arguments that we've been hearing against electric power—the negative side of the story. These arguments sometimes can make a pretty convincing case for cutting back on our power consumption and production, on the surface.

But can we really do it? Could we either freeze our level of electric power use or put

some arbitrary ceiling on future consumption?

Not a chance.

To freeze or attempt to cut back on power consumption would have disastrous consequences that would dwarf our present environmental problems by comparison. Producing electric power causes certain environmental effects, to be sure. But those who would reduce power output and consumption have not considered the environmental effects of *not* producing enough electric power.

Let's examine some of the components of electric power consumption to see what will happen in the future.

First, there is the natural growth of our population. While a reduction in the rate of population increases may come about, I don't think we will ever achieve a zero population growth in the foreseeable future, as some people are advocating. And we cannot pass laws against population increases, because it seems to me that such legislation would violate our rights in a very fundamental way. Those who will be starting families and building houses in the 80's are already born. Should we ship all of these people off to some island in the South Seas so they will not create demands for electric power in the United States?

It is safe to say that there will be more people in this country, and these additional people will need more homes, schools, hospitals and jobs, all of which things call for more electric power. In addition, more electric power will be needed to generate the additional goods and services that a larger population will need.

More people will need more power.

Another factor that will create additional demands for power is the growth in our standard of living. In general, the living standard of any given family in the United States can roughly be measured by the number of appliances it has and by the amount of electricity it consumes, just as total power consumption is a good indicator of the standard of living of a nation. In America, electricity has enhanced our lives with many labor and time saving devices that free us from routine chores in the home. We continue to increase our consumption of power as our living standard rises. Between 1960 and 1969, the average household consumption of electric power rose from 3,851 to 6,550 kilowatt hours, up 70 per cent. By 1985, it has been projected that average annual consumption will be 17,240 kilowatt hours, about four and a half times that of 1960.

Now, millions of families can be considered average in terms of living standard and power consumption. But millions more are below that average. If we were to freeze our rate of power generation and consumption, we would effectively deny those millions who are below the average any chance to improve their lot in the future. I would not personally like to be the one to tell a young family just starting out that they can never buy that air conditioner or color television set because they can't have the extra electricity needed to run them.

There also are some economic ramifications to freezing the level of power consumption and, in effect, living standard. If we can't let people buy new and additional appliances such as air conditioners and television sets, nobody is going to be making those appliances, which means fewer jobs, less personal income and stunted economic growth nationally.

Furthermore, consider the mechanics of administering such a cutback or rationing of electric power. How would we determine who gets how much power? Would we get books with stamps for each kilowatt-hour of electricity we could use? Any system that could be devised would ultimately be not only arbitrary and discriminatory but just about impossible to enforce.

The forces of growth will continue to push up the demand for electric power at fairly predictable rates. Beyond these influences, however, are the new uses for electricity which we will develop and which will create additional demands for power. Technology constantly brings us new and more efficient ways of doing things.

In the home, we have already seen the introduction of garbage compactors and the microwave oven, a new and highly efficient way to cook food. Yet to come are such appliances as ultrasonic dishwashers and laundry equipment; home computers and more extensive use of heat pumps for heating and cooling.

These and more new products will create further demands for power.

Industrial use of electricity is growing at an increasing rate. Between 1960 and 1970 industries increased their use of electric power by 70 per cent. Yet in the decade from last year to 1980, industries will double their use of power. New processes and techniques such as electron beam welding, ultrasonic cleaning, induction heating, computerized process controls and electric arc furnaces are contributing to the increased industrial use of electric power.

But beyond these developments, we can see further industrial demands for electricity created by new technology to control pollution and treat wastes from plants. And as we get into recycling, an even greater need for electric power in industrial applications will be created.

Our increasing population is placing tremendous demands upon our cities and municipalities and their sewage treatment and water purification facilities, many of which are strained to beyond their capacity and are operating with turn-of-the-century technology.

It has been estimated that we will have to spend about \$30 billion on new sewage treatment facilities in this country in the next five years to clean up water pollution. To accomplish this, massive amounts of electric power will be needed to operate these plants.

There is a fairly direct correlation between the use of electric power and farm production. Between 1950 and 1970, the farm output per man-hour more than tripled in this country. And in the same period the non-household use of electric power on farms just about tripled also, as we saw a trend towards fewer but much larger farms.

Increasing amounts of energy will be needed in agriculture to raise farm production in the future. Energy will be needed for such things as poultry production, sprinkler irrigation and crop drying. It is my personal hope that electric power will supply an ever increasing share of that energy needed for agricultural production, and I am sure that our friends here at Union Electric will be seeing to that in their service area.

Using electric power, we will be able to revolutionize our modes of transportation and at the same time sharply cut levels of air pollution. The man who now creeps 15 miles or so to work in a 300 horsepower, 14-foot chariot that gets 10 miles to the gallon will some day have the option of taking electric powered mass transit vehicles into the city or of driving an electric commuter car that does the job so much more efficiently and cheaply and does not pollute the air.

At the present time, transportation uses about the same amount of energy as electric power generation. As we move in the future towards more use of electric power for ground transportation, tremendous additional demands for power will be created.

From what I've just touched on, I think it's obvious that we will need much greater amounts of electric power in this country in the years to come. Historically, the demand for power doubles every ten years. By some estimates, this demand has recently begun

to double in nine or eight years. Obviously, this nation and its electric utility companies are going to be hard pressed to keep up with this growing need for power.

The next questions that come to mind are these: Where are we going to get all that power; and can we do it without creating unbearable levels of pollution?

Let's take the first question. Where will all that power come from?

Obviously, the tremendous task of building more new electric power generating facilities lies before us. Between now and 1990, our nation's utilities will need some \$350 billion to finance new plants and equipment. That's a staggering amount of capital, and the competition for capital funds will be intense.

During these next two decades, the industry will need to build and install about one million megawatts of new capacity. This breaks down to about 40 new hydroelectric installations of 100 megawatts or more; approximately 50 new pumped storage hydroelectric installations of 300 megawatts or more and about 90 fossil and 165 nuclear power plants.

Just as pressing as the problem of building these new power plants is the need to maintain a plentiful supply of the fuels required to generate power in these plants. The energy crisis of 1970 was largely a fuel crisis. We awoke to the fact that because of various problems associated with the production and supply of fossil fuels, we can no longer count on coal, gas and oil to provide limitless, low-cost energy for our power generating plants.

The proper management of fuel resources has become a major national priority. Beyond the immediate problem of supplying enough fuel to generate power in 1971, lies the need to conserve these resources for important future uses other than power production such as the manufacture of chemicals and plastics.

Nuclear power has arrived as the desirable alternative to fossil fuel generation, not only from an economic standpoint, but because of environmental considerations. Fossil fuel prices—especially in the case of coal—have risen dramatically within the last year and we expect continuing increases in the future. A recent study by our company projected that the cost of coal in 1980 would be around 45 cents per million B.t.u.s, while nuclear fuel costs would remain fairly steady, perhaps declining, and would be well below 20 cents per million B.t.u.s in 1980. With the development of fast breeder reactors, plentiful supplies of nuclear fuel will be assured for many decades to come.

The environmental effects of nuclear power plants have been discussed thoroughly, sometimes more with the heat of emotion than with cold reason. But in the last analysis, nuclear power will be proven conclusively to be the most pollution-free source of electric power—by an order of magnitude—available to us for many years to come.

Yet, before we begin to worry about how much physical space all these plants I mentioned will occupy, consider that tremendous reductions in the amount of space to produce a given kilowatt or megawatt of electricity have been made over the past forty or fifty years. The average turbine-generator of the thirties and forties put out less than 100 megawatts and occupied roughly the same space of a modern turbine-generator unit of today, which can generate 1100 megawatts or more than ten times that of the old units. We can project units in the next ten years with outputs ranging to 2000 megawatts which will be comparable in size to these units, and who knows what lies beyond that. The coal yard of a typical coal-fired plant takes up space, to be sure, but, we have learned to extract a lot more energy out of a pound of coal in recent decades. And,

nuclear power plants use less physical space, because the coal yard is not necessary.

We cannot project what developments the technology of 2071 or 2171 will bring to the production of electric power. Certainly between now and then we can expect great improvements in efficiency and capacity in equipment of the type we know now. Certainly by that time we will have learned the answers to the questions posed to us in 1971 by such exotic yet theoretical forms of power generation such as fusion, magnetohydrodynamics, fuel cells, geothermal power and so on. Well before that hypothetical 200 years from now, we will have seen a leveling off in the rate of increase of power consumption. At some point in time, well before power plants crowd us into the ocean or we change the climate of the earth through the rejection of heat into the atmosphere, we will reach an energy plateau, a level at which our technology will have placed us through the super-efficient utilization of power. In other words, we will have learned to do so much more with so much less power that more power plants as we know them today probably would be superfluous.

Transmission line rights of way pose the same kind of problem as the need for more plant sites: they must be located so they can transmit power over the shortest routes and at the same time cause minimum disturbance to the environment.

Yet before we begin to bemoan the projected demands for right of way space needed by 1990 or 2050, remember that technology will bring us advances in this area also. A 765-KV line, the highest voltage in use today, transmits four times the amount of power of the 345-KV transmission line, giving a cost saving of two to one over the lower rating. In effect, the higher voltage requires 50 feet of right-of-way per 1000 megawatts as opposed to 150 feet per 1000 megawatts at 345 KV. When we move to 1100 KV, even further savings in space and investment will be realized per unit of power transmitted.

Furthermore, I am confident we will develop ways to transmit huge blocks of power underground, whether we use superconducting cables, cryogenic systems or compressed gas insulated cables. In addition, development of the concept of the utility corridor, which brings together communications and energy transmission lines and perhaps transportation routes will mean even greater savings of space in the future.

Some of these things, of course, lie well ahead in the future. We must get on with the job, however, of solving today's problems with present technology. We can't wait for tomorrow's developments, because we must be building today to meet tomorrow's demands.

I feel it is urgent that we tell our story—the story of electric power not as a convenience or a luxury but rather as a necessity and a national resource whose adequate supply is absolutely essential to this country's growth and well-being. We must educate the American public to the fact that new generating and transmission facilities must be built to maintain our way of life, and that this sometimes can be accomplished only at the expense of altering the natural environment to some extent.

Can we do this without creating unbearable levels of pollution?

Yes, we can. We can continue to maintain a plentiful supply of electric power and at the same time we can reduce levels of pollution, using present and foreseeable technology, and through proper management of our energy sources.

With the coming development of flue gas desulfurization, and other pollution minimizing techniques, electric power generation will become the least polluting of all

forms of fossil energy use. Furthermore, the use of nuclear power would reduce these pollutant emissions to zero.

Then, if we were to substitute electric power for more polluting forms of energy use in such areas as space heating, process heating in industry and ground transportation, it would be possible to just about eliminate the air pollution from these sources.

The increased use of electric power in these applications could reduce air pollution by about 50 per cent by the year 2000, if nuclear power plants are used to provide the additional power needed.

The rejection of waste heat from power plants is another potential problem, but one that can be handled using present technology. Those who contend that this waste heat will contribute to the warming up of the atmosphere and resultant climatic changes should realize that all the heat releases from power plants throughout the world during the period 1970 to 2000 could only raise the temperature of the earth's surface one degree Fahrenheit in 10,000 to 100,000 years.

Of far more concern are the additions to the atmosphere of carbon dioxide, which affects the ability of the atmosphere to dissipate heat into space. More carbon dioxide was released to the atmosphere in 1970 than was released by man in all of history up through 1900. If all other factors affecting the earth's heat balance remained constant, this buildup of CO₂ by the year 2000 could have a far greater effect on the temperature of the biosphere than the direct heat additions from power plants.

However, not enough is conclusively known about the earth's thermal budget to make any meaningful projections. What is suggested, however, is that electrical energy from nuclear power plants be substituted for those combustion processes that release carbon dioxide in order to hold down this buildup.

As far as the ecological effects of thermal discharges in rivers and lakes are concerned, this becomes a question of whether the thermal effects will indeed cause a problem, and, if so, is the public willing to pay the added cost of equipment such as cooling towers and ponds to avoid these problems.

Both cooling towers and ponds have their own particular set of environmental problems which must be examined to the same degree as the problems they are intended to solve. If alternate cooling methods are used, the cost of such expensive equipment must ultimately be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher electricity bills.

This is a matter, however, the people must decide.

Technology and science have brought us what we wanted. Technology has also brought us things we don't want, but it must be remembered that technology can also solve its own problems, but at a price. If we are willing to pay the cost of a better environment, the majority must speak and let it be known. Industry and technology can do the job if we are given a mandate. We should not, however, be directed by the vocal minorities who would impose costly and unneeded restrictions on our efforts to meet the energy needs of this nation.

The point I'd like to make here today, is that this country will be faced with staggering demands for electric power in the years ahead. Suggestions that we weight our rate structures to penalize large users of electric power, notions that we freeze levels of power consumption, recommendations that we begin to cut back on our use of electricity, all of these things, well-intentioned though some of them may be, are absolutely wrong and dangerous. To pull in the reins on our economic growth, to push down our living

standards, to paralyze our society, would be a sure guarantee of national disaster and the swift demise of the United States as a nation of any consequence whatever.

Man has lived with pollution for millions of years, be it the tons of particulate matter from volcanoes, the refuse of the animals he domesticated and put to work, or his own garbage that littered our early tribes. Yet, man has learned to handle or to adapt to these things as he increased his knowledge of the world about him.

But now, in 1971, in an era whose sophisticated technology was undreamt of 20 or 30 years ago, are we suddenly losing our nerve?

Listening to the shrill cries of the few who see imminent destruction woven into the fabric of an age of the highest affluence and achievement, I sense that we have become afraid.

Reacting in alarm to predictions of global deluge, tens of thousands of cancer deaths from radiation or whatever horror statistic is fashionable at the time, we take extreme positions and call for the removal of whatever cause might be involved.

Have we lost our nerve?

Granted, these are complicated times we live in. And granted, we do face serious problems that have come about as a result of the technological advances that have brought us an unparalleled standard of living.

But aren't we really running away from these problems when we try to turn back the times, slow our advances and cripple our growth?

Where is our nerve?

Electric power has become a national resource. Yet, the production of electric power has been indicted on moral grounds because of its effects on the environment. Much more serious, however, are the moral implications of not producing that electric power.

No, we don't have all the answers in hand, right now, in 1971.

But, I have the strongest faith that we will in time learn all of those answers.

We must direct our efforts not towards reducing our use of electrical energy but rather towards providing an adequate supply of that energy and minimizing the adverse effects involved in its production.

STUDENTS CONCERNED ABOUT INDOCHINA WAR

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when I was at the Burlington Community College recently, student leaders presented me with a petition signed by 300 students which expressed their great concern about American involvement in Laos.

The petition read:

We, the undersigned, request that you, Representative Fred Schwengel, support actively the withdrawal of all U.S. Personnel from all direct or indirect or air war actions in the country of Laos.

The many letters I have received indicate that a substantial number of First District residents share the students' concern about the recent developments in Laos. There is great concern that our involvement in these two countries may broaden the war and lead to a deeper commitment on our part to Cambodia and Laos. At least, no American ground

troops are being used for the operation now underway, thanks to congressional action taken last year which I strongly supported. Should there be any indication that our support activities will lead to a wider involvement or deeper commitment, Congress should seriously consider more stringent restrictions on the use of American forces and air power.

THE PANTHERS, THE POLICE, AND THE PRESS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared on February 21 in the Sunday Star in Washington, entitled "The Panthers, the Police, and the Press." It deserves careful study. I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

THE PANTHERS, THE POLICE, AND THE PRESS

Rumors are to the newspaperman what weeds are to the farmer.

Unwanted seeds, falling on the fertile soil of preconditioned public opinion, take hold, spread and threaten to choke out the truth. It is the duty of the newsman to identify the falsehood and to uproot it before it becomes firmly implanted. It is a duty that is not always fulfilled. There is, for example, the matter of the Black Panthers and the police vendetta.

On December 4, 1969, the Chicago police staged a pre-dawn raid on the Illinois headquarters of the Black Panther Party in a search, according to their warrant, for illegal weapons. The Panthers' state chairman, Fred Hampton, and a party member, Mark Clark, were shot to death. Four of the seven other Panthers present and one member of the 13-man police raiding party were wounded. Less than a week later, three Panthers were seriously wounded in a similar raid on the Los Angeles headquarters.

The press dutifully reported the facts and quite properly started asking some questions. Was the similarity between the raids a coincidence, or did it indicate a federally orchestrated assault on an organization that preaches race hatred and revolution? Was the gunfire a justified response, or was it an inexcusable use of police power? Had the Panthers, in fact, been marked for extermination?

In the prolonged journalistic debate that followed, one very specific item of information was repeated time and again. The police, it was said, had shot to death 28 members of the Black Panther party. The figure appeared in news stories, columns and editorials, sometimes qualified by attribution to Panther sources, sometimes stated simply as a fact. But, in effect, the press accepted the figure as a fact, contributing to the growing suspicion that the Panthers were the victims of police persecution.

Now we know that the debate was unnecessary, that the figure was a phoney, and that the press as a whole failed in an important part of its job. We know, because of an article in *The New Yorker*, a magazine noted for its wit and its literary quality, written by Edward Jay Epstein, who is a teaching fellow at Harvard working for a Ph.D. in political science.

The original source of the figure was readily identifiable. Charles R. Garry, the chief lawyer and frequent spokesman for the Black Panthers, was interviewed shortly

after the Chicago and Los Angeles raids. Hampton and Clark, he announced, were "in fact the 27th and 28th Panthers murdered by the police" within the year. There was, he said, "a national scheme by various agencies of the government to destroy and commit genocide upon members of the Black Panther Party."

That quotation, Epstein notes, was widely reported. So it should have been. The statements and opinions of a recognized spokesman for the Panthers constituted a legitimate part of a major news story. But within the week, Epstein discovered, two journalistic giants—the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*—had reported that figure as a fact, without attribution or qualification. The flat assertion that 28 Panthers had been killed by police during 1969 was, Epstein said, sent by those two newspapers to hundreds of clients of their wire services. Civil rights leaders, on the basis of the stories, took up the cry: Roy Innes of the Congress of Racial Equality demanded an investigation into "the death of 28 Black Panther members"; Whitney Young of the National Urban League spoke of the "nearly 30 Panthers . . . murdered by law-enforcement officials"; Ralph Abernathy of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference talked about "a calculated design of genocide"; Julian Bond of the Georgia State Legislature said that the Panthers "are being decimated by political assassination."

The rumor—or, more properly, the flat misstatement of fact—began to fatten on itself. The newspapers now could quote those civil rights leaders (who were commenting on the press statements), lending still more credence to the picture of wanton police murder and widespread guerrilla warfare in the streets of the inner cities.

There were some attempts to verify the facts and some questioning of the Garry figures, primarily by individual columnists. James Kilpatrick, in a column that appeared eight months ago, challenged the Garry figure and suggested that a top investigative reporter should be assigned to digging out the truth.

But no major newspaper, it seems, did what Epstein did. None of us asked Garry just who those 28 victims were. And so none of us found out, as Epstein did, that the Garry indictment was a work of fiction.

When Epstein asked for the names, Garry amended the total number of victims to 20. Of these, 19 were actually members of the Black Panther Party. Nine of these were killed by non-policemen: One by a store owner during a holdup, one by his wife, one died in a shootout with an acquaintance, four were killed by a rival black-militant organization, one—according to three confessions—was tortured and killed by fellow Panthers, one was shot by an unknown gunman using a foreign-made pistol that was not a police weapon.

That leaves 10 Panthers who were, in fact, shot to death by police. Six of these, Epstein's investigation disclosed, were killed by policemen who had been seriously wounded by those they subsequently killed, or by an accomplice. Two were shot after threatening the police with a gun. One was shot while running from the scene of a gun battle in which three policemen were wounded. One—Fred Hampton—was killed in what must, on the basis of the official inquiries into the case, be termed unnecessary, uncontrolled and unjustified police gunfire.

A reading of Epstein's documented indictment of the press led, as might be expected, to a quick check of *The Star* files. We had, it developed, avoided the obvious trap. The figure of 28 police killings was, in observance of the first law of cautious journalism, always attributed to Garry or to a Panther spokesman. Our first instinct was to congratulate ourselves for being less embarrassed

than our competitors on the Post, who ran a forthright editorial last Friday confessing their error. We were technically clean.

But, in this case, technical cleanliness is not enough. The ritual hand-washing of attribution may suffice the first time a statement is reported. But when the statement is repeated, as it was in *The Star*, more than a dozen times over the course of a year, the covering phrases just won't do. The failure to check a statement so shocking in its implications from so obviously biased a source was a cardinal sin of omission. Indeed our own measure of blame is increased by the fact that Kilpatrick, in his column of June 18, had cited many of the facts later verified by Epstein's research—including the conclusion that the Chicago shootout was the only case of suspect police action. Kilpatrick's column appears in *The Star*, and is distributed by *The Star* syndicate.

But we failed to take the hint and went on repeating the lie. And the repetition, even with the qualifying clichés, must be counted as a contribution to the climate of uncertainty and fear in a society that was already dangerously divided. It fed the myth that the Panthers are the targets of a police vendetta—a myth that has, with the passage of time, become a fixed part of American thinking, and that has contributed to the distorted picture of the police in the minds of much of this country's youth, both black and white.

Garry has been frank about his role in the affair. He picked the figure 28, he said, because "it seemed to be a safe number." He was, he said, justified in using any figure, however inflated, if it focused attention on even one improper killing of a Panther by police.

Epstein tends to clear Garry of blame for the fiasco. "I think a lawyer has a license to exaggerate," he said. "It's the press that should be suspect of Garry."

Epstein is correct—at least in his condemnation of the press. We should have learned to suspect the casual statistic from the bitter history of Senator Joseph McCarthy, who transformed the numbers game into an impure art.

The charge is justified. The plea is guilty. The pledge is to sharpen the instinct for skepticism that is the first requirement of responsible journalism.

THE MANPOWER REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1971

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues a thoughtful and thorough study of the administration's imaginative new proposal for planning and administering manpower programs and services. All too often, we—the Congress—and the bureaucracy respond to demands for change by adding a new wrinkle to an existing program. The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971 rejects that easy response. Rather, this proposal would consolidate a variety of programs to provide job training and employment and give the government closest to the people to be served a real opportunity to carry out the intent of Congress.

This Manpower Revenue Sharing Act will bring about the kind of total programming and funding overall so nec-

essary to make this important program more responsive to unemployed and underemployed people. The proposal will continue the full range of services currently available. But most important, it will allow these services to be provided as needed at the local level, rather than as believed needed by planners in Washington.

And further, these services could be provided without the necessity of requesting shifts and changes in funding from Washington. State and local officials would be given broad discretion not only to design the program of services but also to fund the various services on the scale appropriate for their respective communities.

I am pleased to endorse this legislation.

HASSIDIC LEADER MOURNED

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, an extraordinary outpouring of people took place on the Lower East Side in New York City on March 4 to mourn the loss of a revered leader of the international Jewish community. More than 7,000 people attended the funeral of Rabbi Mordche Shlomo Friedman, Hassidic leader of the Rizhiner dynasty and president of the Union of Hassidic Rabbis. He was 80 years old at his death.

Rabbi Friedman presided over the Boyaner Synagogue on East Broadway, but his influence extended far beyond the confines of this modest place of worship. His following was worldwide, and his contributions to maintaining the vitality and continuity of the Jewish people and their cultural, social and religious traditions were enormous. The rabbi and his wife, who died several months ago, were both descendants of distinguished Hassidic families.

Rabbi Friedman helped to save thousands of Jews who were the victims of the Nazi war of aggression in the 1940's. He was a founder of the Rizhiner Yeshiva in Jerusalem and served for 30 years on the presidium of Agudath Israel.

His loss is keenly felt among all those who knew and loved him during his long and remarkable life. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family and to the members of his congregation. I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times March 3 giving some of the highlights of Rabbi Friedman's life:

MORDCHE S. FRIEDMAN, 80, DIES; LED UNION OF HASSIDIC RABBIS

Rabbi Mordche Shlomo Friedman, Hassidic leader of the Rizhiner dynasty and president of the Union of Hassidic Rabbis, died yesterday in Beth Israel Hospital. He was 80 years old.

Rabbi Friedman was known as the Boyaner rabbi because he was born in Boyan, then part of Austria-Hungary, now part of Soviet Russia, on Sept. 12, 1890. His synagogue at

247 East Broadway, which has room for no more than 175 worshippers, is known as the Boyaner Synagogue.

The rabbi, who came to this country in 1926 from Vienna, presided here over a large and international constituency.

As the chief executive of the Union of Hassidic Rabbis he helped thousands of survivors of the war in Europe in the early 1940's.

Rabbi Friedman served for 30 years on the Presidium of Agudath Israel and sat on its rabbinic tribunal. He also founded the Rizhiner Yeshiva in Jerusalem and B'nai Brak.

The rabbi was the descendant, through six generations, of the Maggid of Mezhritsch, the primary disciple of Rabbi Israel Ba'al Shem Tov, the founder of Hassidism.

To his synagogue on the Lower East Side came the greatest of Jewish leaders and the most humble of worshippers.

Three months ago, the rabbi's wife, the former Chava, Heschel died. She was a descendant of Abraham Joshua Heschel, known as the Apter Rabbi, one of the outstanding Hassidic leaders of the nineteenth century.

Surviving are three children, Israel, an official of the Department of Welfare; Mrs. Mimi Brayer and Isaac, and 10 grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held at 12:30 P.M. today at the rabbi's synagogue, after which the body will be flown to Israel for burial on the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem.

COLLEGIANS FACE JOB PINCH

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have long been aware of the constant erosion of the very foundation of this Nation's once healthy economy. As inflation continues to climb, job opportunities continue to decline.

In my own congressional district I have been becoming increasingly concerned with the growing lack of job opportunities, especially for the young people graduating from high school, who for one reason or another, are unable to continue their education. Many of these youngsters have been denied the opportunity to obtain gainful employment right from the very outset of their careers.

Yet it appears that we have now hit a new all-time low—even college graduates are unable to find jobs. We have always assumed that the youngster who would only continue his education long enough to obtain a college degree would not experience this problem.

Now we find that after encouraging our students to pursue their education, to learn advanced skills and obtain advanced degrees, they, too, are unable to find employment. The students become frustrated and discouraged and the talents they possess cannot be channeled effectively into our society which needs them so badly.

William Delaney, of the Washington Star, recently conducted a very discouraging survey of this dismal aspect of our economy. At this point I would like to insert this highly informative article into the RECORD, and I highly recommend it for my colleagues' reading:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 4, 1971]

PICKINGS SLIMMEST IN YEARS: COLLEGIANS FACE JOB PINCH

(By William Delaney)

"I refused to believe it at first," says Georgetown University's Estill Guinane, "but it's slowly dawning on me."

What's dawning bright and clear to Mrs. Guinane—and to many of her fellow college placement officers around the country—is that college seniors in 1971 may be facing a rougher task landing jobs than at any time in at least the past two decades.

"This is definitely the worst year I've had in my 16 years here," says Mrs. Guinane, who has watched Georgetown's list of visiting job recruiters shrink from about 200 last year to "very little over 100" now.

At Alabama's Auburn University, placement director Scott Farley describes the current situation as "the most severe"—and, to students, the most frustrating—in his 23 years there.

And in Evanston, Ill., Dr. Frank Endicott says the well-qualified Northwestern University senior has slimmer job pickings than at any time since the depression year of 1935, when Endicott began placement work at Northwestern.

Without exception, a Washington Star check of eight varied universities this week bore out the gloomy prediction of a national College Placement Council survey last December—that employers would be making 21 percent fewer visits to campuses this year, and hiring 23 percent fewer graduates.

In fact, at several campuses, that forecast now appears to have been a bit optimistic. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for example, has scheduled one-third fewer recruiters this year than the number who visited there in 1970.

SECOND STRAIGHT YEAR

At 26,000-student San Diego State College, such visits are down an estimated 25 to 30 percent. At Princeton University, the figure is 28 percent, and in the South, both Tulane and Auburn report a 25 percent drop.

Even worse—as the placement officers invariably point out—this is the second consecutive year employers have reduced their campus recruiting. For example, the 20 percent cutback at Northwestern this year follows last year's 15 percent recruiting drop from what Endicott terms the "peak" year of 1969.

Though the hiring cutbacks have been sharpest in the hard-hit aerospace and defense-related industries, the demand for college graduates in virtually all fields appears to have been reduced by the nation's continuing tight economic picture.

According to the placement directors queried by The Star, some members of the Class of '71 who will generally fare best in the sluggish job market are: accounting majors, basic engineers, electrical engineers skilled in the power industry, business management types with computer expertise and teachers who are willing to locate outside metropolitan areas.

And even the bleak plight of a graduating bachelor's-degree physicist appears to be brighter than that of many a 1971 Ph.D.

Once the superstars of the campus market, doctoral degree candidates this year face not only a 43 percent reduction in government-industry demand for their talents (according to the Placement Council survey), but also the current "hiring freeze" imposed by many of the nation's fund-troubled universities.

From New England to California, at public independent and Catholic universities, placement officers cite these trends which have accompanied this year's shrunken job market:

Starting salaries, where they are up at all, generally won't reflect the 5-7 percent increases enjoyed by the Class of '70. (Auburn's Farley puts the increase in the 2-3 percent range; a University of Maryland placement specialist guesses 3-4 percent; Samuel Hall at Washington's black Howard University says salaries are running "about the same" as last year.)

College seniors, well aware of the tight job market, are signing up for interviews with more firms than usual. ("They don't need counseling on that," says Mason Webster, Tulane's placement director.)

At Maryland and San Diego State, for example, students are making greater use of placement office libraries, producing a heavier-than-usual flow of direct applications to employers.

Summer job opportunities for college juniors, traditionally offered by major firms to students they may want after graduation, are sharply reduced this year.

Though Hall says Howard seniors are no more in demand than their white peers elsewhere, Princeton says black seniors have "unprecedented job opportunities"—but are shunning them to take advantage of post-graduate scholarships, despite the general decline in those.

Recruiters are markedly slow this year in making firm job offers, in part because they can be more selective and in part, Endicott feels, because a sudden economic upturn may enable them to hire more than they now plan.

"This year the whole process (of job offers) is delayed a wait-and-see proposition," says Northwestern's veteran specialist. "What used to happen in February will happen in April or May."

To students raised in a climate of prosperity and rising expectations, the prospect of settling for a third-choice job—if there is an offer at all—can be "extremely frustrating," Farley notes.

"I've been so pessimistic I thought it would be silly even to bother interviewing here," said Maryland marketing senior Fred Sixt as he waited in the placement office for his first interview yesterday. "But, well, it's getting late..."

If he gets no satisfactory offers in three or four interviews, Sixt says, "I'll just try local firms myself."

CHECK YELLOW PAGES

That, at Northwestern, is what Endicott says he's advising seniors to do: "Go through the Yellow Pages and pick out some companies you've never heard of."

At Princeton, assistant career services director Jerome Webster says student attitude ranges from a determined aggressiveness to a feeling "that they might as well go to Europe and bum around for awhile, the copping-out bit."

With the end of graduate student draft deferments, he adds, Princeton's percentage of seniors going to graduate school has slipped from 76 percent in 1966 to 50 percent in the past two years. Webster feels the slippage may continue this year, due to a shrinkage in government and other funds to subsidize graduate research and the much-publicized "Ph.D. glut."

UP AGAINST WALL

And at Howard, Hall is fearful his job-hunting seniors may be lulled by the "myth" that blacks are much in demand by industry, and by the "cosmopolitan" feeling that they will, in any case, fare better than their peers at less well-known black schools.

As for the plight of specific majors, Princeton's Webster flatly observes: "Physicists and chemists are up against the wall."

For example, Philadelphia's Rohm and Haas chemical firm, highly regarded at MIT's placement office, regretfully informed place-

ment director Robert Weatherall that it is "not hiring any college graduates this year." And Shell Oil is not interviewing this spring at Tulane, an old-line private school in oil-conscious Louisiana.

Yet despite the reduced employment demand, placement officers voice confidence that bright, aggressive students—even with such hard-to-market humanities majors as religion and art history—can land attractive jobs.

"Math, economics and statistics majors are probably in as good a shape as any," says Princeton's Webster, "and liberal arts majors with some business experience, whether sur-mer work or the Daily Princetonian (college newspaper), can do well with banks, insurance or other management programs."

Teacher placement, almost everywhere, seems to be gripped by the problem of seniors seeking city glitter when the pull of a reduced demand is to more remote school systems.

"We'll be lucky if we get 60 to 70 percent of our (1,200) teacher graduates placed," says Lash Laker of San Diego State's placement office, an estimate which Hall says also holds true at Howard.

Maryland's teacher-placement specialist, however, feels all but 50 or 60 of 1,200 education graduates there will have jobs, despite slight drops in elementary school enrollment's, a lower teacher-turnover rate due to higher salaries, and local cutbacks in special areas such as music and art, physical education and kindergarten.

Surveying the 1971 employment scene overall, Endicott concludes: "Some of these kids are going to wind up doing things they hadn't thought of doing, but that may be the most important experience of their lives."

VIETNAM

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been painfully apparent that the Vietnam war is a mistake from every possible angle. Our only recourse, I believe, is to extricate the United States from this unfortunate conflict at the earliest possible date. The war has hurt America in so many ways it is difficult to conceive of the damage we have inflicted on ourselves. A listing of only the most serious and easily identifiable ways in which U.S. participation has disrupted American society is not difficult, however. This list is not new, yet I feel it bears repeating at every possible opportunity, if only to emphasize the urgency of congressional action on behalf of a speedy end to the fighting.

As we know, hundreds of our men have been imprisoned by the North Vietnamese—often under brutal conditions in defiance of both international law and the common considerations of human decency. Despite our best efforts to free them, it has become increasingly clear that these men will remain captive as long as American involvement continues.

Throughout the long course of this war we have witnessed the creation of an unparalleled bitterness and division within our society. No issue in our time has so polarized the American people.

The erosion of faith within our country has been further intensified by the occurrence of mass killings, coverups, and widespread graft—which have struck at the very moral fiber of our society. Only by ending this war can we begin to heal our wounds and restore harmony to the country.

On an international scale, the Vietnam war has brought about a serious reduction in U.S. world prestige. In the eyes of the international community we have frequently appeared as silly, destructive, and ultimately impotent. Moreover, our deep involvement in Southeast Asia has caused both the partial abandonment by the United States of more important foreign commitments and the rise of a neo-isolationist trend within the United States.

And lastly, there is the tragic waste of tens of billions of dollars, which could have been used in a multitude of ways to improve our society. Only by ending the Indochina war can we redirect our priorities to our many domestic needs.

Today, I am cosponsoring two bills which, if enacted, will go a long way toward assuring an early end to American involvement in the Vietnam war. The first bill, by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) is an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and would prohibit the use of any U.S. troops in an invasion of North Vietnam without the explicit authorization of Congress. I believe it is of the highest urgency to bring the war under this type of strict congressional control.

In addition, I am cosponsoring H.R. 4100 which has been introduced by Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM. This bill would require that all U.S. forces be withdrawn from Southeast Asia by December 31, 1971.

At this point, I believe it is appropriate to mention the one area of agreement between the administration and its critics. The President, I believe, knows that eventually he must set a specific timetable for withdrawal and that this date must be before the 1972 elections. Thus, on the eventual need for a timetable, all are in apparent agreement.

It is only on the specific date of withdrawal where the administration and the war critics begin to diverge. Right now, this is a difference of probably no more than 9 months—in other words, the difference between the December, 1971 deadline that the Hatfield-McGovern bill now calls for and the 1972 elections. This 9-month separation is still, however, a vital difference in terms of the number of casualties our forces will suffer during this period of time.

In my estimation, however, the real battle with the administration will focus increasingly on what withdrawal means, whether it means withdrawal of only what the Pentagon defines as "combat troops" or whether it also means "support troops," "advisers," and other categories. In our eagerness to end this war, we must be very careful not to ignore the remaining complications that will be incurred by withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker, we are all tired of this

bitter and futile war. But, unfortunately, military disinvolvement from Southeast Asia will continue to require the closest scrutiny on the part of both Congress and the American people for a considerable time to come.

GREECE: FEBRUARY 1971: NO RETURN TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, "Greece: February 1971" is the title of an unclassified staff report prepared by James G. Lowenstein and Richard M. Moose for the use of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

These former Foreign Service officers previously made a pair of informative reports on Cambodia. Their temperate, low-key, firsthand observations have been widely reported and well received. The report on Greece is destined to make known to a wider audience the weaknesses of U.S. policy some of us have observed and commented upon previously.

I place the Lowenstein-Moose report in the RECORD. It deserves to be read:

REPORT ON GREECE ACCUSES U.S. AIDES—SENATE INVESTIGATORS CHARGE STATE DEPARTMENT MISLED ITSELF AND CONGRESS

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—A report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee contended today that the State Department had misled itself—and in the process Congress—about the willingness of the military junta in Athens to restore constitutional democracy in Greece.

The report argued that the State Department and the United States Embassy in Greece had given too much credence to statements by the junta that parliamentary government would be restored and had then given away their political leverage when the embargo on American arms shipments was lifted last year.

Instead of pushing the regime toward constitutional government, the report found, the United States has now got itself into the position of seeming to support the junta, with the State Department and the embassy issuing misleading statements about the progress being made toward restoration of democratic government.

The report, made public today by the committee, was submitted by two staff members—James G. Lowenstein and Richard Moose, two former Foreign Service officers—who earlier this year were ordered to make a fact-finding trip to Greece to review the political situation and the Nixon Administration's decision to resume arms shipments.

TWO REPORT BEING TRAILED

During the last three days of their week-long stay in Greece, the two reported, they were trailed by plainclothes policemen in cars and on foot and were followed to the airport as they left. Apparently the police surveillance was imposed after the Greek Government found that the two, in addition to talking with Government and embassy officials, were also consulting with opposition leaders.

The generally critical report may set the stage for hearings on Administration policy

toward Greece by the committee, which is also considering summoning Henry Tasca, the United States Ambassador in Athens, for testimony.

In general, the report was more critical of the embassy than it was of the State Department, and there were suggestions in the report that a split has developed between the embassy and Greek-affairs officers in the State Department over the desirability of lifting the arms embargo and the willingness of the junta to move toward constitutional government.

The "general attitude" of the embassy, the report said, "is defensive about the regime—quick to praise during the period before the embargo was lifted but slow to criticize now that the embargo has ended and the regime is in default on its assurances.

"The embassy," it said, "appears to have operated on the assumption that the regime was sincere in its declared intention to return to parliamentary government" by the end of 1970.

SILENT ON ARRESTS

Now that the junta is in default on such assurances, the report said, the embassy "not only rationalizes the lack of progress but often appears to be more concerned with the regime's 'image' than with the substance of its actions."

The report noted that the embassy, in support of the regime, "refers to the release of detainees" but make no mention of the fact that political arrests are still continuing. The two investigators said that they had heard of the arrest of 40 to 180 persons since last November, when "the new wave of arrests apparently began."

As an example of an apparent pro-junta attitude, the report pointed to a "fact sheet" issued by the State Department, presumably on the basis of reports from the embassy, that contains "the remarkable sentence" that "with minor exceptions, all institutional laws necessary to put into force the Constitution were promulgated by the end of 1970 as pledged by the Greek Government."

In point of fact, the report said, "the Constitution is by no means yet in effect; elections have not been scheduled or even promised and martial law is still in effect superseding the guarantees of due process for which the Constitution provides."

"COOL BUT CORRECT RECEPTION"

ATHENS, March 4.—The two-man Senate fact-finding mission was given a "cool but correct" reception by officials here, where the pro-Government press often refers to Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as a Communist fellow-traveler for criticizing the Greek junta.

Although the two investigators apparently applied in advance for appointments with top leaders, they were seen only by Education Minister Nikitas Sioris, Press Under Secretary George Georgalas, and Foreign Under Secretary Christian Xanthopoulos-Palamas.

Opponents of the junta were reported to have complained that their contacts with the United States Embassy here were sparse. The more inflexible among them accused the United States of forsaking its democratic principles by backing the Greek regime unreservedly in order to protect its strategic position in the area.

The two investigators interviewed Alexandros Dimitis, president of the Council of State, the nation's highest administrative tribunal, which has often challenged the junta's abuse of authority.

They sought information on the number of Greeks—estimated at 40 to 120—arrested since Nov. 28 and held incommunicado in evident defiance of the habeas corpus provisions of the Constitution. The restoration

of the provisions by Premier Padadopoulos in April of last year weighed in the United States decision to resume full military aid.

On Feb. 20, the Greek Government maintained that no amount of pressure from the United States would influence its political course at home.

GREECE: FEBRUARY 1971

A STAFF REPORT, PREPARED FOR THE USE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

FEBRUARY 26, 1971.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 25 you asked us to visit Greece and to report back to the Committee "on the situation in that country, the considerations affecting the need for furnishing military assistance to Greece and the status of and prospects regarding U.S.-Greek relations." By letter you informed Secretary Rogers, Secretary Laird and Mr. Helms of our trip and its purposes, and you asked them each to arrange for us to be briefed in Washington before our departure which was done. The Department of State cabled the Embassy in Athens quoting your letter and asking the Embassy to arrange briefings and "appointments with appropriate Greek officials."

One of us (Mr. Lowenstein) spent a day and a half in Brussels on the way to Athens examining the question of the importance of Greece to the alliance. He saw Ambassador Ellsworth and various members of the U.S. Mission to NATO; General Goodpaster, the Supreme Allied Commander, and Admiral Henderson, Chairman of the Military Committee; and a number of other Ambassadors to NATO.

We both arrived in Athens on January 31 and left one week later. In Athens, we talked to Ambassador Tasca, members of the Embassy staff, Major General Hightower, Chief of the Joint United States Military Advisory Group Greece (JUSMAGG) and members of his staff. We met with the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Education, the Under Secretary to the Prime Minister, who is the official spokesman of the government, the President of the Council of State, which is the supreme administrative court of Greece, and the Governor of the Bank of Greece. We also met with a number of political leaders active in previous governments including former Prime Ministers Kanellopoulos and Stephanopoulos, former Foreign Minister Averoff, former Ministers Mavros and Markezinis, and the President of the last parliament, Dimitrios Pappaspyrou. The appointments with those in the Greek Government were arranged by the Embassy. Most of the others we arranged ourselves. In addition, we saw several experienced foreign observers and Greek private citizens.

When we arrived in Athens we were told by the Embassy that, on its own initiative, the Foreign Ministry had informed the Embassy that the Prime Minister (who is also Foreign Minister and Defense Minister) and the Chief of Staff were considering seeing us. Several times during the course of our week in Athens we said to the Embassy that while we did not want to appear presumptuous we were anxious to see whoever in the government would be willing to see us so that we would have the fullest possible exposure to the Greek Government's point of view. The Embassy's response was that appointments with the Prime Minister and the Chief of Staff were pending. But on the next to last day of our visit, the Embassy informed us that they had been told that appoint-

ments with the Prime Minister and the Chief of Staff were "not possible." The Minister of Justice, who had fixed an appointment on the next to last day of our visit, called an Embassy officer the night before to say that he was too busy.

For much of the last three days at least, and perhaps for more of the time, we were followed by plain clothes police both in cars and on foot. We found ourselves followed when we were in taxis as well as in Embassy cars. We were followed even when going from the hotel to the Embassy. On the last day, a police car followed us to the airport and one of the plain clothes police then entered the airport building and, while pretending to read his newspaper, watched as we cleared through passport control.

When we presented our classified report to the Committee in Executive Session on February 18, we were asked to prepare an unclassified report. That report, in which we have followed our usual practice of avoiding direct attribution, follows.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. LOWENSTEIN,
RICHARD M. MOOSE.

GREECE: FEBRUARY 1971

I. THE POLITICAL SITUATION

Asked to describe the present political situation in Greece, one high ranking Greek official said to us: "Greece today may have the attributes of a political dictatorship but the tendency is not to reinforce these attributes." He went on to point out that since World War II there have been 42 changes of government and that over the years since World War I there have been coups, attempted coups, dictatorships, democracies with a King, democracies without a King and a civil war. The Embassy made the same argument somewhat differently, emphasizing that there have been 45 changes of government in the past 30 years and ten military governments since 1909. The point of these statements, of course, is that one should not speak of the present situation in Greece, or of the future, without bearing in mind the country's turbulent political past.

Other observers commented to us that in order to achieve the totals cited above for the period since World War II, it is necessary to count as changes every transition to and from caretaker government in connection with parliamentary elections. They note that these totals also give disproportionate weight to the five-year period immediately following World War II and obscure the fact that between 1952 and 1965 only three individuals served as Prime Ministers heading a parliamentary government, as distinct from a caretaker government, and the further fact that one of these Prime Ministers—Mr. Karamanlis—was in office continuously for eight years.

The present Prime Minister often refers in his speeches to the chaotic situation which led the group of military officers who constituted themselves the "Revolutionary Council" to take over power in April 1967, although it is said on good authority that he and others had begun preparing for such a move at least as early as 1956. At the same time, he continues to emphasize the transitional nature of his government and his desire to return to parliamentary democracy.

That transitional government has, however, now been in power for almost four years. The constitution has not yet been implemented in most important respects. Martial law remains in effect for political offenses, and as a result civilians are still being arrested for political offenses by military police. If they are charged or tried at all, it is before courts martial. The Prime Minister referred in a press interview, early in 1970, to

the efficacy of the "shadow of martial law," tacit admission of its deliberate use as a tool of intimidation. What talk there has been by government leaders of elections has been to the effect that they will not take place in the foreseeable future, although in a recent statement the Prime Minister issued a veiled threat to his colleagues in the regime that, in effect, if they did not fall into line under his leadership, elections might be held sooner than they might wish.

It is against this background that recent U.S. official statements seem incomprehensible to many Greeks, foreign observers and even some officials in the Executive Branch. When the United States announced on September 22, 1970, the lifting of the selective embargo on the delivery of heavy military equipment to Greece, imposed immediately after the coup in April 1967 and maintained since then except for a brief period in the fall of 1968 after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the announcement stated that the decision to resume the shipment of suspended items rested "entirely" on considerations relating to the strategic advantages to the NATO alliance and the United States which were of great importance to the West. But the announcement went on to say: "The trend toward a constitutional order is established . . . Major sections of the constitution have been implemented . . . The Government of Greece has stated that it intends to establish parliamentary democracy . . ."

As for the importance of the strategic advantages to NATO and the United States, both NATO authorities and U.S. officials do indeed look on Greece as a valuable and important ally. They refer to its vital strategic position on the eastern flank of the alliance, its willingness to increase defense expenditures, the fact that it has the longest term of military service of any NATO country, the excellence of its armed forces, their fighting spirit, Greece's attachment to the west and abhorrence of communism and the common boundary that Greece shares with three communist countries—Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

For the United States, still other important factors were pointed out to us. In a Mediterranean increasingly inhospitable to the United States, and in which there is a growing Soviet naval presence, Greece provides an unrestricted port of call and supply for the Sixth Fleet as well as valuable communications sites. (Last fall, during the Jordanian crisis, there were several hundred ship visits during a three month period at a time when political conditions in Turkey permitted only a few ship visits, and we were told in Athens that there is an average of about 2,000 U.S. fleet personnel ashore per day in Greek ports.)

In addition, Greece affords important operational and logistics military facilities which, in view of current anti-Americanism in Turkey, would be of great potential value in the event of direct U.S. involvement in the Middle East. During the recent Middle East crisis, Greece permitted the United States to evacuate 150 Americans from Jordan and also allowed us to airlift mobile hospitals to Jordan through Greek airfields. In this connection, however, some question whether Greece's willingness to allow its territory to be used in connection with possible direct U.S. involvement in the Middle East can be taken for granted. They note that while providing a safe haven for American civilians does not jeopardize Greek interests in the Arab world, any proposal to use bases in Greece as a staging area for direct intervention could involve risks which no Greek government might consider worth taking. They refer, for example, to the presence of some 25,000 to 50,000 Greek nationals in

Arab countries and to Greece's interest in those countries as an outlet for exports. As an illustration of Greek sensitivity to such considerations, it was pointed out to us that although Greek-Israeli relations are friendly, and there is a Greek representative with the personal rank of Ambassador in Israel, out of deference to Arab countries Greece does not maintain an Embassy in Israel.

As for the second part of the aforementioned Department of State announcement, the Greek Government has indeed stated that it "intends to establish parliamentary democracy" (perhaps a better term would have been to reestablish parliamentary democracy) but it certainly has never stated when it will actually do so. Even in the October 1969 statement of the late Greek Foreign Minister Pipinellis to the Council of Europe, the nearest approach so far to setting a timetable for implementing the constitution, Pipinellis refused to fix a date for elections. A high Greek official told us that five conditions would have to be fulfilled before a "healthy" parliamentary system could be established. These conditions, which have been set forth in various public statements over the last few months but which have no basis in the constitution, were that Greece must move to a developed state economically with a per capita national income of about \$1,050 a year (the present level is about \$700 and the official estimated that it would take "two to three years" for it to rise about 50%, although others estimate that this will require at least five to seven years), a fairer distribution of wealth, a reorganization of the machinery of government, the necessary conditions for a healthy "new political life" for which there must be new kinds of political parties and a better press, and reform of Greece's system of education. When all five of these goals are realized, he said, then there could be a return to parliamentary government without danger.

Over the past year and a half, the government has issued a number of statements promising full implementation of the constitution and the lifting of martial law and has then withdrawn those promises or undercut them by its actions. On August 25, 1969 the Greek Government submitted a note to the Council of Europe stating that the laws envisaged by the constitution would enter into effect by December 1970. In his statement to the Council of Europe in October 1969, Mr. Pipinellis repeated the assurance that the entire constitution would be implemented by the end of 1970. In a speech on December 15, 1969, the Prime Minister said, in a somewhat more qualified manner, that "the passage of institutional laws will be completed" in 1970 (and, incidentally, also said in the same speech: "We are not . . . about to proceed to elections"). But on December 19, 1970 the Prime Minister said flatly that there would be "no change in the coming year" in the constitutional field.

Thus, for the moment at least, further progress on the most significant aspects of the constitution is frozen. Eight of the twelve constitutional articles which were suspended upon promulgation of that document will, according to the Prime Minister, remain suspended through 1971. These are Article 12, relating to the trial of civilians by civilian courts; Article 14, relating to freedom of the press; Article 25, relating to the role of the Council of State and the Parliament in decreeing a state of seige; Article 58, relating to political parties; Article 60, relating to parliamentary elections; Article 111, relating to trial by jury and to trial of press offenses by regular courts; Article 112, relating to the non-trial of civilians by courts-martial; and Article 121, relating to the election of municipal and community authorities. It is argued by some critics of the regime that, in fact, 65

of the 138 articles of the constitution are not being applied at present, in part in some cases and in full in others, either because they are still specifically suspended, or because the necessary enabling or institutional legislation has not been put into effect, or because they depend for full implementation on other articles that are not presently operative.

Putting an article of the constitution into effect involves a complicated legal procedure. In brief, some articles must be implemented through enabling legislation or institutional laws. These laws are first published in the official gazette and may or may not be referred for further study. In any event, they do not take effect until the Prime Minister so decrees.

Fifteen institutional laws to implement the constitution that the government has promised at various times would be enacted and put into effect by decree by the end of 1970 were, in fact, gazetted on January 5 of this year. The Prime Minister then decreed that six of them were to take effect immediately, the dates later this year on which four would take effect were given and five—among which were the most significant of the fifteen—were simply gazetted without specific dates being mentioned. These five relate to the state of siege, the regency, political parties, the Constitutional Court and the functions of the Commissioner of Parliament.

Government statements with regard to institutional laws do not include any mention of articles of the constitution relating to elections and the creation of parliament. These articles of the constitution apparently simply remain suspended.

The regime has created a "Consultative Committee on Legislation," referred to in Athens as the "miniparliament." The decree establishing the Consultative Committee provides that it may debate and comment on draft laws, but it does not give the Consultative Committee the power to initiate or enact legislation. Forty-six of the fifty-six members of the body were chosen by 1200 government appointed electors from among 92 persons nominated by local officials and the executive committees of trade unions and professional associations (membership in such executive committees is controlled by the regime). The remaining ten members of the Consultative Committee were appointed outright by the regime. In statements intended for consumption abroad, the regime tends to portray the Consultative Committee as the forerunner of a true parliament. One opposition figure characterized it, however, as "worse than a farce."

The most discussed provision of the Constitution in Article Ten which relates to due process. The Greek Code of Penal Procedure is controlled by, and ultimately flows from, articles in the constitution which detail the procedures that must be followed in arrests, the issuance of warrants, search and seizure and pretrial detention.

Article Ten specifically states that with the exception of persons caught in the act of committing an offense, no one shall be arrested or imprisoned without a judicial warrant which must be served at the time of arrest or remain in custody pending trial, that the person arrested must be brought before the competent examining magistrate not later than 24 hours from the time of the arrest, that within three days of the time of presentation the examining magistrate is obliged either to release the person arrested or to deliver a warrant for his imprisonment, and that the maximum term of custody pending trial cannot exceed one year for criminal charges and six months for misdemeanor charges. The Greek Code of Penal Procedure also provides that arrests cannot

be carried out at night in a house unless the occupant of the house requests it, or a person in the house is in the act of committing a felony or misdemeanor, or a gathering is being held in the house for the purpose of gambling or immoral activities or the house is open to the public at night.

The Prime Minister has stated, however, most recently in his December 19, 1970 speech, that crimes "concerning the integrity or security or constitutional order of the country" have been left under the jurisdiction of military tribunals. The regime itself is apparently the sole judge of what constitutes a crime against the state.

We were assured by several leading Greek lawyers that under no provision of either civil or military law can the period in which someone detained is held incommunicado exceed 20 days. Yet according to many reports that we heard from the wives of persons now detained, from their attorneys and from their friends, some people are still being picked up without warrants by the military police and are then removed to police stations or detained elsewhere incommunicado for periods considerably in excess of 20 days.

Of course, the question of how Article Ten and martial law can exist side by side is a difficult one to explain. Indeed, no one, including the government officials with whom we spoke, offered an explanation based on law. The government asserts simply that martial law takes precedence over Article Ten and that all the arrests that have been made are according to proper legal procedure.

In the early days of the regime, over 6,000 alleged communists and known communists were rounded up and detained. U.S. and Greek officials say that by April 1970 all but 1,200 of these had been released. We were told that there are now somewhere between 335 and 355 in detention. The Prime Minister has said in a public speech that within the first four months of 1971 all of these detainees, most of whom are on the island of Leros and have been there since immediately after the coup, will be released "provided the internal security situation develops as expected."

These detainees are known as *Kratoumeni*. There are two other categories of prisoners. Those in internal exile, who have been sent to remote islands and villages, are known as *Ektopismeni*. They are considered to have passed through the judicial system, although apparently no specific charges have been made against them. This group, now about 60, includes former members of parliament, high ranking military officers and civilians. The Prime Minister has said that he will release them, too, within the first four months of 1971 if security conditions permit.

The third group are known as *Fylaktismeni*. They are prisoners convicted and sentenced who are now serving terms for political crimes the regime has charged were clearly felonious in intent. We heard various estimates of the number of those in this category ranging from 340 to 380.

Arrests, it should be noted, are still continuing, although when the government or the Embassy refers to the release of detainees no mention is made of these new additions to the number of those being held. The new wave of arrests apparently began in November. Estimates we heard of those arrested ranged from 40 to 180. The government links these arrests to the setting off of a small bomb on October 3 in the garden adjacent to the Prime Minister's office at the time Secretary of Defense Laird was with the Prime Minister and the explosion of a bomb on November 28 at President Truman's statue at downtown Athens.

It should be noted that the policy announced by the Prime Minister of releasing detainees and those in domestic exile on

remote islands will have the effect of freeing all known to have, or suspected to have, communist convictions. But it will leave in prison, or in an indefinite status awaiting trial, non-communist regime opponents—that is, those who are center or conservative.

Often when the number of prisoners, detainees and those in exile is discussed by the Embassy or by government officials it is contended that the numbers involved are lower than under any previous government. Even opposition sources in Athens say that when Karamanlis became Prime Minister in October 1955, there were 4,338 political prisoners sentenced by ordinary or military courts (most of whom had been imprisoned as a result of antigovernment actions during the occupation and civil war) and 833 deportees. They contend, however, that by the time Prime Minister Karamanlis left power there were only 959 political prisoners and no deportees and that in the course of the following four years all but 17 of the political prisoners were released.

One cannot talk of prisoners in Greece without referring to the emotionally charged and heavily publicized question of torture. We felt that there was little we could do to gather direct evidence on this question during our brief stay in Athens. Suffice it to say, then, that on the one hand government spokesmen continue to deny that any tortures have taken place. On the other hand, we talked to former prisoners who said that they had been "tortured" and to wives of other prisoners who said their husbands had been "tortured," although these tortures were never described and we did not feel we could ask for particulars. Sometimes wives talked about the torture of solitary confinement, and other times it seemed to us that the word "torture" was used as a synonym for such brutality as severe beating. It seems clear, however, that there have been cases of "falanga" or bastinado.

The general feeling among Western observers is that there is less torture today than there was before, and perhaps even none at all now, although there were reports during the time of our visit that some of the students recently arrested who are still being held incommunicado were being tortured. Most observers believe it likely, nevertheless, that prisoners are still being mishandled and even brutally treated in police stations. As the agreement between the government of Greece and the International Red Cross, which expired in November of last year, was not renewed by the Government, there is no way to check on such questions. (One of the explanations offered on this point was that the regime may now have less need to resort to torture because people think they may be tortured.)

Since the present regime took power, it has never put its popularity to a free vote, and there seems no way of measuring accurately the extent of its popular support. It is generally accepted among political observers in Athens, however, that the regime is supported by the business community, including the foreign business community (which is actively courted by the regime and obviously prefers a stable political situation—"an oasis of tranquility" as one put it—with no labor unrest, continuing economic growth and favorable terms offered by the government); much of the army (which has been the recipient of salary and pension increases from the regime); and many members of the church hierarchy (church salaries have also been increased). Some say the peasants are more favorably inclined to the regime than opposed to it because the government has brought more roads and electricity to the countryside. Some say the reverse. Some say the peasantry

is politically apathetic. The regime is said to be opposed by most intellectuals, the professional class, civil servants and students. Those who contend that more people are opposed to the regime than in favor of it argue that were this not the case it would not be necessary for the regime, after almost four years in power, to continue martial law in force and that if the regime did enjoy popular support it would have held elections by now if for no other reason than to improve its image abroad.

There are at least five major resistance organizations in Greece, some more active than others. They are PAM, an organization of the extreme left, many members of which, including the nominal leader of the organization, Mikis Theodorakis, are communists; PAK, the Pan Hellenic Liberation Movement which is led by Andreas Papandreou; Democratic Defense, a centrist group; the Free Greeks, an organization composed principally of former army officers loyal to the King; and the Righas Ferraios, a student group. All are dedicated to the overthrow of the present regime, and some are even willing to use violent means.

As far as legitimate political activity is concerned—if indeed such can be said to exist at all—leading personalities of the former center and right parties—many of whom have been in detention or prison at some time since the present regime came to power—continue to speak out to visitors and some occasionally issue messages to the foreign press. They are extremely careful in their activities, however, acutely aware that they are continually under the "shadow" of martial law. The left has been quiet, some believe because they feel that a natural polarization will result and, in the long run, play into their hands.

The status of the press is difficult to define—but it is neither free nor completely under government control. There is no longer precensorship, but the subjects prohibited under the constitution and the new press law are so broad and vaguely defined that the press is reluctant to take chances, particularly in view of the fate of those who have. The Prime Minister said in his April 10, 1970 press conference that offenses described by Article 52 of the new press law—that is, publishing "texts, pictures or illustrations which may revive political passion"—would come before military tribunals. Other offenses come before civilian courts but, under Article 34 of the press law, those who can be punished for acts committed by the press are "the author of the publication, and regardless of responsibility the Publisher and the Managing Editor . . ."

Furthermore, the press is subjected to indirect measures of control. Article 20 of the press law imposes a penalty on newspapers of large circulation (and it is the opposition newspapers that have the largest circulation) by providing that publication with a circulation of 25,000 or less can be printed on newsprint imported duty free while those with a circulation of between 25,000 and 50,000 receive a discount of 50%, those whose circulation is between 60,000 and 75,000 a discount of 25%, those whose circulation is between 75,000 and 100,000 a discount of 10% and those with a circulation of more than 100,000 copies a discount of 5%. The regime is also said to interfere with the distribution of opposition papers outside of Athens and to penalize offending papers by withdrawing government advertising. Finally, the fact that heavy sentences, ranging up to five years, were given the publishers and others on the staff of *Ethnos*, an anti-government newspaper, in April 1970 for publishing an interview which referred to the need for a "national government" to deal with the Cyprus crisis has had an intimidating effect.

The radio and television networks, being state owned, are completely controlled by the government. Thus the paradoxical situation exists of the United States using Voice of America transmitters in Greece to broadcast about democracy to communist countries, transmitting these broadcasts from installations located in a country where the radio is completely controlled by a regime which has no elected parliament and denies many fundamental civil liberties.

On the other hand, the press apparently feels that it can reprint official documents of foreign governments without punishment. The entire record of the Symington Subcommittee hearings on Greece was published, for example. And there is no restriction on the sale of foreign newspapers and periodicals. All can be found at newsstands in Athens.

Political observers in Athens say that the leadership of the regime is not monolithic in its views. It is said that four or five members of the inner council of about 15 are unwilling to go even as far as the Prime Minister in returning to parliamentary democracy, and some argue therefore that the most likely alternative to the present regime is a government even less willing to return to a democratic order. There are also reports that there is a small group of younger Army officers who look to Colonel Gaddafi, the Libyan leader, as their example. Highly nationalistic and chauvinistic, they are said to favor authoritarianism at home and a policy of complete independence from all blocs.

Among the opposition politicians of the center and right, there are a few who believe that they could, under certain conditions, work with the regime, acting as a bridge between the present military government and a civilian government. Others in the opposition feel that a political government cannot evolve from the present military government and that there must be a transitional stage with a government of mixed character under the King.

The regime seems to have a firm hold on the administration of the country. While mayors and village presidents were formerly elected, they are now appointed by the government, and many of them are ex-officers. Similarly, there are military officers attached to every government ministry, in many cases in the post of secretary general, and to university faculties.

Greeks have, of course, been generally pro-American, but now there are reports of growing anti-Americanism, reports which the Embassy seems inclined to discount. On the one hand, the regime seeks to exploit national resentment of outside interference, just as Andreas Papandreou sought to exploit it in the period immediately before the coup. On the other hand, those who are opposed to the present regime blame the United States for strengthening the government's hand by appearing to support it. (As an example, we were shown a student flyer which said that the Embassy "should stop talking about this country on which Americans have imposed the most corrupt, the most immoral and the most backward form of government so that Greece does not become a European state but an American Protectorate.")

Among opposition leaders—most of whom have the reputation of having been strongly pro-American—there is a feeling that the United States has betrayed its true friends and natural allies in the Greek population, selling out these friendships for immediate strategic advantages. Opposition leaders feel that they have been purposely ignored by the Embassy and some, if not all, are obviously becoming progressively disenchanted with the U.S. role in Greece. They point out the existence of what appears to them to be a vicious circle: the Greek people believe the

United States supports the regime, and therefore consider opposing it futile, while the United States interprets absence of outward opposition as evidence of support for the regime. None of those who took this view advocated direct intervention to depose the regime. Instead, they suggested that the United States could afford to put some distance between itself and the regime by means such as restricting the exchange of high-level visits, limiting public appearances by U.S. officials in Greece with leaders of the regime, and characterizing the regime's failure to live up to its promises more realistically in U.S. official statements.

II. THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

In almost lyrical terms, the Embassy's unclassified analysis of the Greek economy, which is given to visiting American businessmen, begins by stating: "The Greeks have a word—*apithanos*—magic—which might well be used to describe how Greece through August 1970 was able to raise GNP at constant prices by 7½ percent while holding the rise in the consumer price index to 2.8 percent. . . ." The paper goes on to say that "Greece's economic performance has continued to sparkle" and adds that "the steady progress of one of America's closest allies in twenty years from a backward, agricultural country to a more prosperous, partially industrialized one, is bound to strengthen our political and economic position in this critical part of the world."

The Embassy analysis also notes that since 1953 U.S. investors have provided some 40 percent—the largest single share—of foreign capital; that over one-quarter of Greece's foreign tourists and 60 percent of its tourist earnings are from America; that the United States has traditionally been the second largest supplier of imports to Greece; and that, in sum, "the United States is far and away the most important source of foreign exchange for Greece."

The following favorable economic factors are cited:

(a) The GNP at 1958 prices rose by 7.1 percent in 1970, according to the Bank of Greece, thus returning to the high rate of growth which began years before the coup but was interrupted in 1967 and 1968.

(b) Manufacturing output rose 10.3 percent in the first nine months of 1970, again according to the Bank of Greece.

(c) Agricultural production rose 7.5 percent over 1969, according to the Embassy.

(d) The average level of consumer prices rose 3.1 percent between January and October 1970, compared to the same period in 1969—a lower rate of increase than any other European country, according to the Bank of Greece.

On the other hand, it is also noted that:

(a) There are inflationary forces present as a result of a 15 percent increase in imports in 1970, a 9 percent rise in industrial wages and a 5 percent rise in pensions of public employees and low unemployment. As a result, the money supply was up last year by 16 percent.

(b) Greece continues to have a chronic trade deficit which reached a level of \$1,003.8 million in the first eleven months of 1970, up from \$842.3 million in 1969. Invisibles produced a net surplus of \$616.1 million in this period so that the balance on current account for the period January through November 1970 was \$387.7 million. (The final figure for the year was \$406.8 million, we were told, compared to \$247.5 million in 1968). The trade deficit in 1970 was apparently worse than planned and had to be offset by borrowing from abroad in the amount of \$28 million between January and November 1970, although this amount was lower than the \$47.1 million borrowed from abroad in the first eleven months of 1969.

It is emphasized by NATO officials in Brus-

sels, and pointed to with pride by JUSMAGG in Greece, that in 1969 Greece devoted 5.1 percent of its GNP to defense expenditures (this figure is estimated to be 6 percent in 1970). Greece is thus the third highest among NATO countries in terms of the percentage of GNP devoted to defense. Only the United States at 8.7 percent and Portugal at 6.2 percent are higher.

In 1966, before the present regime came to power, Greece contributed only 3.7 percent of its GNP to defense and was tied for sixth place, with the Netherlands, after the United States, Portugal, the UK, France, Germany and Turkey. In fact, between 1966 and 1969, the last year for which complete figures are available, only Greece showed a significant rise in the percentage of GNP devoted to defense, due in large part to increased pay and allowances. During this three-year period, the percentage rose from 8.5 percent to 8.7 percent for the United States, from 3.6 percent to 3.7 percent for Norway and from 4.7 percent to 4.9 percent for Turkey. In the case of Greece, the rise was from 3.7 percent to 5.1 percent.

The 1971 Greek budget presented on December 30, 1970, shows a surplus projected of \$143 million of revenues over expenditures, a surplus 16.3 percent greater than 1970. Expenditures in the sector of "defense and public security" (there is no breakdown in the budget between the two and expenditures on internal security do not, of course, necessarily contribute to NATO defense purposes) will be up \$50 million (or 9.2 percent compared to a 10.8 percent rise in all budget expenditures) and will represent 32 percent of total regular budget expenditures. Of this \$50 million increase, \$13 million is earmarked for increased military pensions which are now 131 percent higher than they were in 1966. If the budget is implemented as planned, Greek defense and security expenditures will have more than doubled since 1966.

III. THE U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

In presenting the justification for the fiscal year 1971 Military Assistance Program for Greece to the Congress, the Department of Defense stated: "Greece has been dependent on U.S. military assistance programs to meet its military equipment requirements since 1957." That statement seems to be as true for the period during which the heavy arms embargo was in effect as for any other period since 1947. Indeed, despite the embargo, lifted briefly in the fall of 1968 after the invasion of Czechoslovakia, Greece received even larger amounts of U.S. military assistance, taking all categories combined, during the three years and five months the embargo was in effect than in the equivalent period before the embargo was imposed.

Figures recently released by the Department of State for fiscal years 1968, 1969 and 1970 (a period that begins two months after the coup and ends, two and a half months before the embargo was finally lifted) show military grant aid deliveries totaling \$131.4 million. In addition, the figures show that Greece received a total of \$169.7 million in delivered excess equipment, at acquisition value, and \$25.8 million under the Foreign Military Sales program in this period. Thus, the total military aid received in these three years was \$326.9 million.

This figure does not, of course, represent the total value of military assistance received while the embargo was in force because the period of fiscal years 1968, 1969 and 1970 is four and a half months shorter than the period in which the embargo applied. But the State Department figures do show that the average total military assistance in the three fiscal years preceding the embargo was about \$95.2 million a year while the average total program in the three fiscal years in

which the embargo was in effect was about \$106.9 million a year. This rise was due to the fact that while grant aid deliveries generally declined during the embargo period, compared to the period before the embargo, deliveries of excess defense articles and Foreign Military Sales deliveries both rose sharply.

While these deliveries were being made, a large amount of embargoed material was accumulating. When the embargo was imposed, about \$60 million worth of grant aid was awaiting shipment to Greece. When the embargo was lifted, the total "in the pipeline," over and above the deliveries already cited, was \$42.8 million in excess articles and \$67.8 million in undelivered Military Assistance Program materiel, according to the Defense Department. In addition, the loans of two submarines and six destroyers have been renewed for ten years.

The embargo of major weapons did not, of course, affect the regime's military capability internally. The United States continued to provide small arms, ammunition, communications equipment, and trucks which could be used by the Army for internal security purposes. Nevertheless, the embargo was not generally popular with opposition leaders in Greece because they felt that it did weaken the country's ability to defend itself. On the other hand, there was no pressure from NATO countries for lifting the embargo and apparently some surprise that the embargo was lifted when it was.

The personnel directory of JUSMAGG shows a total of 72 U.S. military personnel, 38 U.S. civilians and 57 local employees. The civilians include 15 "technical representatives" from General Electric, Lockheed, RCA, Northrop, Hughes Aircraft, Pratt and Whitney, General Dynamics, Grumman and Curtis Wright whose salaries and expenses are paid by Military Assistance Program funds for "support of Air Force MAP materiel program," according to the Defense Department. The 73 U.S. military personnel are accompanied by 170 dependents and the civilians by 74 dependents. The announced total is thus 354 Americans.

JUSMAGG is, incidentally, excused from end-use reporting requirements because of "recent personnel reductions." We were told that this exemption applies in a number of other countries which receive U.S. military assistance.

The foregoing personnel figures are, of course, limited to the military advisory mission. They do not include the approximately 7,000 other military personnel, and their dependents, based in Greece. To see what restrictions were imposed on us as representatives of the Committee, we asked what bases we could visit, other than the principal U.S. base at the Athens airport, and we also asked the Embassy for an updated list of U.S. bases and facilities in Greece. The Embassy said that it would have to ask for instructions on both questions. The reply given us the next day was that the Embassy was instructed not to provide us with a list of all U.S. bases and facilities in Greece, but that such a list would be provided in Washington by the Defense Department. As for visits, we were told that we could visit four bases. We were told that we could not visit a number of other bases including a base that had been visited two years ago by members of the Symington Subcommittee staff.

It should be noted that the United States is the only NATO country now giving Greece military assistance. The only other sizable military assistance program was that of West Germany, but that government continues its embargo on military assistance imposed soon after the regime assumed power. At the same time, NATO countries do not restrict their commercial sales to Greece.

According to press reports, West Germany has sold Greece patrol aircraft and submarines and France has sold patrol boats and tanks.

The purchase of French arms is seen by some U.S. officials as ill-conceived because of the drain on Greece's foreign exchange reserves. But the Greek press refers to these foreign arms purchases, as did the Prime Minister in a recent speech, as proof of Greece's ability to provide itself with the weapons it needs. Most independent observers—and some U.S. officials—have concluded that the motivation for weapons purchases from France was primarily political, designed to put pressure on the United States to resume shipments of heavy arms. And indeed the prospect of Greece's buying arms from France, instead of receiving them as gifts from the United States, does seem to have given rise to some concern among American officials that the United States was in danger of losing a source of leverage that could be applied on the Greek Government and, as a result, to have had an influence on the American decision to lift the embargo.

IV. THE EMBASSY AND THE REGIME

"Is the Junta deceiving the Embassy, is the Embassy deceiving the State Department or is the State Department deceiving the Congress?" a prominent Greek critic of the regime—known to be pro-American—asked us. The question was repeated, in less well formulated fashion, countless times during our stay in Athens. Those who posed the question pointed not only to the statement that "the trend toward a constitutional order has been established" but also to the testimony of Executive Branch witnesses before Senator Symington's subcommittee last June, specifically the statements by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Roger Davies that "we are informed that the entire constitution will be implemented by the end of the year" and that "it is my belief that the assurance we have received from Athens, that the constitution will be implemented in full by the end of the calendar year, will be carried out."

The Embassy appears to have operated on the assumption that the regime was sincere in its declared intention to return to parliamentary democracy and that the continuation of the arms embargo was harmful to the development of the kind of relationship which would permit the United States to exercise some persuasion on the Greek regime to restore civil liberties and parliamentary government. It appears to other observers with whom we talked, however, that the Embassy tends to read more into the regime's statements than the regime intends or that is warranted on the basis of the performance to date. Certainly, the general attitude of the Embassy is defensive about the regime—quick to praise during the period before the embargo was lifted but slow to criticize now that the embargo has been ended and the regime in default on its assurances.

Many in the Embassy tend to rationalize the actions of the regime in terms similar to those the regime itself uses. For example, the Embassy apparently believes that the proposed law on political parties is basically democratic and compatible with local conditions despite the fact that under Article 58 of the new constitution, which the new law would implement when put into force, the charter of every political party must be approved by the Constitutional Court which also can supervise the functioning of the parties and has the power to dissolve any party whose "aims or activities are manifestly or covertly opposed to the form of government . . ."

In this same connection, we noted that in Embassy meetings the coup and its aftermath

was often referred to as the "revolution." Those Greeks opposed to the regime in Athens refer not to the "revolution" but to the "junta" or the "Colonels." Others, less partisan, refer to the "government," or the "leadership" or the "regime." It is only those who support the government who refer to the "revolution." The term is certainly not neutral.

The Public Affairs Office of the Department of State, presumably on the basis of reporting from the Embassy in Athens, publishes an unclassified quick reference aid entitled "Greece: U.S. Policy." The latest version of that year, published in January of this year, makes a number of statements that do not seem to be accurate.

It states that: "From a high of over 6,000 in 1967, there are now approximately 300 political prisoners. The Prime Minister has pledged to free all remaining political detainees by the end of April 1971 if security conditions permit." There are, of course, far more than 300 political prisoners if the numbers of those in exile (of which there are about 345) and sentenced prisoners (of which there are about 350) are combined. The 6,000 figure refers, moreover, to those suspected of communist sympathies who were detained immediately after the coup. The Prime Minister's statement applied to the remaining detainees from among that group but not to those sentenced for political crimes, to say nothing of those arrested since November.

The State Department paper includes the remarkable sentence that "With minor exceptions, all institutional laws necessary to put into force the constitution were promulgated by the end of 1974 as pledged by the Greek Government." As we have noted in this report, the institutional laws not yet put into force are hardly minor since they relate to the state of seige, political parties, parliament and the constitutional court. Furthermore, the constitution is by no means yet in effect; elections have not been scheduled or even promised and martial law is still in effect superseding the guarantees of due process for which the constitution provides.

Finally, on the question of torture, the paper states that during the operative period of the agreement between the Greek Government and the International Committee of the Red Cross, "no instances of torture of prisoners were confirmed by the Red Cross." The fact of the matter is that, as a matter of policy, the Red Cross never confirms or denies instances of torture or indeed ever issues public reports. Its reports were made to the Greek Government and were confidential. The implication of the statement quoted is that no torture has taken place when in fact it seems far more probable that some tortures have occurred.

During our visit to Athens, we were struck by the fact that while the Embassy does not question the desirability of a return to parliamentary government in Greece, it not only rationalizes the lack of progress but often appears to be more concerned with the regime's "image" than with the substance of its actions. Time and again we heard expressions of regret at the regime's poor sense of public relations.

As far as arrests under martial law are concerned, the Embassy stated to us that it assumed that the arrests were being carried out under the letter, if not the spirit, of the law. Yet no one in Athens was able to cite to us any provisions of the military or civilian penal code which permits holding persons in detention incommunicado for more than 20 days.

We have already referred several times to the statement issued by the Department of State at the time the embargo on the shipment of heavy arms was lifted last September. A number of opposition leaders told us

that they had not objected to the resumption of heavy arms aid on the ground that no patriotic Greek could oppose the provision of U.S. arms to help safeguard the security of their country. But they emphasized that they had regarded the kind of statement issued in connection with ending the embargo to be of primary importance. One opposition leader told us that the statement that was issued was "pure nonsense", and he asked: "In view of the actual trend of events in Greece, why did the United States become a lying witness in favor of the regime?" The strongly pro-Western former Foreign Minister Averoff gave us a copy of the statement he had issued on September 23 to foreign correspondents. In that statement, he said that he regretted the text of the announcement and that the assurance in the statement that conditions had been created for a return to normal democratic life signified "either that the responsible Americans are badly informed by their services or that they seek for Greece the masks of democracy in order to present those to their public opinion in order to calm it." His statement went on to say:

"The reality in Greece is that the situation has been improved, that we live under a dictatorship that is more lenient but that individual liberties have not been reestablished, that human dignity is trampled upon and that the conditions for a return to democracy have not been created. On the contrary, it appears that conditions are being created for a very long prolongation of the dictatorship under the comic masks of democracy. Not to recognize this reality, and to countenance the harmful hypocrisy, does not serve the prestige of the United States which until yesterday was respected and loved by the Greeks."

V. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Since the present Greek regime seized power, U.S. policy has had two declared objectives: to maintain Greek military cooperation with the United States and NATO, and to bring about the restoration of democratic institutions in Greece. Both objectives became enmeshed in the matter of the embargo on heavy arms.

The decision to lift the embargo was based on a judgment that continuing the embargo would, on the one hand, jeopardize military cooperation with Greece and diminish Greece's ability to defend itself against Communist aggression without, on the other hand, producing any further movement toward the restoration of democratic institutions. Furthermore, the Embassy had apparently persuaded itself that significant progress had been made in returning to democratic order and that, on the basis of assurances given or assumed, even greater progress would be forthcoming by the end of 1970.

In the military sphere, it would appear that our declared policy objectives have been achieved. While there may be some question as to the realistic limits of Greek cooperation in the event of a crisis involving the United States in the Middle East, insofar as it has been tested, Greek cooperation on military matters has been satisfactory. It should be noted, however, that this cooperation continues to involve a *quid pro quo* in the form of a large U.S. military assistance program. By contrast, the declared policy objectives in the political sphere have not been achieved. The "trend toward a constitutional order" is at best ambiguous, and the confident predictions by American officials with regard to the reestablishment of parliamentary democracy have not been borne out by events.

To many with whom we talked, it does not appear that the United States has placed as much emphasis on pursuing its avowed political objectives as on pursuing its military objectives. Those who hold this view believe

that the United States has sacrificed its interest in seeing a return to democratic institutions in order not to jeopardize continued access to military bases, access which they believe any Greek Government would grant. Others, putting aside considerations of principle and morality, fear that we are being shortsighted from a practical standpoint. They argue that the continued absence of meaningful progress toward restoring democratic processes works to our long-run disadvantage and that the emphasis the United States has placed on maintaining smooth relations with the regime has strengthened the position of the regime in Greece and at the same time has reduced the incentives for a return to democratic order.

Many observers—both Greek and American—pointed out to us that, rightly or wrongly, most Greeks believe that the United States supports the regime. Given the importance Greeks attach to American support, because of America's role in Greece since World War II and the respect for the power of the United States, this belief, quite apart from its accuracy or our intentions, constitutes the regime's greatest asset and at the same time provides the United States with its most effective potential leverage. As far as the pursuit of our declared objectives in the political sphere is concerned, however, this potential leverage does not seem to have been effectively applied. The policy of friendly persuasion has clearly failed. The regime has accepted the friendship, and the military assistance, but has ignored the persuasion. Indeed, the regime seems to have been able to exert more leverage on us with regard to military assistance than we have been willing to exert on the regime with regard to political reform. We see no evidence that this will not continue to be the case.

A MATTER OF BALANCE

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, in these days of inflated rhetoric and violent emotions on so many issues of public concern, it is worthy of note when a voice of reason speaks out on one of the questions that divide our society.

The Long Island Press, one of the major daily newspapers serving my district, has recently made what I consider to be a highly significant contribution to the national dialog. Addressing itself editorially to the question of bias in the news media—an issue that has evoked vehement argument on both sides—the Press has raised its voice in moderation and set forth a cogent case for responsibility in criticism both on the part of the media and those who would censor it.

This issue is an important one, for it indicates an apparent dichotomy between our constitutional liberties and the national interest. Any attempt to censor the media flies in the face of the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of the press; but constant severe criticism of our Government by the media contributes to a growing condition of public discouragement and disaffection. So severely does this question divide us that few on either side have been willing to seek a resolution of this problem that would be acceptable to all.

I believe that the Long Island Press has cut through the emotionalism that has surrounded this issue and set forth a reasonable, responsible position to which all can subscribe. I enthusiastically commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Long Island Press, Feb. 28, 1971]

A MATTER OF BALANCE

Daniel P. Moynihan, President Nixon's former urban affairs advisor, who has a knack of saying things that ought to be said, but usually aren't, has zeroed in on the American press.

He has some justification, although he will probably be blasted as another Agnew in liberal's clothing for his article in Commentary magazine. In it, he accuses the press of being so harsh in its disparagement of the federal government that it "is now becoming a matter of national morale."

He blamed much of this on the elitist bias of journalists influenced by the Ivy League's "adversary culture" which knocks the government so much that it encourages distrust of American society and its institutions.

There is truth in this charge, but it goes deeper than the conflict between certain types of journalists and the presidency. Distrust of government is not a class thing, but a deep-seated tradition growing out of our historical roots. The founding fathers built a government precisely out of a profound fear of government free from criticism. This lies at the heart of our unique political freedom. Unfortunately, it has also nurtured a traditional distrust on all levels of society of politicians on all levels of government.

Mr. Moynihan's criticism serves as a warning that this can tip the balance so far away from appreciation of the positive aspect of government that it contributes to a crisis in confidence and the erosion of authority. Presidents have been degraded as "criminals" or dehumanized into devils. But not only presidents get this treatment, and not only journalists dish it out. Black and white radicals dehumanize the police by calling them pigs; ordinary citizens refer over and over to judges as bums; and public officials, from councilmen to mayors, from state legislators to governors, are glibly damned on all sides for all our ills.

One institution catching the most hell recently has been the Army. Just last week alone—even as it was engaged in an unpopular war—it was intensely attacked at home from a variety of sources. It was berated by CBS for wasting millions on highly questionable propaganda; it was under investigation by Sen. Ervin's constitutional liberties for spying on civilians; it was caught in the court-martial spotlight shining on the horrors of My Lai; Sen. Ribicoff's government operations committee was holding hearings on corruption in army PXs, clubs and messes. And for several years it has been fighting a running battle against critics of its spending policies.

But such reportage and criticism, painful as it is, is also the saving grace of America. It is right—indeed vital—that the President be accountable for his decisions, that the press feel free to call the army to account for its excesses, that every institution, from the police to pollution control agencies, be subject to public scrutiny.

But Mr. Moynihan makes an important point in warning that without balance in reportage and criticism, we run the danger of destroying faith in our institutions themselves.

Many people, for instance, swallowed without question the charge by a Black Panther spokesman that 28 Panthers were victims of a police conspiracy to wipe them out. Like

the wild charges of Sen. Joseph McCarthy, this one also was inadequately checked out and became accepted as fact—until a New Yorker Magazine reporter laboriously examined every case and proved that of the 28 names on the Panther list, just two could be said to have been victims of deliberate police aggression.

Locally, hundreds of thousands of citizens were outraged by a law that permitted the court to take a 3-year-old boy from his adoptive parents, the only ones he knew, and send him back to his natural mother. Yet, not until an exhaustive study of the decision by a Long Island Press reporter did anyone realize that there was good reason for the court's decision.

In one case it was the police and in the other, the court, that took a bum rap because of inadequate reporting. The police and the courts, like the President and the Army, are hardly beyond criticism. But they deserve respect and fair treatment. When they are poorly treated, they deserve as much redress as any other individual or group that has been wronged. Without this balance, we only encourage those who are not interested in reforming our institutions, but in destroying them.

LaGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a most significant tribute recently paid to a former distinguished member of this House, the late mayor of New York, Fiorello H. LaGuardia. The occasion was the ceremonies commemorating the naming of Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College.

The career of "the Little Flower" was filled with color as well as adventure, innovation and courage. He was the first Italian-American elected to Congress back in 1922 and then was reelected for five consecutive terms. As an active legislator, a brilliant debater, and a learned parliamentarian, his career in Congress has become legendary. One of the highlights of his achievements is that he was responsible for the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which guaranteed Labor's right to collective bargaining. In 1929 LaGuardia hit a low period of his political life. He ran for mayor of New York and was defeated. In 1932 he tried to regain his seat in Congress but was again defeated. But, in 1934 he came back. He was elected the 99th mayor of New York, and was then reelected three times. Under his dynamic, fearless and brilliant leadership, his fusion regime symbolized reform, integrity and efficiency in municipal government.

It is significant that a college in New York has chosen to honor the memory of the late Fiorello H. LaGuardia by carrying his name. LaGuardia College is to be located in my district and as a LaGuardian and member of the LaGuardia Memorial Association, I truly feel the following remarks are extremely relevant.

The remarks were delivered by three distinguished leaders of our community

who were either associated with "the Little Flower" or associated with the college.

The first speech was delivered by Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, chairman of the Board of Higher Education of New York. Dr. Joseph Shenker then spoke, who at the age of 30 is probably the youngest college president in New York City history. The final speaker was the Hon. Eugene R. Canudo who is chairman of the LaGuardia Memorial Association and a judge of the criminal court of New York.

I feel the remarks are well worth the attention of my fellow colleagues and I highly commend them to you.

I include the material as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY DR. FREDERICK BURKHARDT, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AT NAMING CEREMONY FOR FIORELLO H. LaGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE—DECEMBER 5, 1970

I am pleased to welcome all of you here to celebrate the naming of Community College Number Nine of The City University of New York. I am particularly pleased to welcome members of the LaGuardia Memorial Association who have just concluded their annual meeting.

As Chairman of the Board of Higher Education, I am honored to announce that Community College Number Nine of The City University will be known officially as Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College.

We are most grateful to the LaGuardia family for their permission to use the late Mayor's name for this new college. Indeed, it is most fitting that this new community college, which will offer an experimental work-study program to all of its students, should be named for Mayor LaGuardia. He knew so well the meaning of both working and studying. Without the usual undergraduate preparation, he earned his law degree at night at New York University while working by day in a variety of jobs, such as a steamship company clerk, a stenographer at Abercrombie and Fitch, and as an interpreter at Ellis Island.

The discipline that such a schedule required served Fiorello LaGuardia well. The career of "The Little Flower" was filled with color as well as daring, innovation and courage. He entered city politics as President of the New York City aldermen in 1921 after attaining distinction in the Air Corps during World War I. He was elected to Congress in 1922—the first Italian-American to serve there—and then was re-elected for five consecutive terms. In Congress he was known as a "Progressive" and was responsible for the passage of what is known as "Labor's Magna Carta": the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which guaranteed Labor's right to collective bargaining.

He ran for Mayor of New York in 1929, but was defeated. He also lost his bid for re-election to Congress in 1932. For many, this would have signaled the end of a political career.

However, in 1934 "The Little Flower" became the 99th mayor of New York. He was re-elected three times, and during those 12 years, he pleased New Yorkers with a relentless fight against the underworld and he inspired voters with the moral, financial, administrative and physical rehabilitation through which he put the City Government. He is also credited with steps that led to the city colleges emerging from being only locally known institutions to colleges nationally prominent for their scholarly excellence. This he achieved by searching for persons of outstanding abilities, regardless of political affiliations, to serve on the Board of Higher Education. These members, in turn, re-

cruciated outstanding college presidents who fostered the growth of three city colleges into the vast City University of today, of which Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College takes its place as the twentieth institution.

Mayor LaGuardia was committed to the role higher education should play in the life of the city and voiced a hope that future legislators would be drawn from the colleges, and not from the political clubs. He declared that "quality of a college is not the quality of its buildings," but he was successful in obtaining Public Works Administration funds from Harold Ickes for the construction of Brooklyn College's 27-acre landscaped campus and Hunter College's present quarters on Park Avenue.

Perhaps he foresaw open admissions when he said in 1939: "Advanced education today is a responsibility of government and something that every boy and girl ought to get."

It was also with Mayor LaGuardia's help that the city colleges started attracting better qualified faculty members. When he took office, large numbers of the instructional staff were called "tutors" and were paid \$1,000 a year, or less. He supported the tenure laws for the colleges—the first of its kind in the country—which also established a scale of salary advancement and a structure of professorial ranks for the faculty.

The visionary mayor helped improve the quality of life in New York City in still other ways. It was he who in 1935 established in New York the first housing project in the United States. And it was he who first hired Robert Moses to reorganize the City's parks and recreation programs. New hospitals, a strengthened welfare system and the Health Insurance Program for City employees were also among his achievements, and these are still benefiting New Yorkers.

At this point I would like to ask Mrs. Marie LaGuardia to come forward. Mrs. LaGuardia, on behalf of the Board of Higher Education, I would like to present this scroll to you as written record of today's occasion. I will read the text:

More than a great Mayor, Fiorello H. LaGuardia personified the resurgence of New York City as a world metropolis.

In a time of despair he gave the people of our City the spirit to fight and the will to prevail. Throughout his historic mayoralty, Fiorello LaGuardia acknowledged and enhanced the City's commitment to public higher education as a vital force in assuring the economic prosperity and cultural enrichment of its citizens.

In recognition of his many contributions to higher education in the City of New York, and of his example as a fearless, wise and compassionate leader of men, the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York is proud to commemorate his name by officially designating this important new unit of the City University as Fiorella H. LaGuardia Community College.

FIORIELLO H. LA GUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
(Speech Delivered by Dr. Joseph Shenker President, Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College to the LaGuardia Memorial Association Saturday, December 5, 1970, Park Sheraton Hotel, New York City)

As the Board of Higher Education formally announces the naming of Community College Number IX as the Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College, I am pleased to have this opportunity to describe our plans to you up to this date. Of course, it is impossible to tell you all of the things that are going on in planning a new institution but let me try to indicate some of the highlights of our development.

The college was formally established by virtue of action of the Board of Higher Education and the Regents of New York last April. We are using this academic year for the development of our plans. The college will admit an initial freshman class of 450 day students next September and eventually

grow to 5000 in 1978. There will be, of course, a number of various evening programs.

We have just moved into our facilities located in Long Island City. The building, which we have purchased, formerly known as the Ford Instrument Building at 31-10 Thomson Avenue, is a large building of 250,000 square feet, very near to excellent transportation facilities. We are involved in a two-stage renovation process—the first part to be completed by September, 1971; the second part by September, 1973. We estimate the cost of both stages of renovation to be somewhere in the 7 to 8 million dollar area.

We are developing our academic program around the Cooperative Education theme. Cooperative Education is the effort to integrate practical and academic work in one curriculum. I am sure you are familiar with the program at Antioch College in Ohio and Northeastern in Boston. The theme of Antioch is to provide work opportunities and specifically reinforce career programs. We are attempting to combine the features of both and adapting them to a two-year institution. All of our students will be placed in work experience related to what they are studying. For the career students, those persons planning to seek immediate employment after two years, their work experience will expand and reinforce classroom learning. For the transfer students, those who wish to continue their education at a senior college, the work experience will provide an opportunity to explore various fields, hence when a student must choose a major field of study as he enters the Senior College, he will have a basis for his decisions.

We are in contact with the labor market and request job placements. We have received affirmative responses from various New York governmental agencies (such as, the Urban Corps, the New York State Civil Service) and other areas including Wall Street, Alexanders, etc. and we now have a commitment of a hundred jobs.

To support Cooperative Education Programs, we are developing a Quarterly Calendar which will provide five study periods and three cooperative education periods in the two-year study program.

Because we are a new institution, we have launched a fairly extensive student information campaign in the high schools, newspapers, parent meetings, T.V. spots and 18,000 letters. The reaction of students and parents has been favorable. Our opening curriculum will be in the Liberal Arts field and Business Careers. We have chosen Business Careers because of labor market demand and high student interest. For the future, we will be extremely interested in the Human Services Career field and the Communication field.

It is our intention to launch and develop an extensive program to serve the community in which we are located. This will include the large industrial firms and employees of these firms as well as the various community groups in the local area.

These are the highlights of what we have been doing. I have tried to cover them quickly to give you an overview of the planning process for the college. We are very pleased that we are able to name our college after Mayor LaGuardia and look forward to a continuing relationship between the Association and the College. We hope we can call upon the Association and individual members for counseling, advice, and assistance during the development of all phases of the college.

REMARKS OF JUDGE EUGENE R. CANUDO, CHAIRMAN OF THE LA GUARDIA MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION, AT THE DEDICATION OF LA GUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, DECEMBER 5, 1970

We are very proud indeed, we who had the good fortune to be part of the official La Guardia family, to join with the fathers of our great City University—on this occasion on which we are observing the 88th birthday next Friday of Fiorello La Guardia—in cele-

brating a most significant first: the naming of a college of the City University in honor of one of New York's mayors.

When one recalls La Guardia's pride in his native city, his keen appreciation of the meaning of higher education, and particularly the warm affection that he held for all young people, it is easy to understand why the creation of this pioneer institution which up to now has been known as Community College IX and which today is undergoing a change of name, would have made him very happy indeed, had he been here to see it. As ardent La Guardians, we of the memorial association which bears his name and carries the little flower on its letterhead are very happy and most grateful that you have given us the opportunity to be part of this important occasion.

I remember reporting to work as usual at City Hall one morning back in the fall of 1934 and interrupting the Mayor's reading of his morning mail to say: "Mayor, I think you might like to know, I started law school last night." He looked up, lifted his thick tortoise-shell reading glasses to his forehead, and said: "Dammit, Gene, what did you want to do that for? Why don't you study something useful like chemistry?"

"Gee, Major," I blurted out, "I'd make a lousy chemist. I have no feeling for it."

"OK" he answered. "Have it your way. But don't say I didn't warn you." He lowered his glasses and went on with his morning mail.

I went through with it, because I became more than ever convinced that I would have made a lousy chemist. In time I got my degree and was admitted.

La Guardia couldn't keep a grudge very long, especially where young people were concerned. It seems that in time he forgave me for studying law instead of chemistry. In fact, almost 12 years later, he appointed me to the bench. It was flattering to know that my boss would have preferred seeing me in what he considered a more useful calling, but I'm still convinced I would have made a lousy chemist.

I think you get the picture. La Guardia believed in higher education. The city colleges enjoyed an era of tremendous development during the 12 years that he was mayor. But, if he had lived, he would have derived great joy from the changing concepts in education. He would have applauded with typical La Guardia zest the twofold development we see here today: first, the realization of the dream that a unique educational opportunity—within a university framework—could serve the needs of students, business, industry and government all at one time; and second, the organization of so distinctive an educational institution under the able management of a brilliant young scholar. Only because of his age and without any reference to his abilities, the prospect of becoming a college president would, in 1934 and even in 1945, have been just a dream, an impossible dream, for a long time to come to our 30-year old president, Dr. Joseph Shenker.

We feel ourselves most fortunate to be able to witness this event today. We sincerely thank you, Chairman Burkhardt and your worthy colleagues on the Board of Higher Education, for making these impossible dreams come true.

CONSERVATION IS REALLY UP TO YOU

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, for too long in this country the quality of the environment is something most individual

citizens have left up to someone else. We all knew that it was getting bad and that we were running out of time, but we expected other people to save us from ourselves.

My good friend, Michael Frome, whose credentials in the area of conservation are considerable, has recently written an article for VISTA USA, the magazine of the Humble Travel Club, in which he places the responsibility where it belongs and outlines some goals we should set for ourselves and the country if we are going to succeed in improving the environment to the point where we, in good conscience, can turn it over to the next generation.

Mr. Frome's article, "Conservation Is Really Up to You," should be required reading in the schools, in the offices of industry and management, and in the Halls of Congress. I am pleased to place it in the RECORD, so that its circulation can be increased. The article follows:

CONSERVATION IS REALLY UP TO YOU
(By Michael Frome)

Conservation wears a thousand faces at a thousand different places. In one way or another, we're all concerned with the state of the environment—all of us, from the apartment dweller with flowers in a window box, to the deer hunter, boater, birdwatcher, camper, cattleman, farmer, forester, scholar and, yes, the captain of industry, who is too often pictured as the arch villain of the piece.

But what is conservation, really? Saving scenery and natural beauty is part of it, of course. So is the protection of parks and wilderness. One must wonder, however, in facing the tumultuous challenges of our times, whether these comprise the sum total. Or, is there something quite larger besides?

It sometimes strikes me that public understanding of the issues has not yet reached the level of public concern. People respond to the call of idealism and esthetics, desiring to preserve some segment of the landscape for its own sake. This much is good. But to grasp the total scene the true conservationist must go further, and deeper.

"From birth to death, natural resources, transformed for human use, feed, clothe, shelter and transport us," wrote Gifford Pinchot. "Upon them we depend for every material necessity, comfort, convenience and protection in our lives. Without abundant resources, prosperity is out of reach. Therefore the conservation of natural resources is the fundamental material problem."

Pinchot was the pioneer of scientific forestry in America and close collaborator of President Theodore Roosevelt in the conservation crusade of the early 20th century. Pinchot based his creed on the proposition that, "No generation can be allowed needlessly to damage or reduce the future general wealth and welfare by the way it uses or misuses any natural resource." Thus, he said, conservation means the wise use of the earth for the lasting good of men.

Since the beginning of time, nations have risen in direct ratio to the abundance and husbandry of their natural resources. So history is written. We have only to look to the Middle East, India and China to see what happens to a culture and economy when the rich raw materials of the earth are destroyed.

Here in the U.S. our entire course of growth has been based on the principle of resource luxury—limitless land, forests, water, soil, air. Now, at last, we have crossed the last frontier. The country is operating on a declining curve. Vast portions of our water supply are unfit to drink, scarcely fit for industry. The air is unfit to breathe and get-

ting worse, not better. No fence is tight enough to shut out radiation clouds, drifting sewage or noise from aircraft. Twenty years ago, possibly even 10, we could still escape by moving to Arizona, the Rockies or the Cascades. Now there is no escape. Instead, there is the challenge to clean up the environment and to keep it clean. Otherwise, our health and safety, and the quality of life will be seriously degraded, perhaps life itself endangered.

I like to search history for hopeful guideposts of practical conservation. One favorite begins at the monastery at Monte Cassino, Italy, which St. Benedict established in the sixth century. Because the abiding goal of the monks was self-sufficiency, they learned to manage the land to supply them with food and clothing, while retaining its productivity despite intensive cultivation. They developed a lasting architecture of functional beauty, well-suited to the country in which they lived (as well as to their activities). The Cistercian monks, who followed the Benedictine rule, converted areas of swamps and forests into fertile lands, which make up much of Europe's countryside today. They did so through technological practices, suggesting that technology does not have to be a dirty word.

We have examples in our own country, too. The Spanish padres who came to California built their missions of earth and seashell, mortar and reeds, wasting neither land nor materials. In fact, they laid out their presidios and pueblos allowing room for growth according to plans that had already influenced the pattern of cities in South America. One may conjecture that if this design had continued there might be far less urban sprawl in California today.

One of the most fascinating examples of use in harmony with the land is found in Pleasant Hill, Ky., the Shaker village of the 19th century that was intended to be God's kingdom on earth. Though the religious order (which once settled colonies in seven states) has virtually disappeared, Pleasant Hill remains as a durable monument to its good works. The Shakers' agriculture and industries were unrivaled for practicality and progress. They invented ingenious labor-saving devices like the circular saw, common clothespin and metal pen. They are recognized as the first to have sold garden seeds in packets. They manufactured their own farm implements and succeeded in installing a fantastic central water system, probably the first west of the Alleghenies.

Those people are gone. The Pennsylvania Dutch, however, are much a part of the present. Where other settlers around them exploited the land and moved on, these thrifty Germans sheltered cattle, rotated crops (planting carefully to avoid erosion) and stayed put. Anyone driving through the Dutch country today will be impressed at the sight of land farmed for three centuries that continues to be fertile and productive.

The examples I have cited, as you may note, share a common quality: the utter absence of waste. Conservation is based upon respect for natural systems and the elimination of waste. This is the fundamental principle that must be applied to industrial production and to our life-style as individuals.

We are told more forests must be cut because the nation needs wood for housing construction, yet logging has been a consistently destructive practice. Consider that about half the wood cut is left in the forest, then half the remainder is discarded in processing. Air is then polluted by burning of logging slash and sawmill "residues" (otherwise known as waste). Water is fouled when pulp mills dump their residues into streams.

How much do we Americans waste? Studies show that in solid materials alone we discard 350-million tons of residential, commercial and industrial rubbish (about one-million tons a day); 1.3-billion tons of agri-

cultural manure; 1-billion tons of mining wastes, and 15-million tons of scrapped automobiles. Measured another way, every day of the year, as individuals we throw out almost 500,000 tons of paper, cans, bottles, garbage and other refuse.

We are, in fact, distinguishing ourselves as the most wasteful people on earth. A study by Keep America Beautiful, the anti-litter organization, reveals that each individual generates an annual average of 1,800 pounds of waste, compared with 1,000 in Canada, 500 in England, only 200 in India. Waste is the offspring of an affluent society, in which people are prone to devour endless quantities of "disposable" products—newspapers, magazines, paper bags, cellophane, packages, tissues, bottles, cans—with little thought of where they come from or where they must go, and with scant inclination to save, or repair, anything older than yesterday.

This approach might have worked 50 years ago, but since then the population has doubled. The towering mountains of waste create tremendous problems. Many cities, large and small, still cart the stuff to smelly, rat-infested dumps, which the Public Health Service warns "represent disease potential, threat of pollution and land blight." Besides, we are simply running out of dumping space.

Sure, we can do a better job of disposal through more efficient incineration and composting and landfilling (which inevitably claims valuable marshes, resources in their own right for fish, birds, mammals and recreation). But we would still be discarding vast quantities of products made from raw materials in limited supply. The answer is at last dawning on the nation that we can and must shift from a use-and-discard philosophy to a cycle of use-salvage-and-reuse.

Recycling represents an urgent aspect of modern conservation. It saves raw materials, eliminates pollution, and protects the shrinking open space and wilderness which enhance the quality of life. It even offers the basis of an entire new industry, for it is clearly evident that modern technology can provide the means for recycling vast quantities of materials presently being "poured down the drain." With discipline and determination, society can return paper to the paper mill, aluminum to the smelter, scrap iron to the foundry.

In short, we need a new national goal based on doing more with less. The target should be to recycle, remelt and reuse every pound of metal—just as was the practice centuries ago when metals were not as readily available—rather than tolerating ugly and growing refuse piles. An all-out effort should be directed at collecting and utilizing 25-million tons of fly ash from coal-burning power plants (as other nations do), instead of allowing this resource to pollute the air. The time is now to give the answer to years of neglect, overuse, misuse and waste.

With the tempo of national feeling at a high pitch, Americans have reached the hour for action on a broad front. As one deeply involved in environmental issues, I believe we must assign responsibilities, rather than assess guilt. There is plenty of room for all. Industry must be required to do its full share (and is likely to find that environmental responsibility increases efficiency and saves more money than it costs), but should not be a whipping boy. Thousands of municipalities must respond, too. Do you realize that about 30-million Americans still live without adequate sewage installations or with none at all? That about 2,400 communities need new or better treatment facilities in order to stop further degradation of water quality?

The point is that conservation is everybody's business. It begins in everybody's backyard and neighborhood. Each individual American who cares must accept the responsibility for his own life-style. For example, those who complain about phosphates in

synthetic detergents leading to the deterioration of lakes and streams can switch to soap. The family farmer can decide to raise crops and animals by "organic" specifications, switching from poison sprays and high-nitrate fertilizers to more natural fertilizers and soil conditioners and to rotations that return plant residues to the soil. Instead of burning leaves or cuttings from plants, the home gardener can build a compost pile, which is one of the most direct and personal means of conserving resources and curbing pollution. Any group of citizens can clean up a nearby vacant lot or stream, which may have been a dump, and turn it into a place of beauty and use.

It's amazing how little we understand of the American life community and how poorly we use it. Many insects which we destroy indiscriminately are regarded in more frugal countries to be good food. Not all insects are "dirty," either; some, in fact, are cleaner than the residues of insect killers which farmers spread on their vegetables. By the same token, many plants we shun as "weeds" yield wholesome, palatable and edible fruits, nuts, leaves, stems, roots and seeds to those who involve themselves in the natural world.

Individually and collectively, conservationists can work miracles. The average citizen must keep continuing pressure on everybody who has influence in order to stop the dumping of waste—whether in the form of kitchen scraps, cans, automobile or smokestack exhausts—into the common environment of our small planet. It can be done.

THE "NEW SPRINGFIELD," MASS.
STORY BY DON FRIFIELD IN THE
AMERICAN AIRLINES INFLIGHT
MAGAZINE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, complex problems stemming from core-city deterioration and blight in older major American metropolitan areas, and what my home city of Springfield, Mass., is doing to counter this trend, continues to receive favorable nationwide attention.

Don Frifield wrote a perceptive and interesting article entitled "New Springfield" for the February 1971 edition of *The American Way*, the inflight magazine published monthly by American Airlines.

Noting this predicament of many larger cities, Mr. Frifield points to Springfield as an example of what can be done to save our cities. Through the efforts and continuing dedication of many private citizens and public servants, Springfield has developed a highly successful combination of private financial sponsorship and local-State-Federal Government initiative.

Springfield has been successful in the inauguration of a hopeful program for the rejuvenation of its downtown area, making it accessible through an improved transportation street-highway network, and providing for the preservation of the area's historical heritage. I include Mr. Frifield's article at this point in the RECORD:

NEW SPRINGFIELD

(By Don Frifield)

The impact of inner-city deterioration and blight, the now-familiar pattern of the af-

fluent deserting the city for the suburbs and leaving the central city for the poor, is a problem Springfield, Massachusetts (population 175,000) shares with many cities of approximately the same size.

But Springfield's response amounts to a kind of clarion call of faith in the central city itself. The city serves a metropolitan area of more than 500,000 persons. After Boston and Worcester, it's the third-largest city in Massachusetts, but in economic power it's second only to Boston.

Now taking form in the heart of Springfield is a massive rebuilding of the main commercial area that will—all concerned hope—make downtown Springfield a Place to Go, to Be in. But the very idea implies far more than just another shopping center with office buildings and retail stores: calls for a plan, its backers assert, that will make the downtown area a focus of attraction beyond the power of any suburban areas to duplicate.

In essence, this is the very principle of the city as an idea: you need compelling reasons to journey to the heart of any city—reasons that will overwhelm all problems of transport, parking, convenience, and expense, because the city itself is indispensable.

Among American cities, New York, San Francisco, New Orleans, Chicago, Boston, and Philadelphia—among others—have either retained or rebuilt this irresistibly magnetic power into their central sections, often at great effort and expense, to say nothing of controversy.

But, as we're all aware, most other American cities have lost the magnetism of their downtown areas to suburban areas, some more, some less.

And, even among those cities cited above, the battle remains touch-and-go: Philadelphia has revitalized itself enormously in the areas around the 30th Street Station and Independence Hall, but its inner-city problems grow worse. Nor have new office buildings helped New York and Chicago conspicuously. Even San Francisco has to contemplate a loss in its panoramic views; from the Top of the Mark you now see predominantly the Top of the Fairmont next door.

Springfield's own plans, now in the midst of construction, include:

A massive civic and convention center in the heart of the city, to restore Springfield's importance as a New England convention center. The Civic-Convention Center will be the first of many new buildings in the city's Court Square Urban Renewal area. Its initial capacity of 9,000 will be expanded to 10,600 seats, as the need arises.

Baystate West, a 50 million dollar project of Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company (headquartered in Springfield, where it has 2400 employees), is building on four acres of downtown Springfield just two blocks from the Civic-Convention Center. It will consist of two levels of enclosed retail stores, three levels of parking above the stores, a 29-story office tower, and a 15-story hotel. Sheltered airwalks will connect the various elements of Baystate West, affording an all-weather, air-conditioned environment for shoppers, workers, and visitors.

The North End Project, under the aegis of the Springfield Redevelopment Authority, combines private and urban renewal funds, comprising a 240-room motor hotel topped with a revolving restaurant, a twin-tower high-rise apartment building for the elderly, a bus terminal, a new YMCA building, new office and plant for Springfield's newspapers, and additional commercial construction.

Whatever the immediate benefits of these projects when they are completed, Springfieldites are convinced that the real success of the effort will be determined by one factor alone: Will these initial programs spark others to the point where the central area will once again become significant?

Today the expected poverty-stricken ghetto areas are immediately adjacent to downtown. Civic leaders believe the middle-class flight to the suburbs—and even out of the area altogether—will not be curbed, let alone reversed, by good intentions and limited efforts, however dazzling.

The impression one gets from Springfield people—as from other, similarly-situated Americans at this point in our national history—is of a total rejection of the old chamber of commerce enthusiasms, advertisingese, and the so-called 'Edifice Complex, wherein great slabs of new masonry once spelled progress itself.

"We've got to make this city mean something to today's Americans," says Paul Mason, Springfield's black city councillor. "We've all come to learn that bigger isn't necessarily better, that you can build yourself right out of the human perspective. Size and budget are important, of course, but the human scale is indispensable. We want people to be comfortable in downtown Springfield. We want them to look upon the new creations here as their very own . . . as places to enjoy. The esthetics are every bit as important as the financial prospects—and it may well be that the two considerations can no longer be considered separate, or opposing one another.

"Coming to Springfield as a convention visitor or as a tourist has got to be an event. And this is easier said than done."

The decision of the Springfield municipal government to build the Civic-Convention Center in the heart of town should perhaps be self-explanatory. At any rate, a city spokesman answered the question "Why?" with two others: "Where else would you build such a facility to be most convenient to the most people? And where else could you find a neighborhood that needs improvement more?"

But why did a private company, Massachusetts Mutual Life, choose to build in the central city?

"Well," said James R. Martin, president and chief executive officer, "We just couldn't imagine a better place. If we don't show our genuine faith in our headquarters city, how can we expect others to join us? Besides, our choice was more than a matter of faith. It was the logical place.

"When the Interstate highway network is complete around here in late 1971, downtown Springfield will be the easiest place in the area to reach, the easiest place to park your car, and the easiest place to do the most things with the least effort."

While the very phrase "Great Springfield" may bring smiles to the lips of New Yorkers and Los Angelenos, among others, the fact remains that Springfield is in the heart of many things near and dear to the American spirit.

Old Storowton Villages, on the grounds of the Eastern States Exposition (an annual fair that is the largest in the Northeast and among the dozen largest fairs in the U.S.), recreates a colonial American that helps visitors evoke the land that the bulldozers have destroyed in those places where time alone wasn't enough.

Thirty miles away, the much great recreation of post-colonial America, Sturbridge Village, brings the late 18th and the early 19th century America of farms and villages to life for today's over-urbanized generations, many of whom come away dazzled with the energies and talents of a bygone America.

Within a half hour's drive from central Springfield are some of the nation's first and best colleges: Smith at Northampton; Mt. Holyoke at Mt. Holyoke; Amherst at Amherst. Forty-five minutes away are Williams College at Williamstown and Tanglewood and the Berkshires.

Thus Springfield is in the center of western Massachusetts' uniquely New England contribution to the American experience.

In the city itself, the Springfield Armory Museum reminds us of the armorial tradition of the city: here originated the first U.S. Army musket in 1795, the Springfield Rifle in 1903, and the Garand Rifle in 1937.

Springfield also boasts the first commercially-sold automobile, the 1892 Duryea, and memorializes the creation of the game of basketball in The Nation's Basketball Hall of Fame (Dr. James Naismith dreamed up the game while teaching in the world's first YMCA college in Springfield in 1891).

"We've got to make civic spirit—call it civic optimism—contagious in Springfield," says Richard Booth, former bank president and active in downtown redevelopment since its inception. "This is no time for old-fashioned boosterism and mindless promotionalism, but it is a time to begin conquering our problems before they conquer us."

"But nothing we say has any meaning unless we're willing to put our money where our hopes are. Things are not going to get better in the American city unless the city-dwellers make them better."

DRAFT REFORM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the question of extending our selective service laws and the general question of draft reform is a topic with which we are all very much currently concerned. The Armed Services Committee is currently conducting hearings on this subject. I have recently received a letter from the Iowa Youth Advisory Committee containing a number of recommendations with respect to the Selective Service System. These suggestions are well thought out and I urge my colleagues to read and consider them.

I include the material as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1971.

The Hon. Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: The Iowa Youth Advisory Committee to the Selective Service System has now been in operation for over a year and one-half. Our 10-member committee, representative of the divergent youth groups and areas of Iowa, has as its primary function the representation of contemporary youth's ideas to the Selective Service.

Since the law regulating the Selective Service is now being considered, we feel that it is important to communicate our ideas to you. Beyond this, we would hope that you would communicate your ideas with us.

Among the recommendations which we urge you to consider are the following:

1. The committee strongly favors elimination of the 2-S (student) classification.
2. The committee also recommends the elimination of the 2-A (Apprentice) and the 3-A (Fatherhood) classifications.
3. With respect to the 1-0 (Conscientious Objection) classification, it is our feeling that those so classified should be channeled into the following fields:

- a. VISTA.
- b. Teachers Corps.
- c. PEACE Corps.
- d. Other federal or state programs.

4. The committee feels that the 1-Y classification is being abused. We would recom-

mend a standard comprising the 1-Y classification for use in noncombatant capacities (i.e., desk jobs, etc.) in the military.

5. The committee recommends a 2-year extension of the current draft. We do so with the hope that a "Zero Draft" call will be possible at the end of that period. In addition, we recommend analysis of the potential prospect of incorporating the "Zero Draft" for the last 6 months of this period. We feel that this would be an excellent opportunity to test the potential of the "Zero Draft."

6. We hope that Congress will not overlook reform in passing a 2-year extension of the law. A realistic analysis of the potential for reaching the "Zero Draft" in 1973 leads us to conclude that reform of the current system should not be disregarded in the belief that the current draft will be ending in 2 years.

In closing, I would like to thank you for your consideration of the committee's recommendations. I hope that we can hear from you in the near future regarding your opinions and ideas about the current draft law.

Sincerely,

LARRY E. MCKIBBEN, Chairman.

PRICE OPPOSES RAISING NATIONAL DEBT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the first year of the Nixon administration I, for the first time since coming to Congress, voted to raise the ceiling on the national debt. I did so then because I believed the President needed some fiscal elbowroom to help him turn the economy away from the inflationary spiral caused by the excessive spending and deficit financing of previous administrations.

I took this step in good faith; I took this step in the hopes that it would help the Federal Government set its financial house in order. Regrettably, most regrettably, I took this step in vain.

That financial order at the Federal level has not been attained is obvious. One need look no further than the so-called full employment budget for fiscal 1972, which is nothing more than deficit spending by another name, to see that Federal fiscal policymakers are embarked upon another round of "go now, pay later" Government financing. And, predictably, Congress is now being asked to raise the national debt ceiling once again to provide the extra margin for the so-called money experts to wheel and deal as well as deficit spend.

But, Mr. Speaker, I say far more than enough leeway has been extended. Far too much debt is outstanding. By stretching our indebtedness further we are stretching to a breaking point the fiscal integrity of the U.S. dollar.

Instead of attempting to solve our financial woes by spending more money, let us, just for once, take a serious stab at attempting to solve our financial woes by spending less money. I say it is time, indeed it is way past time, to recognize a fundamental law of economics; namely,

you cannot spend or give away more than that which you have to spend or give away.

I realize this simple precept might shock a highly paid bureaucrat who is more comfortable dealing with abstract facts and national debt account figures, but I am confident every last wage earner, every last taxpayer who has to make out and stick to a budget will know full well what I am saying and will accept it for the basic truth it is. You simply cannot spend more than you have.

Well, the bureaucrat says, when the family wants to spend more than it has it borrows money. Why then cannot the Government do the same?

To the bureaucrat I say, when the family or the individual borrows money repayment is called for, and if repayment is not made as agreed upon then personal or commercial bankruptcy ensues. In contrast, when the Federal Government borrows money, it borrows it, in effect, from either the people in the form of notes or bonds, or from itself. And when repayment is due, the Government often merely prints enough new money to cover its indebtedness or it refinances its indebtedness.

Mr. Speaker, I say this form of government by printing press, or government by continual debt renegotiation, is destined to fail. No government, I repeat, no government can perpetuate itself successfully by building paper castles in the air. And believe you me, this is exactly what we are now doing; and this is exactly what we have been doing for the last 20 years.

To those who think there is no such thing as an inevitable day of financial reckoning for a nation as there is for an individual or a family, let me address a simple thought. At the present time, the second biggest item of Federal expenditure is the \$20.8 billion that will be spent this year just to pay the interest, not the principal, just the interest, on our national debt. This next year, the interest costs will run over \$21 billion. Contrast these staggering interest costs to the more modest amount of \$8 billion that it took to service the national debt in 1961. And if this contrast is not startling enough to make all but the compulsive take pause, it has been computed that on the basis of this year's interest of \$20.8 billion, just the interest alone costs \$39,600 for each minute of the year or \$400 million each week of the year. This is what it costs each and every one of us to support those who blindly spend, spend, spend on the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the last few years is clear. The limit on the national debt, although established in 1917 as a statutory ceiling or maximum limit on the total amount of Federal securities that may be outstanding at one time, has become merely an invitation to costly and misleading fiscal maneuvers. Keynesian theorists, Fabian Socialists, and plain misguided and misinformed altruists have used the national debt limit as a level to jockey this Nation into a financially treacherous position.

The "go now, pay later" boys have

overspent the real resources of this Nation to the point that U.S. gold reserves have shrunk from almost \$24 billion to under \$11 billion at the same time short-term U.S. dollar claims held by foreign interests have climbed to more than \$42 billion.

Yet in the face of this financial crunch, what do we hear from the free spenders? We hear, "The heck with reality, the heck with financial stability, open the doors of the Nation's Treasury and full speed ahead."

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to say, enough is enough. Now is the time to say this far and no further. Now is the time to say "tonstaff"—there is no free lunch. Somebody pays for it sometime. In the case of the national debt, that "somebody" is the taxpayer, and the "some-time" is, I am afraid, soon.

HOW THE HOUSE VOTES ON INTEREST RATES

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the high- and low-interest forces in the House of Representatives were plainly revealed for the American public. The low-interest forces lost, 212 to 180, but there are many significant points about that vote that should be brought to the attention of the American people.

Without a solid Republican vote for high-interest rates, it would have been impossible for the removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling to have passed the House of Representatives. Ninety-one percent of the Republicans—all but 14—voted for removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling and for allowing the Treasury Department to market \$10 billion of long-term Government bonds without regard to this ceiling.

On the low-interest side of the issue were 166 Democrats and the 14 Republicans.

Nearly three-quarters of the Democrats present were recorded for the 4¼-percent ceiling and low-interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the American voters will long remember this division in the House. I am proud of the fact that the leadership—including 11 committee chairmen—stood by the principles of the Democratic Party and voted for low-interest rates.

It is also significant that 29 of the 32 new Democratic Members of the House present cast votes to retain the 4¼-percent ceiling. These are people who were elected in a 1970 campaign which centered heavily on economic issues including interest rates. Only three of these new Members were recorded on the high-interest side of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, many of the State Democratic delegations voted together to keep the 4¼-percent ceiling. In 11 States, only a single Democratic Member crossed the

line and voted against the 4¼-percent ceiling.

The Banking and Currency Committee has long been concerned about high-interest rates and I am happy to report that 14 of the 16 Democrats present voted on the low-interest side of H.R. 4690. Only two Democrats on the committee voted the other way.

Last week's vote against low-interest rates, 212 to 180, threatens to label the 92d Congress as "The High-Interest Congress." However, the 180 Members who voted for low-interest rates cannot be blamed for the mistakes of the 212 who pushed this ill-timed measure through the House.

Mr. Speaker, the 180 Members who voted for low-interest rates are to be commended in the highest terms. They are reflecting the demands of the American people for economic stability and the lowest possible interest rates and the lowest possible charges on Government borrowings. These 180 Members make up the honor roll of the low-interest forces in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a list of the names of the 180 Members by State:

THE 180 MEMBERS WHO VOTED FOR LOW INTEREST RATES

ALABAMA

Robert E. Jones, Democrat.

ALASKA

N. J. Begich, Democrat.

ARIZONA

Morris K. Udall, Democrat.

CALIFORNIA

Glenn M. Anderson, Democrat.
Phillip Burton, Democrat.
George E. Danielson, Democrat.
Ronald V. Dellums, Democrat.
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., Republican.
Augustus F. Hawkins, Democrat.
Chet Holifield, Democrat.
Harold T. Johnson, Democrat.
Robert E. Leggett, Democrat.
John J. McFall, Democrat.
George P. Miller, Democrat.
John E. Moss, Democrat.
Thomas M. Rees, Democrat.
Edward R. Roybal, Democrat.
John G. Schmitz, Republican.
B. F. Sisk, Democrat.
Lionel Van Deerlin, Democrat.
Jerome R. Waldie, Democrat.
Charles H. Wilson, Democrat.

CONNECTICUT

William R. Cotten, Democrat.
Robert N. Giaimo, Democrat.
Ella T. Grasso, Democrat.

FLORIDA

Charles E. Bennett, Democrat.
Bill Chappell, Jr., Democrat.
Dante B. Fascell, Democrat.
Don Fuqua, Democrat.
Sam Gibbons, Democrat.
James A. Haley, Democrat.
Paul G. Rogers, Democrat.
Robert L. F. Sikes, Democrat.

GEORGIA

Jack Brinkley, Democrat.

HAWAII

Spark M. Matsunaga, Democrat.
Patsy T. Mink, Democrat.

ILLINOIS

Frank Annunzio, Democrat.
George W. Collins, Democrat.

Philip M. Crane, Republican.
Edward J. Derwinski, Republican.
Kenneth J. Gray, Democrat.
John C. Kluczynski, Democrat.
Abner J. Mikva, Democrat.
Melvin Price, Democrat.
Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat.
George E. Shipley, Democrat.
Sidney R. Yates, Democrat.

INDIANA

John Brademas, Democrat.
Lee H. Hamilton, Democrat.
Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Democrat.
Ray J. Madden, Democrat.
J. Edward Roush, Democrat.

IOWA

John C. Culver, Democrat.
H. R. Gross, Republican.
Fred Schwengel, Republican.
Neal Smith, Democrat.

KANSAS

William R. Roy, Democrat.

KENTUCKY

Romano L. Mazzoli, Democrat.
Carl D. Perkins, Democrat.
M. G. Snyder, Republican.
Frank A. Stubblefield, Democrat.

LOUISIANA

Hale Boggs, Democrat.
Patrick T. Caffery, Democrat.
John R. Rarick, Democrat.

MAINE

Peter N. Kyros, Democrat.

MARYLAND

Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat.
Paul S. Sarbanes, Democrat.

MASSACHUSETTS

James A. Burke, Democrat.
Harold D. Donohue, Democrat.
Robert F. Drinan, Democrat.
Michael Harrington, Democrat.
Louise Day Hicks, Democrat.
Torbert H. Macdonald, Democrat.
Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Democrat.

MICHIGAN

John Conyers, Jr., Democrat.
John D. Dingell, Democrat.
William D. Ford, Democrat.
Lucien N. Nedzi, Democrat.
James G. O'Hara, Democrat.

MINNESOTA

Bob Bergland, Democrat.
John A. Blatnik, Democrat.
Joseph E. Karth, Democrat.
John M. Zwach, Republican.

MISSOURI

Bill D. Burlison, Democrat.
Durward G. Hall, Republican.
William L. Hungate, Democrat.
Richard H. Ichord, Democrat.
William J. Randall, Democrat.
Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat.
James W. Symington, Democrat.

MONTANA

John Melcher, Democrat.

NEVADA

Walter S. Baring, Democrat.

NEW JERSEY

Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat.
Cornelius E. Gallagher, Democrat.
Henry Helstoski, Democrat.
James J. Howard, Democrat.
Joseph G. Minish, Democrat.
Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat.
Robert A. Roe, Democrat.
Charles W. Sandman, Jr., Republican.
Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat.

NEW MEXICO

Manuel Lujan, Jr., Republican.
Harold L. Runnels, Democrat.

NEW YORK

Bella S. Abzug, Democrat.
Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat.
Herman Badillo, Democrat.
Mario Biaggi, Democrat.
Frank J. Brasco, Democrat.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat.
John G. Dow, Democrat.
Thaddeus J. Dulski, Democrat.
Seymour Halpern, Republican.
James M. Hanley, Democrat.
Edward I. Koch, Democrat.
Otis G. Pike, Democrat.
Bertram L. Podell, Democrat.
Charles B. Rangel, Democrat.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat.
William F. Ryan, Democrat.
James E. Scheuer, Democrat.
Samuel S. Stratton, Democrat.
Lester L. Wolff, Democrat.

NORTH CAROLINA

L. H. Fountain, Democrat.
Nick Galifianakis, Democrat.
David N. Henderson, Democrat.
Roy A. Taylor, Democrat.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur A. Link, Democrat.

OHIO

Charles J. Carney, Democrat.
John F. Seiberling, Jr., Democrat.
J. V. Stanton, Democrat.
Charles A. Vanik, Democrat.

OKLAHOMA

Carl Albert, Democrat.
Ed Edmondson, Democrat.
Tom Steed, Democrat.

OREGON

Edith Green, Democrat.
Al Ullman, Democrat.

PENNSYLVANIA

William A. Barrett, Democrat.
James A. Byrne, Democrat.
John H. Dent, Democrat.
Joshua Ellberg, Democrat.
Daniel J. Flood, Democrat.
Joseph M. Gaydos, Democrat.
Thomas E. Morgan, Democrat.
Robert N. C. Nix, Democrat.
Fred B. Rooney, Democrat.
Joseph P. Vigorito, Democrat.
Gus Yatron, Democrat.

RHODE ISLAND

Robert O. Tiernan, Democrat.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John L. McMillan, Democrat.
James R. Mann, Democrat.

SOUTH DAKOTA

James Abourezk, Democrat.
Frank E. Denholm, Democrat.

TENNESSEE

William R. Anderson, Democrat.
Ray Blanton, Democrat.
Joe L. Ewins, Democrat.
Richard Fulton, Democrat.

TEXAS

Jack Brooks, Democrat.
Bob Casey, Democrat.
Jim Collins, Republican.
Bob Eckhardt, Democrat.
Henry B. Gonzalez, Democrat.
Abraham Kazen, Jr., Democrat.
Wright Patman, Democrat.
J. J. Pickle, Democrat.
Richard C. White, Democrat.
Jim Wright, Democrat.

UTAH

K. Gunn McKay, Democrat.

VIRGINIA

William L. Scott, Republican.

WASHINGTON

Brock Adams, Democrat.
Julia Butler Hansen, Democrat.

Mike McCormack, Democrat.
Lloyd Meeds, Democrat.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ken Hechler, Democrat.
Harley O. Staggers, Democrat.

WISCONSIN

Leslie Aspin, Democrat.
Robert W. Kastenmeier, Democrat.
David R. Obey, Democrat.
Henry S. Reuss, Democrat.
Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat.

WYOMING

Teno Roncalio, Democrat.

A NEW BREED OF LAWMAN
FROM SWTU

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, because of the vision of the Southwest Texas State University at San Marcos, the future of law enforcement looks brighter and stronger.

This university has initiated and doubled the size of its department of law enforcement education in less than 2 years. Now, SWTU is one of only 11 universities in the State of Texas offering a 4-year bachelor program in law enforcement. Plus, it is one of only three universities in the entire United States selected by the Air Force to train its Institute of Technology personnel.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the leadership at SWTU is not content to talk about the problem of the rising crime rate—they want to do something about it. That something first begins with trained law enforcement personnel. Therefore, in the hopes that the Nation will prosper by the example begun at SWTU, I ask unanimous consent to present for the RECORD the following article written by Don Fairchild in the February 27 edition of the Austin American:

SWT TRAINING A NEW BREED OF LAWMAN
(By Don Fairchild)

SAN MARCOS.—Beginning in September of 1969 with 22 students, the Department of Law Enforcement Education at Southwest Texas State University has more than doubled in two years to 568 students, 188 of whom are making this field their major.

The department at the San Marcos school now has two fulltime professors, a chairman, and two part-time instructors.

And a large group of enthusiastic, dedicated students, young and some not-so-young. But all of them are enthusiastic.

They are enthusiastic about what is a new approach to law enforcement, as well as a new venture in education.

San Marcos's SWTU is one of only 11 universities in Texas offering a four-year, bachelor-level program in law enforcement.

And it is one of only three universities in the United States selected by the Air Force to train its Institute of Technology personnel.

Chairman of the department is Dr. Oscar Dorsey, who is also dean of professional schools at the university.

Master teacher is C. C. Mahaney, with I. J. Horn, a retired Air Force major, as the other fulltime instructor.

Part-time instructors are William O. Mad-

dox, who is campus security director, and D. B. Harrelson, who will go on fulltime basis in the fall.

According to professionals in the field, what is the future for a young man or young woman in the field of law enforcement?

Mahaney is definite: "Now is a good time to go into the field." Standards are rising. So are pay and consideration, Mahaney said this week in an interview.

"Right now would be a good time to enter the field, for someone who wants to be of service to society," said the master teacher.

"Pay and rewards are much better now—but they should be even higher; I think they will be better when society realizes the law enforcement officer is trying to become a professional person," said Mahaney.

The Law Enforcement Education program is designed to give its students a strong academic background, including must-take courses in psychology and sociology; a common ground with other professionals in the academic courses taught; a free exchange of information between departments; and a code of ethics.

Mahaney says "psychology and sociology and a study of social attitudes of people and individuals are musts."

"The human affairs part is vital—to know how people are going to act and react under stressful situations."

The students must take several courses in abnormal psychology and human behavior in abnormal situations, Mahaney says.

Mahaney says the Department is perhaps the fastest growing department at the university. "We have to turn away students," he said. The Department has been "well received" by faculty and students, he added.

What about pay and incentives for the graduate? Mahaney says the standard-setting department in Texas at the moment is Dallas. There, the rookie officer, once he has been through the police academy of the Dallas force, can expect to begin at \$700 a month. "That's pretty good pay for a starting bachelor of science degree in any field," said Mahaney.

But the graduates aren't limited to the choice of being an officer on the beat, says Mahaney. Many go into federal service; some go to the Treasury Department; and many of them go into security work.

"Let's get one thing straight," says Mahaney. "The degree won't make you a good officer automatically. It depends on what the individual is capable of doing with his degree. The degree doesn't automatically make you a good law enforcement officer—but it will aid."

What about public attitudes toward law enforcement people, especially in view of these troubled times?

Mahaney still thinks it's a good time to get into the field. Public attitudes are changing, he said, and they are changing in favor of professionally trained, high-standard peace officers.

"The public can have the type of police force it wants," says Mahaney. "If the citizens will demand an excellent force, they'll get it."

Also, Texas is fortunate in that it does not have the human relations problems of the East and West Coasts, said the teacher.

The beginning peace officer should be between 21 and 35 years of age, but that doesn't mean the law enforcement courses are limited to that age bracket. "Many senior officers are going to school so that they can take their place in law enforcement education," said Mahaney. "There is a big demand for college-trained peace officers."

The San Marcos course is a four-year, 128-semester-hour course from which the graduates receive a bachelor's degree in law enforcement. "We hope to be able to offer a master's degree course in 1973," the teacher said.

Although the field is practically brand new, more than 600 universities and junior colleges in the United States now have programs in law enforcement, said Mahaney.

And the field is attracting more and more women. There are 11 girls majoring in law enforcement at SWT; 10 are majoring in social law enforcement, and one in criminal law enforcement.

"Many girls want to go into juvenile work," says Mahaney, "That is why they study social law enforcement."

"It is," he said, "an expanding field for women."

Security also is a field that is opening to women, he said. And the field is big. "There are two guards to each police officer in America," said Mahaney. Women are welcomed in industrial security, personnel security, department stores, and other areas, said Mahaney.

PLANS, PROGRAMS, AND ECONOMICS OF THE COAL INDUSTRY TO MEET POWER REQUIREMENTS

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, meeting America's increasing power requirements is one of the most pressing problems facing us today. In a recent speech before the American Institute of Mining Engineers, Mr. Carl E. Bagge, president of the National Coal Association, presented the views of his association with regard to this problem and offered some suggestions as to how we can best meet these power needs. Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Bagge's remarks in the RECORD so that my colleagues may have the opportunity to study his proposals:

PLANS, PROGRAMS AND ECONOMICS OF THE COAL INDUSTRY TO MEET POWER REQUIREMENTS

(A speech by Carl E. Bagge)

My topic today is to inform you, the engineers who have such a vital input into industry's future plans, how the coal industry is planning to meet power requirements. Such a subject presents quite a challenge in at least two unique respects. First, the coal industry has sufficient productive capacity to meet existing demands and in 1970 proved its ability to do so by establishing a 20 year production record. Secondly, while other fuels are short of reserves, coal will only be short of productive capacity to meet future demands to the extent that industry, particularly the electric utilities, fails to make a timely commitment to rely on coal. The problem is one of attracting sufficient investment capital to expand our productive capacity. And this cannot be achieved if the prevailing attitude of a large segment of the utility industry continues to consider coal as the last resort in any plans for the future. If the coal industry can be assured of the role you planners want it to assume in your company's future, I can assure you, gentlemen, that the coal industry will be willing to invest the risk capital necessary to develop the productive capacity to meet those future demands.

The relationship in the past between the coal industry and the utilities undoubtedly could have been improved but history can serve us only if we profit from the mistakes of the past without dwelling on them. At this critical time in the development of our energy-oriented society the limitations on our existing energy sources must be taken

into account in the development of realistic solutions which are so essential if the growing needs of this and future generations are to be met. It is imperative for the electric utilities to recognize that coal must assume an essential role in their future plans—not only with respect to the requirements of existing plants but the need for the construction of new coal-fired facilities well into the next century.

My remarks today will focus primarily upon some of the major considerations which should form the basis for any constructive approach to our mutual problems.

Throughout most of our recent history, as a nation, we have enjoyed abundant quantities of low-cost energy. It has been only within the last few years that we have been forced to face the inevitable; when our geometrically increasing demand began encountering some troublesome and finite limits on supply.

There was a small foretaste of future troubles last year when an autumn heat wave caught some power companies with many of their facilities off line for annual maintenance and some brownouts resulted in the northeast. That situation was caused primarily by a shortage of generating capacity, not fuel. Nevertheless, some utility executives spent some worried weeks watching their fuel stockpiles dwindle. And all fuels were in short supply.

While the immediate concern has been with generating capacity, the underlying problem in the long run is one of an adequate and available fuel supply. It is in this regard that coal enjoys an enviable position within the fuel spectrum. While the other fuels are short of reserves, as pointed out above, coal is only short of the productive capacity necessary to meet your projected demands for coal in the future.

If the nation's present rate of energy demand is projected into the future, we come up with some staggering figures. In 1969, the United States consumed nearly 65.8 quadrillion Btu of energy, more than 95 per cent of it from fossil fuels. A consensus of recent estimates indicates a national demand for 145.4 quadrillion Btu of fossil fuels by the year 2000.

Estimates of the recoverable reserves of coal in the United States range from 7,980 quadrillion Btu in the sort of seams now being mined, to 32,973 quadrillion Btu in estimated total ultimately recoverable reserves. This is our greatest stockpile of energy, making up 88 per cent of our known or provable reserves of energy fuels—including uranium—and 74 per cent of our ultimate recoverable fuel reserves.

In this context, the future fuel demand by the electric generating industry will also undergo a dramatic increase. The Federal Power Commission estimated last year that by the year 1990, the nation's electric power requirements will increase more than four times to approximately 5.83 trillion kilowatt hours. Given this increased demand, the electric power industry will require an annual energy equivalent to 2 billion tons of coal. While this figure is indeed difficult to even comprehend, it should be pointed out that at this rate our known recoverable coal reserves could support the entire electric utility demand for at least 160 years before we would have to search for presently undiscovered coal seams.

Conversely, the discovered reserves of oil and gas do not approach those of coal, though many persons have stated that if the price justified the risks, sufficient quantities of oil and gas could be discovered to meet our domestic oil and gas needs for the rest of the century. By the same token, the question of price may also determine whether synthetic oil and gas are produced from coal to replace the depleting natural supply.

The problem with respect to uranium, the

other fuel presently available to the utilities is not generally publicized and yet could be most critical to the long run economic utilization of atomic energy. There are at least two principal complications, for the question of possible reserves of uranium depends on the date that a dependable commercial breeder becomes available, and on how fast it breeds—in other words, its doubling time. It is becoming increasingly apparent that unless a breeder reactor is successfully developed and on line providing a substantial portion of our atomic energy—and thus increasing the energy potential of uranium by a factor of 80—the present types of light water reactors will soon exhaust the slender supplies of uranium economically available. Moreover, the AEC concedes that all of the "reasonably assured" uranium resources at the present price—up to \$8 a pound—will be consumed by 1980.

The AEC estimates that if the breeder is introduced in 1984—which is presently about the most optimistic date being discussed—and if uranium prices and fossil fuel prices continue to rise, approximately 1,150,000 tons of uranium will be required by the year 2000. If development of the breeder is delayed ten years or significant online problems arise and if the price of uranium somehow stays at \$8 a pound, 1,750,000 tons of uranium will be needed by the end of the century. The profound implications of these forecasts are critical because the AEC states that we are now reasonably assured of only 204,000 tons of \$8 uranium, with ultimate figures put at an additional 390,000 tons. These AEC reserve figures would indicate that we will be forced to resort to using uranium in the \$15 to \$30 a pound range to meet the turn-of-the-century demand, and at that price level the economic feasibility of nuclear power generation will obviously be less than predicted and must undergo a critical reevaluation.

In light of these considerations it is abundantly clear that the coal industry and the electric power industry need each other now and will continue to need each other far into the future. Based upon this common bond, it is imperative that the coal and electric utility industries work together in order to meet the present and future concerns affecting our ability to achieve a reliable and adequate power supply.

One of the most critical issues relates to environment. The most troublesome aspect of the problem at the moment is the sulfur dioxide from coal-burning power plants. Compounding the already difficult technical problems has been the immediate over-reaction on the part of many who have urged, and in some instances required, the use of low-sulfur fuel without a reasonable attempt at rational solutions.

We presently possess abundant reserves of low-sulfur coal but it is unfortunately located in those areas least available for use by the majority of the nation's power plants. The U.S. Bureau of Mines states that more than 100 billion tons of bituminous coal with less than 0.7 percent sulfur are to be found in the United States, but only 36 percent of that total is found east of the Mississippi River, and nearly all of that in a very limited region near the junction of Virginia, West Virginia and Kentucky. This area produces roughly 86 percent of the low-sulfur coal mined in the United States. But besides being low in sulfur content, this coal has other characteristics which make it ideally suited to conversion to coke for the manufacture of steel and most of the reserves are owned by steel companies or coal producers who have committed their reserves to them under long-term contracts. Moreover, two-thirds of the coking coal consumed in this country is mined by steel companies and does not enter the commercial market. Further, this metallurgical coal generally lies in thin, deep

seams which are usually more difficult to mine.

The bulk of our low-sulfur coal—64 percent of it—lies west of the Mississippi, in States like North Dakota, Montana and Wyoming. The distance of these reserves from the major markets is so great that freight rates generally preclude their substitution for high-sulfur fuel, even assuming they could be used in existing boilers. But even if utilities would pay the freight, the problem of adequate mining facilities still exists because the western states account for only 4 percent of our present coal output. To supply the power industry from these fields would mean abandoning more than half the mining capacity east of the Mississippi. Such a decision would not only have devastating effects on the economy of Eastern mining regions, but would also require an investment of three or four billion dollars in new mines.

A rational solution to the nation's environmental needs, and at the same time, one which takes into consideration our present and future energy requirements, simply stated, is one which places the SO₂ controls on the stack and not the stoker. The techniques for removing sulfur dioxide from stack gases have been intensively researched and a number of processes are being tested in large-scale commercial plants. Some of the most promising test installations are being financed by the Air Pollution Control Office of the Environmental Protection Agency in cooperation with the electric utility industry. The manufacturers say they are certain the plants will work. Although the precise costs are not yet known, the manufacturers state that the operating costs will be between 4 and 8 cents per million Btu, or \$1 to \$2 per ton of coal. When these plants are proven reliable and their costs are known, the electric utilities will be able to meet the present conflicting demands for plentiful power and for clean air and just as important, the power companies can then make good on their promise to the public on both of these national objectives.

The coal industry achieved a commendable record in helping avert a potential fuel supply crisis late last year. Given the incentive of a free market price structure, coal production was able to respond to the law of supply and demand by meeting the utilities' critical fuel needs. The industry is making good use of its present facilities and is running at full capacity, allowing for wildcat strikes, railroad equipment shortages and extreme weather conditions.

The cost of developing new mine capacity raises the same money problems that confront other industries. The problem of risk is common to any extractive industry and is generally complicated by the difficulty in accumulating capital and higher interest rates for capacity expansion.

In this regard, a non-profit industry holds few charms for investors, and this concern becomes more important in view of the tremendous investment which will be necessary to enable the coal industry to meet future demands for energy.

To open a new underground mine now requires a capital investment of \$12 to \$14 per ton of annual capacity, and that does not include the cost of coal reserves. The cost spread is contingent upon several variables, the type of mine, the seam of coal, the amount of preparation or milling required to develop and attain product status, to name a few.

Before committing that much money investors want some promise of a return commensurate with the risks involved. At present that rate of return must compete with the high rates available on many other industry and government securities.

The utility industry has a vital role to play in this area through the use of long-term

contracts. Faced with present and future mining costs, nobody is going to open new coal mines on speculation, in the hope that somewhere, somehow, they can sell the coal for some price to somebody. Coal producers must have some assurance of a viable market before undertaking the required large capital investment.

The days of unreasonably cheap energy are gone forever. The cost of mining coal along with most fuels has risen after years of stability, and the factors which caused the increase will remain for the foreseeable future. Beyond these higher costs, the coal industry will require a reasonable profit in order to attract the capital necessary to support the expansion to meet the nation's critical energy requirements.

Higher costs for coal, however, should not impair coal's competitive position. The other fuels have their own problems, including one coal does not share—scarcity of proven domestic reserves.

Canada has an available supply of natural gas but restricts exports to those reserves which are in excess of its own long range market needs. As a result Canadian gas may constitute an important supplement to domestic supplies, as it does now, but will probably supply a relatively minor share of the total U.S. market. Furthermore, in view of the transportation costs involved, it is questionable whether Canadian imports could successfully compete in many of our major market areas, with the price of domestic gas if available. However, foreign gas supplies are being contracted for today primarily because additional new domestic supplies cannot be purchased at any price. But once the domestic wellhead price is freed from the unrealistically low levels set by federal regulation, thereby giving impetus to the exploration and development of our untapped potential gas reserves, the comparative cost of the various alternatives will again become a vital factor and the pressure to supplement reserves with imports will probably taper off.

Liquefied natural gas from Algeria and some from Venezuela is also being imported because of the gas shortage in the U.S. but primarily at this time for peak shaving purposes. The price of imported LNG is still considerably higher than that of domestic natural gas.

Through 1965 imports of foreign residual oil into the East Coast were limited to a reasonable percentage of demand which prevented an undue dependence by the electric power industry on foreign sources of supply. In 1966, however, the East Coast was thrown open to unlimited imports of foreign residual oil due in large measure to the mounting pressures to make the cheap, residual oil from the Middle East available. As a by-product with little world wide demand at the time, it was priced just under coal, the lowest cost alternative fuel in the U.S. market.

Ordinances were passed which encouraged the wholesale conversion to imported low sulfur residual oil on the East Coast without considering the long range availability of this supply source and the effect this action would have on demand and price. This unrealistic approach caused a massive shift away from coal in the Northeast and created a tremendous demand for low sulfur residual oil which has today proved to be in limited supply. As a result, coal handling facilities at generating plants in the East were scrapped, coal production had to be diverted to new markets, railroads serving this area atrophied and the urgent need to develop systems for the removal of SO₂ from stack emissions was forgotten. And today, when imported residual oil is in tight supply and its price appears destined to climb to unprecedented heights, vast domestic coal reserves simply cannot be utilized to alleviate the fuel shortage overnight. We are obliged, however, as a nation, to live for some time with the consequences

of this decision. And we are now paying the price: First, in higher prices; Second, in vulnerability of supply and; Thirdly, in delaying the evolution of the technology which would permit the utilization of abundant domestic supplies of fossil fuels in harmony with our environment.

Low sulfur fuels, residual oil as well as coal, are scarce and cannot meet the world's demand for energy. The U.S. is blessed with abundant reserves of fossil fuel, particularly coal, and primary reliance for our energy needs must be placed upon the utilization of these domestic sources with the development of adequate safeguards to protect the atmosphere from harmful SO₂ emissions.

The coal industry firmly supports the adoption of a realistic national energy policy which recognizes the critical need to utilize our abundant fossil fuel reserves without damage to the environment.

Such a policy would have obvious implications for the electric utility industry in meeting its commitment to provide the public with abundant and reliable electric power. It will not only help determine the kind and quantity of fuel available for today's conventional steam-electric generating plants, but, at the same time, it will provide viable solutions for the future.

A prudent national energy policy should include a decision to reevaluate the present government research program. While it is encouraging to note the nearly \$4 million increase in this year's Office of Coal Research budget, the current allocation of approximately \$21 million for coal research is but only about one-tenth of that accorded civilian nuclear research by the federal government. The vital role of coal in meeting the nation's energy requirements makes it essential that the government research program increase its allocation to coal and fossil fuels, both in its funding and planning. We are not asking that the nuclear R&D program be diminished; rather, we seek a more equitable commitment of the government's R&D priorities to all energy sources in order to ensure that the public will benefit from the maximum utilization of the nation's fuel supplies.

Coal holds great promise in providing alternatives to be employed in meeting future fuel demand. One of the most important is the manufacture of pipeline quality gas from coal. The significance of this program becomes more apparent in view of the Federal Power Commission's predictions that the nation is facing an immediate natural gas shortage. There are at least two processes in the government-sponsored pilot-plant stage to make pipeline-quality gas from coal. The industry-supported laboratory, Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., has a third process which also looks promising. Some of these processes have a byproduct of char, which can be used as fuel for electric power generation. And in the process of gasifying coal they also remove its sulfur content, thereby making available to the utilities a source of clean fuel.

Government research is also sponsoring pilot-plant tests to convert coal to a substitute for crude petroleum, which can then be refined by conventional methods. Again, there is a byproduct of char which can be used as fuel for generating electricity.

In addition to these programs, the government should invest funds to push research in exotic means of generation, such as magnetohydrodynamics, or fluid bed combustion. Another interesting method is combined-cycle power generation by gasifying coal and then using a combination of gas and steam turbines; this holds promise of simpler removal of sulfur compounds and reduced thermal emissions compared to today's conventional fossil fuel plants. Early laboratory work on these exotic methods shows promise, but to date no one has been willing to undertake the expensive pilot-plant stage.

This year's outlook for coal supplies is encouraging. The National Coal Association estimates that customers' requirements will total 604 million tons of bituminous coal in 1971, the largest market since 1947, and one of the greatest of all time. During this year it is estimated that coal production will reach 610 to 615 million tons, providing there are no major labor problems or other unforeseen delays. This will allow consumers to rebuild some of their stockpiles.

Electric utilities consumed about 325 million tons of coal last year and in 1971 they are expected to increase this by 5.5 percent, to 343 million tons. The coal industry can produce fuel in these quantities today and in the larger amounts required in the future. However, the industry's vast productive capacity cannot be turned off and on and the utilities must realize this in planning their own requirements. A national energy policy will help assure that coal will be available in an orderly manner to meet any long-term demands.

In meeting these future demands, the coal industry will require more than opening new mines. Except for mine-mouth plants, it will need some way to deliver the coal, and this will mean more railroad hopper cars. The hopper car shortage was critical last year, and obviously many railroads are in such deep financial trouble they cannot invest heavily in new rolling stock. A government policy to assure an adequate hopper car supply is urgently required.

The utilities and the coal industry must unite to meet the public's demand for an improved quality of life. The coal industry will strive to meet the utilities' requirements with an adequate and reliable supply of fuel. The utilities, on the other hand, must recognize that the days of coal's surplus production capacity, which they could always fall back on, no longer exist, and that there must be a definite commitment to coal to ensure the necessary confidence and capital investment if our most plentiful source of energy is to be fully utilized. The recognition of this fact by the individual utility companies is essential and the attitude that coal is all right for another company's generating plants cannot remain a part of utility management thinking. If we are to achieve a reliable and adequate energy supply, these realities must be accepted and dealt with at the early planning stages. In this way, these two industries can meet today's problems and at the same time prepare for tomorrow's challenges.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a most propitious time to honor those heroes who have sacrificed themselves for their country. At a time when we see dissident elements in our cities and colleges desecrate the American flag, ridicule the American dream, defile the Armed Forces of the United States and try to turn patriotism into an ugly word, I feel a burst of pride on this day to recapture the exhilarating sense of devotion and honor that comes from a love of country. This is especially true when I review in my mind the history of the American fighting man.

This is what this day is really all

about, the American fighting man. Not the hippies, the drop-outs, the drug users, and those "jolly" radicals and bombers who would not fight for their country even if it were under enemy attack, but who readily reap in the benefits this country hands them at the cost of the lives and limbs of those heroic young Americans who willingly assume the responsibility of defending the freedom of their country and the world.

The American soldier was first put to the test in early March of 1918. In this, what was to be America's first real entry into the arena of world conflict, our Allies wanted to know, our enemy wanted to know, indeed, millions of people throughout the entire world wanted to know, "How will the 'Yanks' do when they meet the enemy in their first battle?"

On that cold, grey, wet March morning in France, the world saw for the first time the courage and determination of American troops.

In a battlefront described as a "fiery furnace" the men of a battalion of the 168th Infantry of the Rainbow Division rose up out of their trenches, took the enemy after a bitter struggle and won the accolades of friend and foe alike.

And for 82 days thereafter these fine American youth fought the enemy with such valor the French Corp Commander cited the division thusly:

For its offensive ardor, the spirit of method, the discipline shown by all its officers and men, the inspiration animating them, prove that at first call, they can henceforth take a glorious place in the new line of battle.

From this first major test of her fighting men America was set on a course that was to see it assume the leadership role in the defense of the free world.

And the American "civilian soldier" was to be the instrument which defeated those who would deny freedom to the weak and enslave the world.

After this auspicious beginning on the Salient du Feys in 1918, there followed a succession of great and sometimes agonizing victories. The Marines halted the German drive on Paris at Belleau Wood near Chateau Thierry, again, in World War I. Then in World War II there were the courageous, outnumbered GI's in the Battle of the Bulge, the Marines at Tarawa and our Navy at the battles of the Coral Sea and Midway. Then in Korea there were those men who fought the memorable battles of Pork Chop Hill and Heartbreak Ridge—and I am proud to have served with those men. And now in Vietnam our current generation of fighting men who were given their baptism of fire at the Iron Triangle and the siege of Khe Sanh are showing the world that the American GI is still a courageous defender of freedom.

While we were not always victorious I recall with pride the return of the American fighting men from some battles lost—Bataan, Corregidor, Kasserine Pass, and Rapido River to name a few. They came back from humiliating defeats to destroy the enemy that had sworn to destroy America and the world.

From all of these tests of America's

strength and will, the Disabled Veterans of America has taken the shattered and wounded heroes that survived these and all our other battles and given them a helping hand in every form imaginable.

Their services run from hospital aid to the distribution of clothing in furniture to the compensation of wives, children, and parents of veterans who prematurely die of wounds they received in the service of their country.

I am especially proud of their current efforts to retrieve from North Vietnam those unfortunate prisoners of war who have paid a price for serving their country far and beyond the call of duty.

I especially want to commend the DAV unit in my own district which is now larger than it has ever been since World War II. Day after day they aid my office in helping to obtain for the disabled veteran the things he deserves for the sacrifices he made.

They have rendered unstinting service to my district and I am grateful to such men as Bernard L. Bonner, commander-adjutant, Kenneth Doyle, senior vice commander, Leonard Martin, junior vice commander, and Matthew Baldi, treasurer, men I have known for years.

I am certain these men are looking to the next 50 years with even greater enthusiasm than in the past in their efforts to restore New York's wounded veterans to productive happy civilian lives.

But no matter how much these men meld into the civilian world, the vast majority of them, and I know this is true of most veterans wounded or not, will reserve a place in their hearts for that period of time when they proudly wore the uniform of the United States, a place in their hearts where they will recall their buddies, alive and dead, who served beside them when their country needed them.

PRIME MINISTER OF ITALY VISITS CAPITOL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as you know, during their recent state visit, the President of the Council of Ministers of Italy, Mr. Colombo and Italian Foreign Minister, Mr. Moro, joined by Italian Ambassador Egidio Ortona as well as a number of other distinguished representatives of the Republic of Italy, honored us with their presence at the Capitol. It was indeed a privilege to have had you share in that occasion, reaffirming the deep bonds and affection between the American and Italian peoples. And, I wish, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD the sentiments expressed by Prime Minister Colombo as well as your own expression of the feeling which exists between our nations.

REMARKS OF HIS EXCELLENCY, THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF ITALY

It is with great pleasure that I am amongst you today, honorable Members of Congress, together with the Chairman of the House of

Representatives, Representative Carl Albert, who today so worthily occupies the place of Speaker, held for many years and with much prestige by the Representative John McCormack (who was recently awarded the decoration of "Cavaliere di Gran Croce" by the President of the Italian Republic). I extend to all of you the most cordial and warmest greeting on the part of the Italian Government.

Our visit to the U.S.A. has afforded us the means to verify once more the depth of the long-standing friendship between our two nations, which has been strengthened by the fruitful contribution you have made in participating in the political life of the country.

Your involvement in the political life, as eminent representatives of the Italo-American community, has increased in the last decades: today it is the most eloquent proof of the admirable success with which the Italian Americans have followed the rapid progress of the American nation. Looking back on the past, we note with great pleasure that in little over twenty years the number of Congressmen of Italian origin has increased from one to nineteen.

We are aware that, with utmost loyalty and deep pride as American citizens, you act in Congress for the good of the United States and that for this Country you express with dedication the best of yourselves. But we are also aware that, while you bear constantly in mind your duty as representatives of the American People, you have not forgotten the homeland of your forefathers, Italy, to which you give proof of sincere attachment and deep affection.

Thanks to the contributions of each one of you, over the years, initiatives of particular importance have been realized; among these I would like to mention the introduction of more liberal measures in the field of immigration, which has facilitated—among other things—the reunification of the families of our immigrants. This is a need which is deeply felt, at the present moment; in view of the changed economic and social conditions of the Italians, the pattern of emigration is also undergoing a change: it is no longer due to the dire pressure of economic necessities, but above all to the legitimate desire of many to be reunited with their loved ones who have definitely settled in this great and hospitable country. We are confident that this valuable humanitarian achievement will be completed by other legislative provisions which will provide a more adequate solution to the still pressing problem of re-uniting families.

Your commitment in strengthening the bonds between the two countries has also been focused on other objectives to which the name and prestige of the home country have been associated. Evidence of this lies in your generous endeavors to have Columbus Day made into a national holiday in the United States, a significant acknowledgment of the spiritual ties which for centuries have united our two countries.

We are grateful to you for all this and we thank you for the sincere and real contribution which you have and will continue to make in order to strengthen the friendship between the U.S.A. and Italy.

Our thoughts of gratitude at this moment are also turned to your parents and to the older Italian immigrants who through their humble and unobtrusive hard work, have been truly responsible for the present success of Italians in America.

With these sentiments of warmth and gratitude to all Italian Americans, I wish you, Hon. members of Congress, and to your families, every happiness and the best of success.

To the "Leaders" of the House, who have honored us with their presence at this meet-

ing, I wish to say that we regard the American Congress as the truest seat of freedom and democracy, as the most efficient instrument of progress and most prolific example of wise decision-making. To the Speaker, Mr. Albert, of whose laudable work as legislator we are well aware, and to his colleagues, we also extend our fervent greeting.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE CARL ALBERT, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Your Excellency, the Prime Minister; Your Excellency, the Foreign Minister; Your Excellency, the Ambassador of Italy; Your Excellency, the Ambassador of the United States; Your Excellencies, and my colleagues and friends:

It is a great honor for me to be present at the second coming of Columbus.

Mr. Prime Minister, your name is, of course, a household word in this country. It was here when this continent was discovered by one of your distant relatives nearly five centuries ago. It was another compatriot of yours of that same generation that gave this hemisphere its name. It was principally Italian navigators who opened up the two oceans and a new world to Spain and Britain and other European nations. It was your people who laid the foundations of civilization in this hemisphere; they have been participating citizens ever since. As witness today, that seventeen American Congressmen of Italian descent hold outstanding positions in the House of Representatives, and one, Senator Pastore, is probably the most eloquent member of the United States Senate. Italians in America have excelled in every walk of American life. The spirit of America would not be the same if it did not have in it a blend of the spirit of Italy. Here in this very Capitol, the mecca of American democracy, Italian influences are evident everywhere. It was Italian-born Constantino Brumidi who became the Michelangelo of the Capitol. The most famous art work in any public building in America was done by him here in the Capitol dome, which is directly above the room in which we are meeting now. Every President who walks out of the Capitol Building onto the steps of the East Front to be sworn into office by the Chief Justice, passes through bronze doors containing a picture of the first landing of Columbus. Thanks to Congressman Peter Rodino of New Jersey, Columbus Day is now one of the few American national holidays.

We welcome you not only as a great man and citizen of the world, but as a representative of a free and friendly nation whose ties to this country in culture, blood and politics are very strong. The United States of America has no better friend in the world than the Republic of Italy. We have common interests in human freedom and common beliefs in the dignity and importance of human beings. I have said that no country, not even Great Britain, has had a greater impact on this country than Italy. Yes, no country in all the world has had an impact so great on western civilization as the country from which you come. In no other country can one see outstanding physical representations of every generation since western civilization began, in such quantity as in your own. Western civilization was founded there. Italy is the cultural capital of the world, as it is the original capital of the modern civilized world. No other country has matched the quality of your artists. In sculpture, painting, and in song, there is only one Italy.

I have been in your beautiful country many times. I first went there in 1927 when I was a high school student. I was never more impressed. The beauty and majesty of the Italian Alps, your great galleries, operas

and theaters, your matchless cuisine, your friendly and loveable people, made an early impression upon me that has caused me to believe over the years that the spirit of Italy is the spirit of life itself. I am proud that I come from the county in Oklahoma that has more citizens of Italian origin than any other county in my State. I have known Italian-Americans all my life; I have known them in Italy since I was a boy. I can count any number of them among my finest and closest friends.

So, sir, it is a great privilege for me personally to be able to welcome one of Italy's most distinguished sons to the Capital of the United States. And now, will you stand with me as I propose a toast, first to the Prime Minister of Italy, and second to the President of the Republic of Italy?

AUTOMOBILE GRAVEYARDS—LET US MAKE A NATIONAL EYESORE A NATIONAL ASSET

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the junked automobile is the most obvious example of our nationwide solid waste disposal problem. In his environmental message last year the President noted that—

Few of America's eyesores are so unsightly as its millions of junk automobiles.

It has been estimated that if we placed all the abandoned and obsolete automobiles in the United States side by side we could put a "girdle around the earth." The number of rusty hulks in junkpiles and graveyards throughout the country is estimated between 15 and 20 million and represents \$1 billion in re-useable metals. This year 85 percent of the 9 million automobiles which will go out of service will be recycled into new metals, but the remaining 1,300,000 will simply be abandoned on neighborhood streets, deserted roads, or country hillsides.

The richest mineral source of the products discarded by our affluent society is interestingly enough scrap autos. Although discarded car hulks constitute only a small fraction of the waste disposal problem in terms of tonnage, they are higher in metal recycle value than other material. Recent studies by the Bureau of Mines on the conversion of old cars to metals suitable for recycling pointed to the fact that a representative automobile would yield 2,500 pounds of steel, 500 pounds of zinc, 20 pounds of lead, and 51 pounds of aluminum. The use of just 1 ton of scrap would eliminate the need for 1½ tons of iron ore, 1 ton of coke, and one-half ton of limestone.

There is growing recognition in the Congress and throughout the Nation that we need to recycle solid waste material back into the economy instead of permitting it to deface our landscape and pollute our environment. The Resource Recovery Act approved by the 91st Congress was an important step forward in providing the mechanism for

proper solid waste management, but we need to do more in this area.

I have cosponsored legislation which I believe will effectively deal with the abandoned automobile problem and change it from a national eyesore into a national asset by recycling these rusting, worn-out hulks back into the steel making process. The legislation is designed to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide tax incentives for the recycling of auto scrap.

Specifically, the bill would annually earmark 1 percent of the Federal auto excise tax to assist States in funding pickup and removal programs.

It is felt that this amount will enable us to collect the number of automobiles abandoned each year and begin to remove the 15 to 20 million strewn throughout our countryside. In order for scrap processors to increase efficiency and handle the added volume under these collection programs, the bill would allow rapid amortization tax benefits for the purchase of modern equipment and machinery for reducing old cars to useable scrap. As I have indicated an old, junked car is a valuable mineral resource if recycled. The reclamation of abandoned automobiles is a logical answer to cleaning up our landscape and at the same time conserving irreplaceable natural minerals.

IN COMMEMORATION OF GREEK
INDEPENDENCE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1453, Constantinople, the New Rome, fell into the hands of the Ottoman Turks, and more than 1,000 years of Byzantine history came to an end. As a result, Greece, and most of Eastern Europe, were placed in a servitude which lasted almost four centuries, and what was left of the Hellenic and Byzantine cultures was forced to be buried in the monasteries or to be passed from one generation to another by secret gatherings of worshippers and children seeking a knowledge of their historic past. In this way, Greece was able to preserve her traditions, and in doing so the desire for a liberated Greece was always present, for Greeks, from the beginnings of the ancient city-states, always recall the thought of Isocrates:

Remember no human condition is ever permanent. Then, you will not be overjoyed in good fortune, nor too sorrowful in misfortune.

The success of the American Revolution, and its "shot heard around the world," inspired, as it still does, the oppressed people of the world. And, then the French Revolution with its principles of liberty and equality again challenged the old order. Europe was swept with

these ideals, and Greece, too, was touched by the cries of freedom.

On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos, and his fellow churchmen, raised the sign of the cross, their banner of rebellion, and the Greek war of independence had begun. Great Britain, France, and czarist Russia all sympathized with this noble cause.

And, although the Ottoman Turks were ruthless in their massacre of Greeks, ever to the point of executing the ecumenical patriarch of the Orthodox Church, Greece was zealous in her desire to overthrow the yoke of bondage, so that by 1830 with the final defeat of the Ottoman Empire, she was guaranteed her independence.

Greece is no longer as powerful as she once was. Nevertheless, we are still indebted to her and her people. Let us, for a moment, recall the words of Odysseus: Ay, miserable me, now I am only a shadow Of the strong man that I once was! But if You look with care at this old stubble Then you may guess how straight and tall Once grew the corn.

Consequently, in the year in which all Greeks will be commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of their nation, I have introduced H.R. 5491 because it is fitting for the United States to pay tribute to this historic occasion with a commemorative postage stamp, for Greece, as the United States did in 1776, came out of chaos. However, unlike the United States, Greece was reborn, not born. And, while Odysseus and Achilles are dead, and while there is no longer a Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle, and while Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides are now of the past, the commemoration of Greek independence reminds us all of that gift, bequeathed to the world by Greece, and yet rediscovered by her only in 1821—freedom.

AFL-CIO CONSUMER STATEMENT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO executive council recently issued a statement on consumer protection which was an articulate, forceful presentation of the types of legislation required to give the consumer adequate protection in the marketplace. It reflects the firm and unswerving commitment of the labor movement to progressive consumer legislation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE
COUNCIL ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

Despite some forward steps by the 91st Congress, the advance of consumer protective legislation was disappointingly small in the past two years. The disappointment is especially keen, in view of the large number of proposals that were made and the several that came close to final passage, but narrowly missed.

Outstanding among the bills on which the Congress had nearly completed action were the consumer class action proposal and

the bill to create an independent Consumer Protection Agency in the Executive Branch of the federal government. We urge the 92nd Congress to act promptly on these measures.

Other major consumer legislation which will be ready for consideration by the 92nd Congress will reflect the work of special studies, authorized in previous years. The National Commission on Product Safety, which completed its report in June 1970, recommended a comprehensive Consumer Product Safety Act which would for the first time provide significant consumer protection against hazardous household appliances and equipment. Certain features of the proposed legislation may need improvement or strengthening, but we are glad to endorse its major objectives and commend the Commission on its work.

The principles of testing for safety before releasing unknown potentially hazardous new products upon the public should be firmly imbedded in the proposed new legislation. This requirement should also be introduced in existing consumer safety statutes where it does not now exist, such as the Hazardous Substances Act, the Flammable Fabrics Act, and the parts of the Food and Drug Act dealing with cosmetics and medical equipment. Recent evidence of possible consumer injuries from widely-sold new enzyme laundry detergents is a clear case in point.

The safety of food products is of mounting concern to the public, alarmed in recent months over mercury contamination of tuna packs. We call for greatly stepped up resources for the Food and Drug Administration and speedy enactment of the previously proposed Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act, including provision for continuous, full-time inspection of fish-processing plants.

The comprehensive Automobile Insurance and Compensation Study conducted by the Department of Transportation has been largely completed and Congress should be in a position to act concretely on the crisis in auto insurance. The outlines of constructive auto insurance reform have already been laid out in legislative proposals introduced by Senator Philip Hart toward the close of the last Congress. We are glad to endorse this approach, including the introduction of the "no-fault" principle into the basic system of compensation to accident victims, the encouragement of group coverage and the provisions designed to reduce the costs of auto repair.

The National Commission on Consumer Finance, currently engaged in a study of consumer credit practices under the terms of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, will not report until July 1972. Pending completion of this work, Congress and the administrative agencies can and should take action on immediate, pressing issues. In particular, we commend the Federal Trade Commission for its proposed Trade Regulation Rules which would provide a "cooling off" period in door-to-door sales and, even more important, preserve a buyer's rights and defenses when a retailer transfers a consumer credit contract to a finance company or other party.

Legislative or administrative action should also be taken to remedy consumer complaints of faulty billing practices and computation of finance charges on revolving credit accounts. Excessive charges for credit life, accident and health insurance, sold by lenders in connection with consumer loans, should be eliminated by legislation directing the Federal Reserve Board to establish ceilings on such charges.

The proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code, intended by its sponsors for adoption into the laws of every state, will again be under widespread consideration in 1971, when most state legislatures are scheduled to meet. We again caution state bodies as to inade-

quacies in the Code, especially the excessive finance charges permitted to creditors and the failure to make significant improvements in wage garnishment provisions, beyond those already established in federal law.

Sales and promotional gimmickry continue to frustrate the consumer's need for reliable and unbiased product information on the product he buys.

To enable the consumer to make easy price comparisons on packaged products, we favor amending the Truth in Packaging Act to require disclosure of prices in terms of price per unit of quantity.

Present government consumer information services should be expanded and consumer product-testing results, compiled by federal agencies, should be made fully available to the public in readily understandable form. Additional facilities for impartial testing of consumer products should be developed and the groundwork laid for instituting a system of labeling on performance characteristics of consumer products.

Immediate progress toward more informative labeling can be made by enacting legislative proposals to require label information on product durability. Labeling of expiration dates for food and other perishable products is of particular priority. Broader requirements for disclosure of food ingredients and nutritive values are also needed.

Government product grading programs should be improved and made compulsory at the retail level at least for basic foods.

The public continues to be harassed and cheated by meaningless and ineffective guarantees and warranties issued by manufacturers on the reliability and performance of their products. We favor legislation that will induce manufacturers to stand—not hide—behind their products.

Finally, we support stronger and broader powers for the Federal Trade Commission to deal with consumer deception and fraud. Increased penalties expanded jurisdiction over commerce, power to issue temporary injunctions and binding regulations, plus authority to obtain redress for injured consumers are essential ingredients. If these reforms can be enacted, along with a strong consumer class action bill enabling consumers to sue as a group when they have been cheated in sales transactions, real progress can be made in reducing the victimization and gouges that today are too often the experience of the buying public.

MULTIYEAR CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with an article by Capt. Donald A. Patrick, ASCE, who recently has been appointed vice president of Pacific Architects & Engineers International, and will oversee Far East operations from the firm's Tokyo office. I feel this subject should receive more consideration and I submit the article for reprinting in the RECORD:

MULTIYEAR CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

A multi-year contract makes the total scope of a project a condition of the contract even though only increments of this total scope are placed in the contract as funds are needed. Thus, both parties assume a risk that future funds will become avail-

able as agreed to in the contract, in the belief that economies resulting from the larger scope will more than offset the probability of paying termination charges if the full contract scope is not carried out.

The Armed Services Procurement Regulations (ASPR) (1-322.1) indicate that the advantages of multi-year procurement include such things as lower cost, more standardization, reduced contract administration, improved continuity, and greater competition. Basically, the features of multi-year contracts are as follows:

(1) The procurement covers two to five years of funding increment according to ASPR. A similar construction period is probably all that is reasonable in the non-federal market as well. Funds are added annually or at other intervals to the contract.

(2) If funding for future increments is relatively uncertain, or if, as in the federal case, the Congress normally requires it, each funding increment may be structured to provide a complete and usable product.

(3) Funds are obligated as each funding increment is added.

(4) The contract form can be any of the normal types: formally advertised, fixed price, unit price negotiated, etc.

(5) Award may be based on the total package price or the first-year price, although only the initial increment of funds is obligated.

(6) The contractor is paid termination costs if the contract term is shortened.

(7) The contracts may include price escalation provisions.

(8) The contract is not an option contract unless specific option features are included. Option, in this case, means the contractor may select among materials, designs, or methods as permitted by the specifications. A contract giving the client an option to add work at a later date lacks many of the multi-year contract advantages. First, it is a much more uncertain situation usually causing the contractor to bid to get the work on the first increment, and then charge as much as the traffic will bear (rather than incremental cost basis) for the follow-on. Second, the contractor certainly is not going to develop special equipment, training programs, casting yards, etc., for uncertain future programs.

SOME CASES IN POINT

The Department of Defense has found considerable advantage, both to itself and to industry, by contracting for procurement in a two- to five-year time frame, using the multi-year technique. Specifically, aircraft ships and all manner of smaller hardware have been contracted on a multi-year basis. Similarly, the Congress recently approved multi-year contracting for certain operations and maintenance services, especially where mobilization and demobilization costs are relatively high. And so two questions arise: (1) should multi-year procurement be used for construction, and (2) if so, what are the decision rules for selecting multi-year procurement over other types?

Before going into the details of multi-year contracting for construction and what it entails, a review of some typical construction situations will illustrate some opportunities for improvement. The following are based on actual construction projects:

(1) Facilities not needed all at once—For example, housing and dining facilities for 1,000 students were needed to accommodate a build-up in increments of 250 students. Funding was in four successive increments with four successive contracts. Three different contractors were employed on the first three increments, followed by the first contractor being awarded the fourth increment. All of these contracts were formally advertised, fixed-price, competitively bid.

(2) Facilities can't be built all at once—Replacement projects, say in a facilities complex, may require demolishing facilities and replacing with other facilities while the overall facility remains in operation; or a building may require considerable time to erect followed by equipment installation or outfitting of some kind. The tendency in these cases is to award individual contracts, even though the full scope is known.

(3) Sequential projects cannot be awarded individually within available funds—The tendency is to wait until later increments make the project big enough to attract suitable bids. For example, housing in several successive funding increments could not be awarded within available funds when advertised successively. The projects were awarded within available funds when packaged in one increment with an option (which was exercised) to add an increment in a later program. This procedure was not a true multi-year contract in that the option rested with the client as to whether the final increment would be added.

(4) Funds not available all at once—Government agencies and other clients all have budget restraints and desire to make funds go as far as possible in any budget period. Thus, if parts of the project can be deferred for any reason, they will be budgeted incrementally. The tendency is to award individual contracts as funds become available. Projects funded by bond issues and borrowed money may show substantial savings if funds are applied only as needed incrementally.

(5) Plans changed without full knowledge—when projects are presented individually, various reviewers tend to treat them as individual projects for deleting or reducing the scope. Such action may be inconsistent with a master plan, and require redesign in the midst of plan execution.

From these typical situations, opportunities can be seen for the construction industry working with the client to stabilize the situation considerably and achieve substantial economies by longer term, more comprehensive contracts. Thus the question, "Should multi-year procurement be used for construction?", is answered "Yes."

NEED FOR ECONOMY

For many owners a reduction in costs for construction projects will result in the same or even increased budgets for construction. Level budgets will go further towards reducing construction backlogs, and economically marginal projects will become cost effective.

Specifically, the military construction programs have been too small in terms of support to new mission requirements as well as modernization of existing facilities. Serious shortages occur in such critical areas as personnel facilities, naval shipyard modernization, industrial facilities, hospitals and pollution abatement.

Congressman Robert L. F. Sikes, chairman of the subcommittee on military construction, House Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Congress, asked a poignant question concerning military construction appropriations: "Are we planning right and building enough?" His answer was "no" to both parts of the question. He indicated a need for sound planning supported by proper maintenance as a joint responsibility of the Congress and the Department of Defense.

In addition, programming and cost estimating for military construction projects have received considerable attention. With combined annual military construction programs of the Army, Navy and Air Force in the \$1 billion cost range, programming and estimating assume major importance. In 1968, for example, the under secretary of the

Footnotes at end of article.

Navy initiated a new emphasis on multi-year construction programming. He stated that "the formulation and review tasks associated with the current budget years have tended to distract us from the long range programs of which the budget year programs is an increment. It also seems that the strength of our program is degraded in Congressional presentations which do not illustrate adequately the relationships of the annual increment to our important long range programs." Similarly, the Congress, through its hearings and committee reports, has spurred the Department of Defense to improve programming and cost estimating.

One contribution to reducing costs and also solving these programming and estimating problems would be to enlist more of the management and ingenuity of the private construction industry which does most DOD construction. In this regard, multi-year contracting could make a definite contribution.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY WOULD BENEFIT

Long term construction contracts often are not awarded because of the uncertainties in the industry. In addition, many contractors, particularly smaller ones, are geared for single task projects and do not have the management staffs for longer term projects. On the other hand, many large projects are awarded, such as dams, industrial facilities and housing projects, which do require the long range viewpoint.

The construction industry traditionally has been fractionated in such a manner that modern management techniques, as well as long-term development and research, have been inhibited. In 1967 there were 800,000 contractors in the U.S. doing an \$80 billion annual business, yet a listing of university research on construction would fit on a single typewritten page.³ And in 1969, only three firms had more than \$1 billion of contracts.⁴

Longer term contracts on a multi-year basis would greatly tend to stabilize the income of the contractor. Thus, the contractor could expand his permanent staff on management and labor in order to reap additional profits. Pooling of resources through joint ventures would be encouraged. Sophisticated managerial techniques, research and development could be used to obtain economies.

Of course, in such an industry as construction, with its long traditions, unique features, and competition-tested makeup, major changes do not come easily. Multi-year contracting, nevertheless, can provide an element of stability which will encourage the better managed firms.

DECISION GUIDELINES

The decision framework which would lead to selection or rejection of a multi-year construction contract should be identified. A number of considerations should be examined in detail, both separately and in combination. A list of questions has been derived which should aid in the decision. Other questions may be applicable to a specific project; however, answers to these questions, especially quantitative answers, may reveal opportunities for significant cost savings and other improvements.

(1) Planning and Design.

a. Master plan—Is a master plan firm enough to look two to five years ahead?

b. Systems—Is a larger project suitable for systems applications, such as modular design, integrated structural and mechanical systems, or computer uses?

c. Stability of development—Is the end product stable in development, such as paying, or are breakthroughs expected during the multi-year period, such as factory fabrication of sub-assemblies? Note that a multi-year approach may encourage such breakthroughs.

d. Design status—Will design for the entire project be complete by the time the first

increment is awarded? Should design be included in the construction contract as a turnkey project?

e. Will financing costs be stabilized and reduced through substitution of agreed contract costs for estimates, and use of incremental funding having a lower present value than a single funding amount?

(2) Construction Features.

a. Remoteness of site—Is the construction site so remote that extensive contractor facilities will be required?

b. Continuity of performance—Can the contractor, knowing the full future scope and the funding schedule, provide for continuous performance, leveling our seasonal peaks and arranging for resources scheduling?

c. Specialized developments—Are more efficient equipment, casting yards, new techniques and specialized facilities likely to be developed for a contract with a broader base than a single increment?

d. Similarity of construction type—Are similar or related construction features involved, such as pile driving, precast concrete sections, or compatibility of electrical gear?

e. Repetitiveness—Does the project under consideration have repetitive end products, such as housing, increments of aircraft parking aprons, or highway work? Will standardization be enhanced?

(3) Construction Execution.

a. Mobilization costs—Are these, as well as demobilization costs, a substantial part of the total cost, and would they be repeated in successive contracts?

b. Quality control procedures, pre-production runs and pilot testing—Would they be repeated in successive contracts?

c. Level of effort—Is a level of effort approach, rather than peaks and valleys, likely to have benefits? Will the work force and other resources be stabilized?

d. Learning curves—Are personnel apt to improve with a more extensive contract period, and are they likely to stay with the job until the end?

e. Construction sequencing—Is the sequencing such that activities such as pile driving or mechanical installations would be completed in the first increment in proper time phase with the follow-on increments?

f. Materials buys—Would single purchases with phased delivery schedules be less costly?

g. Equipment usage—Will schedules be more economical and over longer depreciation periods?

h. Quality—Will it be improved under a single contract?

(4) Contract Administration.

a. Project scope—Will a larger scope interest more contractors, plus enhancing competition resulting in lower total cost?

b. Work phasing—Will phasing with owner operations and among the several items under the single contract be simplified? Will a single source of responsibility aid in fitting all items into an integrated whole?

c. Other fund sources—Is it reasonable to include other funds for related work for a larger single contract, such as operations and maintenance funds for outfitting, or procurement funds for installed equipment in later years?

d. Future increments—Are the out-year items in an approved plan or do they otherwise have an approval for follow-on budgets? Will fund flow synchronize with field needs?

e. Periodic revalidation—Does the character of the work lend itself to revalidation as time progresses, in comparison to paying the termination costs of the multi-year contract and starting a new contract?

f. Contract administration costs—Will a single contract covering several increments reduce contract administration costs both for the owner and the contractor? Are multi-year sub-contracts desirable?

(5) Other.

a. Area-wide considerations—Can appropriate items be grouped within a logical geographic area, such as phased construction of housing throughout a metropolitan complex?

b. Construction industry—What specific industry factors, such as small business set-asides, would affect multi-year contracting?

c. Contractor capabilities—Are these suitable for longer term, more extensive projects, or are potential contractors all of small scale?

d. Politics—Are politics, domestic or foreign, amenable to longer term commitments?

e. Termination costs—Are the termination costs, even though presumably stepped down year by year, compatible with the savings anticipated? Note that in many cases the first-year cost plus the termination cost would not exceed the cost under a single increment contract and in the second and subsequent years savings would accrue.

f. Risk and uncertainty—Can the decision be reduced to a risk situation with probabilities assigned to the various possible outcomes? Or is it an uncertainty situation with inadequate probability information, but still subject to rational decision?

ACTIONS NOW

Sufficient reasons are available to proceed with multi-year construction contracts more extensively in appropriate cases. The decision considerations listed previously should be applied to each potential multi-year contracting situation. These considerations should be quantified as much as possible, particularly in cost areas. However, the real test of multi-year contracting is in the market. The end result expected is greater use of construction industry management talent and resources to the mutual benefit of owners and constructors.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Sikes, Robert L. F., "Military Construction Appropriations," Defense Management Journal, Vol. V, Issue No. 4, 1969.

² Under Secretary of the Navy, Memorandum for the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, subject: Military Construction—Multi-Year Programming, 30 Jan. 1968.

³ "ASCE Forms Construction Research Council," Civil Engineering, August 1968, p. 90.

⁴ "ENR's Top 400 Contractors," Engineering News-Record, April 9, 1970, p. 73.

DAV DAY IN CONGRESS—A TRIBUTE TO QUIET COURAGE

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of a democratic society to its disabled veterans was set forth more than 2,000 years ago by the Greek ruler Pericles, in a funeral oration in honor of Athenian soldiers.

Pericles stated that when a democracy accepts men to fight in its defense, it incurs a duty to provide for those men and their families should they be injured or killed. This duty arises from the risks of armed service to the relatively few and the considerable benefits resultant thereupon to all.

The gap between democratic ideals and democratic practice is, of course, always

with us, but of this Nation's continuing fulfillment of its duty to its disabled veterans, there is much to be proud.

Our present as well as our hope for continued progress in this regard is in large part due to the efforts of disabled veterans themselves. Their strength and persistent courage in 50 years of organized effort to make the American governmental system aware and responsive to its obligations to disabled American veterans has made such a contribution to the functioning of that system as to rank only with their own wartime sacrifices.

When the Disabled American Veterans initially organized in 1920, there was a wide gap between our intent and our ability to meet a democratic society's obligations to its disabled veterans. A summary of the historical circumstances is included in the Disabled American Veterans 50th anniversary report:

Of the approximately four million men who returned to civilian life after World War I, about 300,000 were wounded, disabled, handicapped or ill. This large number of disabled men caught the country by surprise. The government was not prepared to cope with their problems.

Most of these men were in desperate need of immediate help in the form of medical care, vocational training and compensation.

Government bureaus were hastily set up and existing ones tried to handle some of the problems. What resulted was utter chaos. There were many different bureaus, all working at cross purposes. The bewildered disabled veterans were in the midst of it—going from one bureau to another without getting any real or beneficial help.

Medical treatment was deplorable. In the veterans' hospitals disabled and sick men were sleeping on the floor. There was not enough doctors and nurses to care for them properly.

The entire compensation program had bogged down. Many of the men who were entitled to compensation were getting nothing at all and those who were, received unequal and inadequate ratings.

A plan was evolved by the government to institute vocational training courses for disabled veterans in an attempt to give each man a trade or profession to compensate for his handicap. These were poorly organized and run.

Many disabled veterans enrolled in these courses, but the need for self-help and recognition of their problems was all too apparent. They formed clubs—mostly for fraternal reasons and to be in a position to help each other.

The beginning of the organization was unpretentious. From the ranks of those disabled veterans in the various clubs across the country came the men who conceived and brought into being the Disabled American Veterans.

In 50 years of service, the DAV has done much to close the gap. Its early objectives remain the same today:

To advance the interest and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured disabled veterans, their widows and dependents . . . to cooperate with all federal and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the conditions, health and interest of wounded, injured or disabled veterans.

The number of disabled veterans assisted and the amounts of compensation recovered for them bear impressive testimony to the Disabled American Veterans efforts. In my own State of Michigan,

there are 131 chapters of the Disabled American Veterans with a membership of nearly 22,000. In 1970, they handled 11,711 cases resulting in recovery for disabled veterans and their dependents annual and retroactive benefits totalling \$14,014,454.

A breakdown of these figures further demonstrates the scope of service the Michigan chapters provide Michigan veterans.

MICHIGAN: RECOVERY OF COMPENSATION IN 1970 BY DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

1. Service Connected Disabilities: 629. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$1,199,409.
2. Compensation Increases: 2,044. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$2,532,218.
3. Compensation Maintained: 1,701. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$4,664,448.
4. Pension Maintained: 496. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$604,800.
5. Non-Service Pension Claim: 620. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$886,396.
6. Education Benefits: 1,830. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$1,508,192.
7. Misc.: 51. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$69,759.
8. Death Compensation: 305. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$467,063.
9. Death Pensions: 2,354. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$1,399,957.
10. Insurance: 79. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$424,268.
11. Burial Allowance: 981. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$249,456.
12. Pension Increases: 659. Annual and Retroactive Benefits, \$408,483.

These efforts multiplied by similar efforts in 49 other States and the District of Columbia resulted in recovery of nearly \$200,000,000 in compensation in 1970 alone. The lives thus affected, directly and indirectly, stand in tribute to the quiet courage that made them possible.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is much to be learned about how our democratic system works from the example of the Disabled American Veterans.

After having served their country in World War I, many disabled veterans returned home to confront treatment which often was incredibly—if unintentionally—cruel and unjust. They responded. Not with self-pity nor anger but with action—in the best democratic sense. In the ensuing 50 years, Disabled American Veterans has made the American people aware of their responsibility and provided invaluable, continuing service to disabled veterans—and their country—in making our veterans compensation system work.

It is a privilege to join with my colleagues in recognizing the Disabled American Veterans on their 50th anniversary.

THE CALLEY TRIAL—MEDIA POLLUTION OF JUSTICE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the persecution of Lieutenant Calley, under the pretext of a trial, continues. Not only is Lieutenant Calley one Army officer

who has fearlessly performed the duties in combat for which he was trained but also one officer who has had the courage to face his antagonists without cringing or denying his performance. Not only is Lieutenant Calley being tried by court-martial in Georgia, but almost daily in every communications media in our land, to the humiliation and disgust of the American people. It becomes increasingly more obvious from the biased and one-sided reporting of the trial of Lieutenant Calley that there is a definite movement aided by the news media to have Lieutenant Calley tried by public opinion on the charges in order to discredit the military in the eyes of young draft-age men.

The March 5 issue of Life magazine continues the prejudicial onslaught upon this American officer. On page 24 of this Life magazine the reader sees a reproduction of a photograph which depicts a group of dead men, women, and children lying in a road. The inference is that this picture shows people killed by Lieutenant Calley or under his command, although the reader has no way of knowing when the picture was taken, whether the people are Chinese, Vietnamese, Koreans, or other—or even where it was taken.

From past experiences, the American people should have learned to question the authenticity and accuracy of photographs, especially photographs from slick-paper magazines like Life.

The December 6, 1968, edition of Life, at page 35, carried a photograph of uniformed, helmeted people—supposedly police officers—involved in an altercation with uniformed people in Chicago at the National Democratic Convention. Almost a year later, the October 17, 1969, Life magazine, pages 70 and 71, carried a picture bearing the caption, "Club swinging police move in on students and faculty members who protested a Pentagon-backed institute operating at Princeton University."

Ironically, the photograph of the so-called Princeton riot in 1969 is the same photograph that had appeared in Life magazine in 1968 as a pictorial report of the National Democratic Convention. It is doubtful that even the Life magazine people know just what the picture does show and where it was taken. Further investigation might very well prove that the same picture of the police was used during the Selma March.

Since the Life photographs of the police are obviously unreliable, one must be suspect of the authenticity of the photographs used to prejudice the Calley case.

We hear considerable talk these days about our environment and its pollution. Perhaps some people will understand the need for ethics in news reporting to protect the people from mental pollution by staged photographs and biased reporting.

As for Lieutenant Calley, the American people are aware that he is one of the very few military officers who can show psychiatric evidence of his sanity. I question how many of the garrison of-

ficers and national leaders who have instigated this charade and permit it to continue could stand similar examinations.

Why should American soldiers such as Sergeant Mitchell, Lieutenant Calley, and others continue to fight for a country which sends them into battle and then submits them to exhibition and ridicule for doing their duty?

The whole My Lai incident is being exploited to portray the American soldier as if a sadistic murderer who enjoys killing innocent people so as to discredit and weaken the Army. Likewise by sensitivity training it so psychologically conditions the minds of impressionable young men that they will do all possible to avoid serving in the Armed Forces; or if they serve, they will be ineffective combat soldiers for fear of becoming criminals rather than heroes.

The American people can be thankful that, in spite of the many handicaps under which our fighting men must serve, there still exists the spark of patriotism, love of country, and sense of duty and honor in the makeup of the majority of American soldiers which cause them to come to the defense of their fatherland.

The time is well nigh when a concerted effort must be made by responsible military officers, members of veteran's organizations, and other Americans toward giving full support to our Armed Forces and reversing the trend toward permissive breakdown in discipline which results in an inept and ineffective force.

Two Americans who have undertaken a role in coming to the aid of distressed men such as Sergeant Mitchell, Lieutenant Calley, and Captain Medina are Walter James Dilbeck, Jr., and Charles T. Kandel.

Dilbeck, presently residing in Evansville, Ind., is the holder of the DSC for valor, three Bronze Stars, and three Purple Hearts. Kandel, who resides in Las Vegas, Nev., is a combat veteran of World War I and World War II.

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, U.S. Army, retired, Chief of Intelligence for Gen. Douglas MacArthur from 1941-51 and author of numerous books and articles, became interested in the efforts of Dilbeck and Kandel and has written in his Foreign Intelligence Digest a series of three enlightening articles about the endeavors of Dilbeck and Kandel and of the meaning of the My Lai incident.

I insert the three articles by General Willoughby at this point and call special attention to his conclusions and recommendations:

EFFECTIVE TEAM IN DEFENSE OF VIETNAM GI'S ACCUSED OF MURDER IN WAR

The Hon. Roger H. Zion, M.C. statement: "Profile of a Companion" is the first of a planned series of articles analyzing the so-called My Lai "massacre"—a totally unwarranted attack on the American Army with serious moral and social implications that have undermined the prestige of American arms. The entire journalistic approach to this incident is crypto-communist. Its calculated effect was to whitewash the bonafide atrocities perpetrated by the Russians

and their Communist stooges, as a pattern in all their wars.

Evansville Marine Thomas R. Bold was under orders to "eliminate Viet Cong" in Son Thang IV where he and four other Leathernecks are under investigation in the "slaying" of 16 Vietnamese civilians.

"Virtually all of the alleged victims were either related to members of the Viet Cong or working directly with them. The village in which the incidents occurred is considered a hostile hamlet and is located in a free fire zone, i.e., shoot on sight.

"Testimony from many of the young men in the unit revealed that these civilians were supporting the enemy, sometimes to the point of using small children to lead our boys into ambush. Many of the women set booby traps and alerted the Cong when our Marines arrived."

"These young men have been caught in the middle of a dispute between the Marine field commanders whose responsibility is eliminating Viet Cong and the politically motivated military here in Washington who are concerned with world opinion," he said.

At this point, Walter Dilbeck stepped into the picture. Evansville is his home town. His commercial Headquarters is at the Ramada Inn—Suite 821. He undertook to engage a first-class local firm of attorneys: "Trockman, Lloyd, Flynn & Swain," and flew to Viet-Nam.

Pfc. Boyd was acquitted of the trial charges. Other Marines in the same patrol were not so fortunate.

MY LAI AND A KOREAN ROADSIDE DITCH

BY WAY OF AN INTRODUCTION

In view of the editorial trend of the "Foreign Intelligence Digest", since 1938, it was inevitable that we should enter the national controversy over an alleged "massacre" in Viet Nam (1968). I go on record that I do not see eye to eye with "Harper's" of the hydrocephalic crew that awarded the author a Pulitzer Prize. As a combat veteran in every American war (or police action?) from 1916 to 1951, I am on the side of the American soldier, our teenage draftees, carelessly dumped into assorted rats-nests of a largely anti-American and hostile world. I am for the bedraggled GI of Bill Mauldin and Ernie Pyle! I was one of them, in my days, and I look at the muckraking Ridenhour and Hersh with contempt and loathing.

Fortunately, there are more appetizing citizens to turn to for a breath of fresh air. There is something stirring in the ranks of old soldiers: Walter J. Dilbeck, D.S.C., Evansville, Indiana, who flew his attorneys to Saigon to defend a home-town boy, Pvt. Boyd, Co. B, Seventh U.S. Marines; and Charles Kandel, of the "Sands", Las Vegas, Nevada, who sponsored Captain E. L. Medina, a key figure in the My Lai alleged "massacre".

I assisted Dilbeck and Kandel in developing two preliminary articles "Profile of a Companion" and "Effective Team in Defense of Viet Nam GI's". My editorial position is reiterative: "... the My Lai Operation, largely on a company and platoon level, has been blown up beyond reasonable proportion by a collection of careless journalists, photographers, and radio-liberal publications ranging from "Harper's" to "Time" and "Life." Their handling of the material represents a shabby story initially related by malicious gossip mongers, endless delays and thus endless inaccuracies and errors, in a conspiratorial web spun by disgruntled soldiers who were not present at the action and did not belong to the unit involved.

In this connection, a group of conservative publications have understood the socio-political implications of the Viet Nam trials and have attempted to inject a note of sanity into proceedings, vis: "Herald of Free-

dom," P. O. Box 3, Zarephath, New Jersey; "American Opinion," Belmont, Massachusetts; "The Manion Forum," St. Joseph Bank Building, South Bend, Indiana; "Tactics," Arlington, Virginia; "National Economic Council," 230 Park Avenue, New York, New York; and "Boniface Press," 8207 Flower Avenue, Tacoma Park, Maryland. A dollar spent in support of these publications will produce more effective intelligence on domestic communist infiltration than a thousand dollar bill, flung around by tax-exempt "Foundations" or D. of D. "think-tanks", plagiarizing each other and the files of the War College.

THE SECRETARY OF WAR: NOVEMBER 26, 1969

Here follows extracts from a personal report of the Secretary of the Army, the Hon. Stanley A. Resor, who is a holdover from the Johnson administration, to a Congressional Committee:

"Let me review the known facts concerning the tragic events which took place at My Lai hamlet, Song My village, Quang Ngai Province.

"My Lai is located in an area which is now and has been for several years the home of the 48th Local Force Battalion, considered one of the best Viet Cong units in the country. U.S. Forces had conducted prior operations in this vicinity (i.e. enemy territory) and had suffered casualties, principally from mines and boobytraps. In March 1968, the 11th Infantry Brigade, a unit of the American Division, made plans to conduct an operation in this area.

"On the morning of March 16th, following a three-minute artillery preparation on its landing zone, Company C, commanded by Capt. Medina and consisting of approximately 105 infantrymen, made a helicopter assault immediately west of My Lai. Company A simultaneously occupied a blocking position to the north, and Company B made a helicopter assault into an uninhabited area to the south. The 1st Platoon, commanded by Lt. Calley, led the advance and physically occupied the cluster of habitations that constituted the hamlet. Most of the buildings were then burned or otherwise destroyed. The operation terminated at approximately 6:00 p.m. on that day, and our troops were withdrawn.

"The Task Force commander's after action report for the entire operation indicated enemy losses as 128 killed; it made no mention of civilian casualties. Friendly losses were given as 2 killed and 11 wounded.

"The Brigade Commander interviewed the Task Force Commander, S-3, and the commanders of the two companies which had been in the immediate area. It was concluded that approximately 20 noncombatants had been inadvertently killed by "preparatory fires" and "in crossfires between friendly and enemy forces", and that the reports of unnecessary killing civilians were merely another instance of a common Viet Cong propaganda technique and were groundless—a view shared by the (local) Vietnamese District Chief. The matter was not brought to the attention of Saigon headquarters or the Department of the Army.

"Over one year later, in early April 1969, the Department of Army received identical letters, dated 29 March 1969 and originally addressed to Secretary Laird and five members of Congress, from a Mr. Ronald Ridenhour, a former soldier who "had heard rumors about a supposed atrocity from fellow soldiers", alleged that Task Force had been assigned "the mission of destroying My Lai and all its inhabitants". He went on to describe in considerable detail several instances of alleged murder which "he believed" had occurred there.

"Upon receipt of these letters, the Chief of Staff on April 23, 1969, directed the Inspector

General to conduct a full-scale investigation of all allegations made by Mr. Ridenhour. This investigation took place both here in the United States and in Viet Nam.

"On August 4, 1969 the investigation was transferred to the Provost Marshal General. Since that date, criminal investigators have located and interrogated over 75 witnesses, 28 of whom are still on active military duty. They have also visited the site of the incident and interviewed local Vietnamese officials and former inhabitants (all Viet Cong) of the hamlet who witnessed the alleged killings.

"An Army combat photographer present at My Lai took a number of (colour) photographs, which he did not turn over to Army officials.

"I have reviewed what we know of the incident at My Lai with a number of officers who have served in Vietnam. It is their judgment—that what apparently occurred at My Lai is wholly unrepresentative of the manner in which our forces conduct military operations in Vietnam. Our men in Vietnam operate under detailed directives from higher headquarters which prohibit in unambiguous terms the killing of civilian noncombatants under circumstances such as those at My Lai. During the last few years hundreds of thousands of American soldiers have participated in similar operations in Vietnam. I am convinced that their overall record is one of decency, consideration and restraint towards the unfortunate civilians who find themselves in a zone of military operations. Against this record, the events at My Lai are difficult to understand. . . ."

We dislike the apologetic nuance of the Secretary's last paragraph. The investigation and report of the local Vietnamese civil authorities is largely ignored; instead, reports by an outsider (Ronald Ridenhour) who was not physically present—i.e. hearsay evidence, jurisdictionally unacceptable (!) set the pace for publicity.

This report contains professional items, that may escape the average non-military reader—but will be important to luckless Lt. Calley and Capt. Medina.

There is the admission of "preparatory fire" and "cross fire" between friendly and enemy forces; the admission that, for months, My Lai and vicinity was "the home of a Viet Cong battalion" and "casualties from mines and booby traps." I trust that the defense will raise technically pertinent questions viz:

- I. Who made the count of casualties?
- II. Percentage of wounds ascribed to preparatory fires, artillery or copter gunnery.
- III. Percentages of rifle wounds ascribed to Calley's Platoon?
- IV. Combat veterans of all wars know what "preparatory softening-up fires" mean. The bleeding hearts do not know—and could not care less.
- V. Army photographers, malcontents and literary scavengers select biased material—for the highest bidder.
- VI. A shabby story—published by shabby people.

EYE-WITNESS AND FRONT-LINE COMMENTS

The testimony of one of the soldiers, normally acceptable as an eye-witness participant, Sgt. Charles West is very significant: ". . . In moving on My Lai, 'C' Co. was badly blooded, with soldiers killed and wounded by snipers and booby traps. The company was pinned down by enemy fire just outside the village and took shelter in a rice paddy. Then it attacked; it was met by sniper fire. When the company entered the village, they found many dead as a result of artillery shelling and bombing from the air. The only firing into groups of old men, women and children . . . when males of military age deliberately ran into these civilians. Eventu-

ally it was established that some of them were Viet Cong or northern troops . . ."

West's report on My Lai confirmed by other front-line comments, establishing a consistent pattern in similar combat situations, viz: ". . . We would take a village from the V.C. There would only be old men, women and children in evidence. Troops would search the native houses. When two or three men went in, a "Claymore mine" would go off and they would be blown up. Some "little old lady" sitting on her doorstep was also sitting on a number of strings and when she saw our men go into a certain building, she would pull a certain string and off would go a mine. Even innocent looking little children are used by the Viet Cong. Any time you see a kid with a package, especially one who is pushing into our men, crying for candy—especially chocolate—it's time to yell out an alarm. The chances are the kid's carrying a bomb and has been taught by the Viet Cong to pull a string and "give the soldiers a surprise." That the kid was blown up along with the explosive, is no concern whatever to the V.C. . . ."

OFFICIAL SOUTH VIETNAM REPORTS 1968

President Nguyen Van Thieu initiated an official investigation. The My Lai area is an enclave in the command of Lt. Gen. Hoang Xuan Lam: ". . . Reports that 527 civilians were massacred were completely inaccurate . . ."

". . . When (Americans) moved into that area, they met strong resistance from the enemy . . . the result of contact was 125 enemy killed . . . about 20 civilians were killed by tactical airstrikes and artillery . . ."

Washington, i.e. the Department of the Army, should have accepted and stuck to this official Vietnamese statement. Obviously local Government investigators are more competent than private muckrakers like Ridenhour, giving the immediate language problem, if nothing else. The American "public relations" handling was incredibly inept, if not stupid. They deliberately equated My Lai with Hue (1968) and Katyn (1943).

LT. GEN. LEWIS W. WALT, U.S. MARINE CORPS

"I learned early in my two years of duty in South Vietnam, fighting and working alongside the South Vietnamese forces, the Communist terrorism is no mere accident of war but a program of systematic butchery. This deliberate and brutal assault against the grassroots citizenry is one reason why we who have responded to South Vietnam's call for assistance believe devoutly that our efforts to save this nation are worthwhile, necessary and important . . ."

"General Walt tells of his arrival at a district headquarters the day after it had been overrun by VC and North Vietnamese army troops. Those South Vietnamese soldiers not killed in the battle had been tied up and shot through their mouths or the backs of their heads. Then their wives and children, including a number of two- and three-year-olds, had been brought into the street, disrobed, tortured and finally executed; their throats were cut; they were shot, beheaded, disemboweled. The mutilated bodies were draped on fences and hung with signs telling the rest of the community that if they continued to support the Saigon government and Allied forces, they could look forward to the same fate.

"These atrocities are not isolated cases; they are typical. For this is the enemy's way of warfare, clearly expressed in his combat policy in Vietnam. While the naive and anti-American throughout the world, cued by Communist propaganda, have trumpeted against American 'immorality' in the Vietnam War . . . the Communists have systematically authored history's grisliest catalogue of barbarism . . ."

PINKERTON ON COMMUNISM

Communism has always been an inhumanely evil force. The late Allan Pinkerton, founder of the famous Pinkerton Detective Agency, warned of this evil many years ago in his 1878 book entitled "Strikers, Communists, Tramps and Detectives". In regard to the Paris Commune he wrote:

"With a grim sort of humor, the Commune abolished public executions, while foully murdering scores of victims in prison . . . It destroyed public buildings and demolished monuments. It leveled upon the rich and encouraged rapine upon both rich and poor. Incendiarism, robbery and murder were its constant practices. It brushed out of existence near a hundred great newspapers, and brought into existence nearly a hundred sheets which for vileness were never equaled. Unbridled license was the crowning feature. All that is held by mankind as execrable and infamous was enacted by it. . . ."

"Its lesson is not one for Paris . . . (but) for the entire civilized world. . . . Give it time and let it alone, and it will lift its red hand with all the savage ferocity with which it struck Paris . . . (Communists) are a class of human hyenas worthy of all notice and attention . . ." Later in the book he rightly contended that communism "calls for as prompt an extermination as we would give a deadly reptile . . ."

Mr. Pinkerton's warnings were absolutely correct some 92 years ago and they are still correct today. Truth, instead of misinformation about communism, can lead more of our nation's idealistic young activists to work against this evil instead of helping to bring its terror upon an unsuspecting American populace.

A SHABBY REPORT BY SHABBY PEOPLE

The battle for Vietnam is not fought solely in rice-paddies and the jungle, but in news print and on the airways. Given any juicy morsel of "atrocities," the journalistic rodents bare their fangs and go to work. Though they may live in sheltered America, these character-assassins are crypto-communists; their current objectives is to discredit the military, at the front and at home—not to mention a fast buck!

The horror story disseminated by "Life" has distinct commercial elements!

The Army photographer involved was one R. L. Haeberle, assisted by Jay Roberts, both of the Pub. Inf. Det. 11th Inf. Brig. Both "volunteered" for this operation because word was out that it would be "a hot one." Haeberle was well prepared with three cameras, one for the Army and two de luxe types for himself, the Army film being black and white and the private film being in color. When he returned from the war, he lectured and showed his "horror" films around the Cleveland area. When the massacre story finally hit the news, he took his pictures to the liberal Cleveland "Plain Dealer." The paper printed eight of the pictures. That same night, Haeberle flew to New York. He set up shop in Room 801 of the Gotham Hotel, went into business and invited bids from newspapers and magazines. A package deal was made with "Life"; payments were reportedly in five figures.

The timing was suspicious—especially Haeberle's "volunteerism". The effect was calculated. "Time" has done it before on a shattering scale. With the connivance of the "New York Times", they built up Castro and Cuba is now a deadly Russian missile base.

My Lai publicity furnished "cover-up" for a vast and real massacre in Vietnam and in the same month: the murder of thousands during the brief Communist occupation of Hue. We will pursue this theme elsewhere.

Although the newspaper headlines screamed "Only the chickens were left alive,"

Chief W. O. Hugh C. Thompson received the D.F.C. for his action as helicopter pilot, March 16, 1968 at My Lai. The citation: "He spotted 15 young children trying to hide in a bunker and evacuated them to a safe area. Moments later, he spotted a wounded Vietnamese child and disregarding his own safety, he again landed and evacuated the child to the Quang Ngai hospital . . ."

Compare this with the mealy-mouthed muckraking of another helicopter crewman (far away from My Lai), the "conscience-stricken" vagaries of one Ronald Lee Ridenhour, an avid collector and purveyor of hearsay evidence and indefatigable gossip.

WHO OPENED THIS CAN OF WORMS?

Seymour M. Hersh, a free-lance writer got a tip from the Pentagon. With a \$1000 grant from leftist tax-exempt "Phillip M. Stern Foundation" he tracked down some ex-GIs who were "willing to talk". It may be remembered that one of the Sterns, long suspected as a Communist activist, is a fugitive behind the iron curtain with his wife, the notorious daughter of an American Ambassador.

Seymour has now expanded his flash reports (hearsay evidence!) to the leading article in left-leaning "Harper's", in the May issue in thirty-three full pages of biased, highly prejudicial material, preceding the expected trial of the My Lai participants. Hersh has since received the current Pulitzer Prize—a bit of amoral back-scratching by a coterie of literary prostitutes.

Ronald Lee Ridenhour, a disgruntled draftee, never served in or near My Lai but nevertheless took it upon himself to "investigate" the massacre. He claims he was "conscience stricken". We share the view of Col. O. K. Henderson, 11th Brig.: "I can't believe a guy who did not participate in action, that his 'conscience would bother' him, a year later, more than the men involved." When his informational coup did not immediately burst upon the American scene, Ridenhour got a "literary agent" (M. Cunningham) who attempted to sell Ridenhour's story to newspapers, magazines and television networks.

Paul D. Medlo, another GI witness appeared with Mike Wallace on C.B.S. The intermediary again was "Dispatch News Service" which was reportedly paid \$10,000.00. Medlo got nothing but has since told prospective interviewers ". . . I ain't talking to nobody now unless they pay." This schizoid casually boasted: ". . . Calley ordered 370 villagers killed. I killed personally about 10 to 15 . . ."

Of course, the Communist Press loved every minute of this and had itself a field day. The Communist "Daily World" promptly induced conscience-stricken Ridenhour to give them an interview. Cui Bono? If Ridenhour did not know that he was appearing before the official Communist daily organ—he was stupid. If he knew, his action could only be interpreted as "aid and comfort to the enemy" and that is treason. The net effect of this "witness" (for a quick buck) was to furnish whitewash for Red atrocities, on a vast scale, from Hue contemporaneously (1968) to Katyn Forest (1943), the standard Red genocide pattern.

THE SCAVENGERS ON THE SCENT

C.I.A. information (confirmed by the International Comite, D.C.C.) indicates that Communist organizations throughout the world have been instructed by Moscow to go all out in using the My Lai incident to discredit the U.S. Army and the American war effort in defending South Vietnam.

"Cui Bono" is still valid. Smearing the American military with alleged "atrocities" will cover up the historically demonstrable barbarities of the Russians, as at Katyn (1943), near Smolensk and the systematic

destruction of hundreds of thousands of Japanese in Siberian P.W. Camps (1945-1948).

Military deserters in Sweden are being organized to hold press conferences and fabricate that they witnessed atrocities and torture in South Vietnam. Deserters and "draft resisters" are to be helped by clergy and laymen. The group had an Episcopal priest stationed in Stockholm to aid the colony of traitors there. We seem to be confronted with a crypto-Communist drive to drop Vietnam as we previously abandoned China. The tax exempt I.P.R. (Institute for Pacific Relations) then did the hatchet job on China.

Naturally, given the nature of the enemy, there now are tax exempt "pinko" outfits, in the States, leaping to an opportunity to attack the "military-industrial complex": the new "Institute for Policy Research" merged with the "Peace Research Institute" . . . note the deliberately misleading labels! It is financed by the "Ford Foundation", the "Institute for International Order", the "Field Foundation" and the "Edgar Stern Family Fund"—which paid Seymour Hersh, the "investigative reporter", scouring the country for talkative eyewitnesses to "the massacre of My Lai"! Suggestively, one James Boyd is executive director of the "Stern Fund". Boyd is better known as the former employee of Senator T. Dodd, ransacking and copying thousands of the Senator's private files, to accommodate Drew Pearson's smear job on the Senator.

A new left-wing "news" (i.e. propaganda) service called "Dispatch News Service" opened the My Lai barrage. The outfit was started in Taiwan by David Obst, a Chinese language student. Assistants set up a staff in Saigon: Morrow, M. D. Luce, D. Ronke and Dick Berliner. In Washington, they have D. Norcross who writes "Youth Notes" for "Parade". Richard J. Barnet, who has recently returned from Hanoi—a source of impartial war news?—acts as "advisor". Barnet is a director of the leftist "think tank": Washington's "Institute for Policy Study"—policy derived from Hanoi trips, enemy-territory, pure and simple. The "Dispatch" sponsored Seymour M. Hersh, free-lance writer and peddled his "My Lai stories" for \$100.00 a clip. Some 35 newspapers printed it in November 1969.

There are other anti-American channels and operators: "American Documentary Films," San Francisco, plans to import and distribute sixteen (16) North Vietnam and Viet Cong films. David Castro, an executive of this outfit, stated that he will distribute to churches, trade unions, libraries and campus groups. The films are "gifts from the Vietnamese people". As an index of the social and journalistic level of this traitorous scum, travelling on the My Lai excitement, Castro spent seven years in American prisons on narcotic charges.

MY LAI: VOX POPULI: A MIXED BAG

Space available, we could have listed many more "Letters to the Editor." Percentages pro-and-con are about even. I find some items totally unpalatable. I take the liberty of some editorial appraisals, viz: (1) A not so subtle undercurrent of racist feeling? (2) This bird will shortly run out of curses. He will have nothing left for Hue. And how will foul-mouth emote when he is confronted with American teenage conscripts, slaughtered like animals and flung into a Korean roadside ditch? (3) This is the piece-de-resistance. This beladme is a recognizable throwback to the French revolution—the cradle of Communism. Her vulgar prototype enjoyed frontrow seats when the guillotine was clattering. We recommend item (6) as appropriate for the not-so-charming Metz (3)—Fox (5) statements.

(1). Sir: The trite phrase "My country right or wrong" sounds very hollow in view of the American war atrocities at My Lai. The

innocent, helpless civilians so brutally murdered there are another testimony to the fact that "liberty and justice for all" exist only if one happens to be American wealthy and white. (The Rev. F. O. Villien, Lafayette, La.)

(2). Sir: Why is the world so horrified? I don't remember hearing any outcry against the air crews who bombed civilians in Germany and Japan. Or is there an Army regulation which stipulates that civilians may be killed only when they cannot be seen? (E. K. Anderson, Leicester, England.)

(3). Sir: I just watched the television coverage of the Pinkville "atrocities", and for the first time I am bitterly ashamed to be an American. All I could do was mutter helplessly, "God damn them! God damn them!" (Donald S. Metz, Deerfield, Ill.)

(4). Sir: Let's not allow the issue an undeserved partiality. The village was a haven for Viet Cong. The people were sympathizers with the V. C., and their direct aid contributed to American combat deaths.

When I was in Viet Nam, our battalion had a young sergeant who had been first on a battle scene where he discovered half a dozen Americans hanging upside down, tied through the ankles like deer, and castrated. The V.C. had attempted to skin their "war prisoners" like we skin animals. Cuts circled their wrists, ankles and thighs from the futile attempts. Yet I do not recall any up-roads about the atrocities of the V.C.

It is folly to think that war should be conducted with a cool head and a box score delivered every day. (Roger Gallagher, Lafayette, La.)

(5). Sir: I, who detest violence of any kind, would deem it an honor to be in the firing squad to mete out their just due to the murdering cowards of the C Company of the 11th Infantry Brigade. My only regret would be that I would not have the advantage of the element of surprise that these merciless killers had in the slaughter of the innocent people of My Lai. (Mrs. Naomi S. Fox, Burlington, Mass.)

(6) Sir: I wish the people of the world who are speaking out so loudly against the U.S. presence in South Viet Nam and the incident of My Lai could see the "friendly" villagers by day and the fighting hardcore V.C. by night. I wish they could see the women and children setting booby traps and mines. I wish they could see a young child that has had his limbs cut off by V.C. terrorists. I wish they could see the good will many of our troops have spread throughout the countryside of South Viet Nam. I wish they could see the harm done to the fighting morale resulting from peace marches and war demonstrations. I wish they could see that this war, just as any other war, is hell! And until they see some of these things themselves firsthand, I wish they would keep their damned mouths shut! (Marvin F. Pixton, III, Capt., U.S.M.C.)

(7) Sir: Since when do men have the right to judge a man for murder, when they taught him how? We hand these men guns, teach them to kill, and then expect them to remain mentally intact. If you think the younger generation is screwed up now, wait until you start checking out what's coming home from Viet Nam. (Ellin Pollachek, Elizabeth, N.J.)

(8). Sir: Why the hell all that noise about My Lai? The story of humanity is a long, uninterrupted list of atrocities. I remember the Spanish War, Lidice, Babl Yar, Korea, Algeria, the Congo, Mozambique, day after day after day—children murdered—all in my generation.

We are only human beings, and the fittest will survive. Please stop playing with ideals and words, and be prepared, for "something rather dark and bloody" may happen someday in the States, and it won't even be WW III. (Jean Crete, Sao Paulo, Brazil)

(9). Sir: Lieut. Calley or his commander, or both, will be tried and convicted and

punished, because someone has to be the "patsy" in any war.

Nineteen years ago today, I was a captain in front-line combat in Korea, with orders to shoot anything that moved after dark. We did, and we "won." On D-Day in Normandy and for some time afterward, the same order applied in my outfit, and we "won" that war, too. So it has always been, is now and will ever be, until some power stops war. (Harry McDaniel, Carmel Valley, Calif.)

(10). Sir: Just what the hell is this country coming to? What kind of America is it that sends its men into foreign countries to help uphold the doctrines of freedom, yet will not back these men when they wage war as they have been ordered? No one condones this alleged act of violence, yet one cannot help feeling that this man is being made a scapegoat to ease the minds of those who believe that our position in Viet Nam is unethical. (Charles G. Michal, Baltimore, Md.)

(11). Sir: I will go on active duty as an Army lieutenant in January, and what with the Green Beret case and now this one, I am not at all certain that there is any future for me. If one side doesn't get me, the other will. (Robert C. Meehan, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

By and large, the main agitators are the mass circulation media, the weekly's, notably "Time". With malicious ingenuity, they knew that a certain handling of photographic reproduction would be effective in emphasizing the "culprit," luckless Lieut. Calley. We will admit that he is not bright—but he is not a case-hardened criminal either. So they touched up a front page portrait of Calley.

"Color-key transfer by Fred Burrell, whose technique of diffusing the photograph through various layers of colored plastic is to suggest "the mist of horror surrounding the massacre and any who participated in it."

Bunk! Burrell is not as vicious as Haerberle and I suspect that his prose is one of "Time's" pinko-editors or rewrite men. What Burrell has done, however, is to "diffuse" Calley's undistinguished visage and make him look like a Mafia thug. So much for "unbiased" reporting, and pictorial fraud.

MASSACRE IN HUE: RED TET OFFENSIVE, 1968

While My Lai reports on numbers of killed have varied initially from 50 to 126, the "Tet" offensive, in the same year, a Communist operation, involved literally thousands of South Vietnam victims. The City of Hue was held by the Viet Cong and the Vietminh for about three weeks. They rounded up all prominent local officials and conservative citizens and murdered them barbarously. The victims were lined up with arms bound, bludgeoned to death or simply buried alive.

L.B.J.'s Secretary of Defense (as of 1958) Clark Clifford perorates in "Life," May 22, 1970, "... the President has suggested that a 'blood bath' could be expected with Catholics as a target." Clifford claims that in two years, following the Red takeover in Hanoi, "only 19 complaints of political reprisals" were filed with the International Control Commission.

As Secretary of Defense, he must have known the lurid details of the Red Massacre in Hue. In three weeks of occupancy of the ancient Capital City, the Reds rounded up about 5000 citizens; the total is not fully accounted for, but mass graves are discovered continuously and approximately 3000 victims have been identified. If Nixon has "lost credibility," what degree can be attached to the ex-Secretary of Defense?

Not quite as naive as the Secretary, the American Press largely ignored or played down the Hue horror. At any rate, at least in comparison to their major effort vis-a-vis My Lai.

There was no Haerberle around to carefully

select and arrange coloured films as at My Lai, and there was no money; they were not worth a counterfeit piaster. The Pentagon and State Department had early and complete information about Hue, but chose to ignore it. They would reveal little or nothing on the old basis that "we were trying to negotiate a peaceful settlement with Hanoi."

Compare this relative silence with the strident caterwauling about My Lai. Obviously the phony indignation was a cover-up for current and past Communist crimes. However, the similarity between Katyn and Hue was noted by Rep. Roman Pucinski April 3, 1969, viz:

"... I was the chief investigator of the special Congressional Committee which in 1952 investigated the Katyn Forest massacre, and I was struck by the tragic similarity between the methods and techniques used (by the Russians) in Katyn near Smolensk in 1940 and the methods used by the Communists (Viet Cong) against the South Vietnamese civilians in Hue. The entire world should be shocked by the discovery of mass graves in Hue..."

They could not care less! Washington kept the facts bottled up along with photographic proof. Instead, we were fed the "Green Beret Scandal" and now the My Lai "Massacre". Anything to keep our attention away from the unmistakable Russian pattern as adopted by their "stooges"; their consistent program of genocide, the killing of civic leaders, teachers, magistrates, etc., by special goon-squads and executioners. The American people have been left in the dark concerning enemy behaviour. If the networks and leftist papers such as the "Washington Post," "New York Times," and "Los Angeles Times" were to exert a tiny fraction of the initiative and indignation they habitually concentrate on exposing American soldiers, in just simply reporting the vast program of mass murders by Communist terror groups, we could have a united public opinion. Elsewhere, we shall expose the "double standard" of the knee-jerk liberals in an eyewitness report of the massacre at Masan, South Korea, in 1951. The victims were American teenage prisoners of war and the technique of assassination was like Katyn (1943) and Hue (1968) ... but Agnew's "effete snobs and impudent fools" remained discreetly silent and contemptuously indifferent.

THE BLEEDING HEARTS AND A KOREAN ROADSIDE DITCH

Here follow extracts from a column by a clergyman, the prototype of bourgeois morality (11) and a sophisticated weekly, i.e. normally not in the field of geopolitics. (12)

To demonstrate the utter idiocy of these bleeding hearts, apply their lachrymose wording to the massacre of Hue (1968) and most particularly, the massacre of hundreds of teenage American P.W.'s at Masan, Korea (1950) in a Korean roadside ditch.

Read the hypocritical prose inspired by Haerberle's commercial photos showing Viet Cong (i.e. enemy) men, and a scattering of women and compare it with an identical horror photo (not for sale), showing hundreds of young American F.W. murdered by Korean Communists, on the eve of their panicky flight after MacArthur's capture of Inchon. When you make that visual comparison, keep "Life's" commercial photos in mind and reflect on the lachrymose prose, they engendered in a literary psychopath. The inserts in brackets are our editorial reactions: "... Our best instincts are deserting us ... we are quietly choking on the blood of innocents (in a Viet Cong strong-hold) ... When soldiers of other nations did such things we have no trouble finding words of condemnation ... Now we find ourselves (looking) through the eyes of (American) perpetrators ... A death close

to us personally (it was close in Korea but never personally!) seems unfathomably large, but their deaths (Viet Cong) dwindle to abstraction ... All the shame and horror of Viet Nam seems to settle on this tiny hamlet ... It is still the price the nation must pay for its miscalculation and folly (The White House is a better reference than the Nation) ... the people in the living rooms of America are the final victims of this Asian conflict! ... If anything good has come of the shabby story, it is the tenacious honesty of young veterans, to come forward as witness to the truth ..."

What about the shame and horror of a Korean hamlet (Masan in lieu of My Lai?). Who came forward at Hue, on the same date as My Lai? Whose tenacious honesty is eulogized? Ridenhour, a military malcontent, a gossip monger on events to which he was neither eyewitness nor participant? An avid purveyor of "hearsay evidence." And where were the "tenaciously honest veterans" to come forward at the Masan, Korean mass murder in 1950? Most of them were killed: their hands tied behind their backs with captured American signal wire and shot behind the ears with Czech-Russian rifles or pistols.

If "confrontation with Communism" is a compulsive national or international issue, it would have been plausible (and still is!) vis-a-vis Castro and Cuba, a Russian missile base 90 miles from Florida, in contemptuous violation of the Monroe Doctrine, vitiated by the late but not lamented F. D. Roosevelt. However, confrontation with Communism in Viet Nam, thousands of miles from North America was and is an indefensible geopolitical folly.

At this point we accept that Nixon is the only President to seriously attempt to retrieve Kennedy's monumental fumble.

This thing is relentlessly evolutionary. My Lai is just another move on the checkerboard. I have used the photo of a Korean roadside ditch to accompany an older F.I.D. article: "International and Domestic Policies of the Roosevelt-Truman Regimes 1933-1952." That is when all this began—the military and international adventurism by executive fiat!

Things have not improved much since that date. I am reminded of a statement by MacArthur on the eve of the execution of General Tojo, Japanese wartime Premier. Considerable pressure was applied on MacArthur to personally attend that macabre occasion. He flatly refused: "... I am not a hangman. I am opposed to post-facto war crimes trials. They have set a dangerous precedent. We better win the next war—or some of us are going to swing." Of course, the General had no idea that the "boomerang" would someday be hurled from Washington by its own brand of bleeding hearts and a schizophrenic concern for "world opinion," in a world largely dominated by cynical Russia.

As a professional soldier, in defense of other soldiers, I challenge the fraudulent manipulations by which the My Lai incident was blown up beyond reasonable proportions.

The frenetic and wholly phony agitation over My Lai (1968), as compared with the relative silence on Korea (1950), indicates a moral degeneracy of certain public mediae and a spineless connivance within and without the Government.

Federal officers, military and civil, have sworn valid oaths on accepting their commissions, under the Constitution, to "defend the United States against all Enemies, Foreign and Domestic."

Only ignorance or treasonable flirtation will deny that we have now entered a danger zone in which Russian-directed international communism may ultimately score a world victory.

The earliest expose of the My Lai hoax was made by Frank A. Capelle, publisher of the

"Herald of Freedom," P.O. Box 3, Zarephath, New Jersey. I rate Capelle tops in the development of hard intelligence on Communist or Radic-Liberal domestic subversion. He moves swiftly and accurately! Within ten days, he reported on the recent crypto-Communist ruling of Judge Gerhard A. Gesell D.C. against publication of a report by the "House Internal Security Committee, October 14, 1970."

Gesell's blatantly biased ruling is in keeping with his murky background. It takes one back to the Kennedy days. Yarmolinsky, McNamara and the plan "for racial equality within the Armed Forces." The directive was probably written by Adam Yarmolinsky (in the shadow of Babette Deutsch?). The Hon. Mendel Rivers M.C. denounced it "as the most infamous document ever devised, highly inflammatory, vicious and extremely prejudiced . . ." Gesell was involved in this action in 1962.

There is a genetic parallelism between Gesell's (1963) and the current persecution of Viet Nam GI's (1970).

THE VOICE OF H. L. HUNT

The recent quotation from this remarkable man is pertinent to Gesell's incredible ruling. H. L. Hunt is one of a half a dozen giant-size American entrepreneurs in the oil industry. He is deeply concerned with the future of the United States: "... Constructive action can build a political party. Plans should be implemented to convert one of the major parties to the freedom side . . ."

... Entrenched appointed Government officials, who cannot be fired by elected officers because of civil service laws, can do much harm to our constitutional system by sabotaging the policies of a newly elected party. Patriots can expect to face the wrath of a small but powerful clique of these left-leaning, entrenched appointed officials any time a constructive step is taken to fight crime or communism . . ."

This is a perfect delineation of Gesell's operations. The My Lai agitation may become the catalyst for effective reforms.

In the growing internal degeneracy, from campus riots to illegal postal strikes, Washington's only recourse has been to call in troops when the police failed. This puts a premium on the Regular Army and/or National Guard. It puts a premium on their "morale", their "esprit de corps" . . . that intangible, elusive element that holds Armies together, that tied the bedraggled Confederate soldier to Robert E. Lee, that kept the South going for four bitter years.

In our days, the effrontery of McNamara's civilian "whiz kids" came near corroding the morale of the Officer Corps.

Highly competent Armies and Navies felt the gnawing of the cancer: The French Army practically mutinied (1917) in a sit-down performance. The British Navy suffered similar convulsions. The entry of fresh American troops restored the broken spirit.

In Viet Nam, there have been instances of individual and collective resistance, though we rotate troops after one year service. Let us call it "war weariness"—a charitable interpretation but a danger symptom in any event!

When these confused, insecure young soldiers are exposed to the further pressure of "courts martial" when they merely carry out orders in actual combat situations, when self-defense is equated with murder in peacetime, the morale factor enters precipitately! Believe me, as a professional soldier of forty years service in all ranks from Private to Major-General, when you tamper with the morale of an Army, you gamble with national security!

The alleged "barbarities" are a totally unwarranted attack on our soldiers in the field,

with serious defamatory moral and social implications that have undermined the prestige of American Arms. The entire journalistic approach to this incident is crypto-communist slander. Cui bono? It's calculated effect was to whitewash bona fide atrocities, systematically perpetrated by the Reds, in Viet Nam and elsewhere, in a consistent and vastly larger pattern.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The My Lai "farce," exaggerated by rascally journalists and pinko publishers, must be viewed against the current background of a hostile Russia, arming at white-heat in every category of their military forces, in a race to overtake the United States—while local termites undermine our own establishment.

We concur in Mr. Hunt's appraisal, but would strengthen and amplify his cautious recommendations:

1. All fraternal veteran's organizations, on the State and National level, to unite in a common political philosophy for direct action. Required: A national network of veterans' and military retired personnel for constructive intelligence and security operations, in support of the police, the F.B.I. and civil defense agencies.

2. The voting potential is demonstrable in the current operations of labor unions. There is a greater number of war veterans and draftees—a voting bloc of literally millions of immense power, provided they act in tight unity.

3. Suggested title: "Coalition of Veterans and Draftees" (C.V.D.). Suggested emblem: "Don't tread on me . . ." the historical Arizona rattler, uncollaring for self-defense.

4. Within constitutional limitations, the C.V.D. to band together for the sole purpose of electing conservative Congressional candidates, all war veterans with emphasis on combat service. The historical precedent is found in the political impact of the G.A.R. in the post-Civil War period.

5. The resulting militarized Congress is expected to curb international adventurism by executive fiat, from the Mekong to Lebanon.

6. A militarized Congress is expected to control current crypt-communist trends in education, welfare and social experimentation.

7. A revision of Federal Centralism from the Supreme Court to the Internal Revenue Service with emphasis on sanitizing tax exempt foundations.

8. Revision of taxation to return 50% of revenues to the States of origin. Revision of pension to widows of service men, now approximately \$50/\$75 per month—a contemptible figure, unworthy of the United States.

9. A revision of the United Nations structure and location, with emphasis on curbing the Afro-Asian "bloc", the so-called "Third World."

10. Revision and control of Foreign Aid recipients.

11. Revision and control of current foreign alliances and commitments.

12. Outlawing the Communist Party and affiliated groups with emphasis on the immediate, accelerated prosecution of their leaders until these crypto-Communist cells are destroyed.

13. The revival of Alcatraz as a place of confinement for foreign and domestic spies and traitors.

14. Nixon is the only President to have made a substantial effort to reduce our military commitment in the Far East. He now has a political opportunity to intervene in aid of our Viet Nam GI's—an opportunity of unparalleled psychological and sentimental impact that may affect the upcoming elections.

15. The action: a) Terminate promptly all current Viet Nam Courts Martial; b) Stop all further denunciatory allegations by irrespon-

sible muckrakers; c) As C. in C. pardon all convicted Viet Nam GI's as victims of a ludicrous miscarriage of justice; d) Advise hypocritical foes and friends that the U.S. Services will not accept allegations of crime in the heat of combat actions, under orders, and e) That the U.S. is fully aware that, by comparison, Russia and its stooges practice genocide on a vast scale.

PROFILE OF A COMPANION: WALTER J. DILBECK, DSC

Walter James Dilbeck, Junior, holder of the DSC—for Valor, 3 Bronze Stars and 3 Purple Hearts, was born July 11, 1918, in Fort Riley, Kansas. His mother Catherine Gray Dilbeck, was a gentle soft-spoken, southern girl; his father a stern, army sergeant-major who had served with Black Jack Pershing during the Mexican Border troubles. Dubbed the "rattlesnake major" because he casually carried a live de-fanged rattlesnake about his neck during the pursuit of Pancho Villa, Water Senior, was a stern disciplinarian. Later he advanced to the rank of Major during World War I. Upon his retirement, the family moved to Fort Branch, Indiana, where Major Dilbeck became a building contractor.

Walter Junior, was the first of eight children, four boys, and four girls.

Fort Branch was a town of some 1500 citizens, a considerable portion of whom worked on farms or in the neighboring coal mines. However, it is widely accepted that the small, grassroots community is a source of sound Americanism: it contributed to Dilbeck's exemplary career.

Throughout 4 years of high school, Walter starred in football, baseball, and basketball. When he was 19, the St. Louis Cardinals signed him to their Joplin Farm Club. It was a year later while playing exhibition games through Southern Indiana that Walter met a pert and pretty Irish girl named Dorothy Rogers. By Dec. 7, 1941, he was married, father of a baby girl, and working for Swift & Co., in its Evansville plant.

The meat industry was considered essential to the war effort and its employees were immune from the draft. By 1943, as America and its allies geared themselves for the attack on "Festung Europa." Walter and Dorothy had acquired a family of three lovely girls: Carol Sue, now 3, Jo Ann 2, and Barbara Ellen, 1. It required money to support this flourishing brood. Walter who, with Dorothy, had been operating a small grocery on the side borrowed \$6500.00 and took a three months leave of absence from Swifts to open a small roadhouse catering to soldiers from a nearby army camp.

The opening night was a great success but before Walter and Dorothy had time to exult, a familiar greeting arrived from Uncle Sam. No longer under the protecting arm of Swift & Co., Walter had received his notice to report for military service.

After induction at Fort Harrison, Walt was shipped on to Camp Branning, Florida for basic training. After a short leave home, the company was re-mustered at Camp Patrick Henry, in Virginia. From there they moved to Fort Meade, Maryland, and were put aboard the U. S. S. Monticello. In about 10 days they would be landing in North Africa.

Bivouacked outside Casablanca, Walt's outfit was assigned as a replacement unit for the 36th division, a tough and distinguished Texas outfit, which fought in almost every action from North Africa, through Sicily, Salerno, up the Italian Boot, and later on into the heart of Germany.

North of Rome, Walt received his first taste of combat. He was "picked" to volunteer to deliver some special equipment to a front line unit. They gave Walter a mule already

loaded with two boxes of equipment, a compass, and a nose hook to persuade the mule in case it got stubborn. Together they set out up a narrow, tortuous mountain trail. Progress was deadly slow and suddenly became deadly dangerous when a German fighter plane spotted Walt and his mule and dove at them, machine guns chattering. Walt made it to the safety of a ditch but the mule was killed, leaving Walt to finish the delivery of the special equipment on his own. It was nightfall before he dragged himself and the boxes of equipment into the command post only to be greeted with: "What the hell took you so long?"

With the Italian campaign pretty much stalemated, the 7th Army was formed to invade Southern France. Walt's outfit was transferred to the newly organized 63rd division, but still functioning as a back-up unit. As they moved toward the Vosges, he trained the green G.I.'s in the use of mortars and the automatic rifle.

Last of the leisurely, back-up days ended when the war neared German soil. Walt's group graduated to a spearhead unit. By war's end, of 194 men in his rifle company only some 36 emerged alive and unscathed. Walt was not one of them. Outside Heidelberg, battling S. S. troops in one of the sharpest actions of the war, he was wounded.

CITATION: DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS

Mr. Walter J. Dilbeck, DSC, Ramada Inn, Suite 821, 600 Walnut St., Evansville, Indiana, was granted the Distinguished Service Cross for his extraordinary heroism while serving as a private first class with F Company, 253rd Infantry Regiment, 63rd Infantry Division on 6 April 1945, in the vicinity of Buchof, Germany. When his company was hit from two sides by a strong and determined enemy force of over two hundred SS troops, Private First Class Dilbeck observed that panic was running wild among our troops. Everyone just took off for the rear allowing the enemy forces to move into the foxholes as fast as they were vacated. From his new position Germans poured out a deadly stream of automatic and small arms fire causing terrific casualties among the Americans and giving them no chance to reorganize. Realizing that something had to be done to stop the enemy attack, Private First Class Dilbeck stopped voluntarily on a bare knoll and began to pour deadly automatic rifle fire into the ranks of the charging SS troops. With conspicuous gallantry and determination he stood his ground even though all the fire power of the enemy was almost upon him, but he continued to fire as fast as he could change magazines. The enemy attack finally stalled because of their terrible losses. Private First Class Dilbeck had killed or wounded over sixty of the SS troops. Because of his indomitable courage and fearless tenacity, Private First Class Dilbeck saved the lives of many of his comrades and made it possible for this company to withdraw successfully, reorganize and hold its new position.

Companion Dilbeck holds battle stars on his campaign medal to indicate participation in the battles for Italy, Southern France, and Germany. In addition, he wears three awards of the Bronze Star, three awards of the Purple Heart (wounded in combat), and the Combat Infantryman's Badge. Now engaged in the development and financing of real estate, Mr. Dilbeck was nominated for membership in the Legion of Valor, by Major General Charles A. Wiloughby, DSC, USA, Retired, 3602 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C. 20007.—General Orders—Legion of Valor—February, 1968.

In the lapel of his coat, Walt wears the small emblem indicating the second-highest

battle award in the American Army: the Distinguished Service Cross for Valor.

Since the war and his recovery from battle wounds, Walt and Dorothy have made their home in Evansville. Successful in business, Walt heads some nine companies engaged in real estate and large land development. Several of his old comrades now work for him.

HANDS ACROSS THE SEAS

Walter has never lost his interest and affinity for the young men in our armed forces. He has made two trips to Vietnam and on one occasion made a practice jump with the 101st airborne.

It is a far cry from Buchof, Germany to My Lai, Vietnam but they are linked by that intangible feeling between fighting men, the brotherhood of combat veterans, the bedraggled doughboys of Bill Mauldin and Ernie Pyle, and Walter Dilbeck is one of them. He can't keep away from it—and thereby hangs another story: Report by Arlo Wagner, Washington Correspondent.

Evansville Marine Thomas R. Bold was under order to "eliminate Viet Cong" in Son Thang IV where he and four other Leathernecks are under investigation in the "slaying" of 16 Vietnamese civilians.

Rep. Roger Zion divulged this fact today. His administrative assistant Belden Bell said Zion has other secret information to exonerate Boyd and his companions from blame in the Feb. 19 incident. "If civilians were killed by these men, there is reason to believe Boyd and his companions thought they were the enemy."

Bell said the basic situation is similar to the My Lai massacre in which 10 U.S. military men are charged with murdering 128 Vietnamese civilians.

The Marines were in a battle situation, felt they were under orders and subsequently 16 villagers were found dead in a front yard. Zion described the Son Thang incident viz:

"Virtually all of the alleged victims were either related to members of the Viet Cong or working directly with them. The village in which the incidents occurred is considered a hostile hamlet and is located in a free fire zone.

"Inhabitants were repeatedly ordered to evacuate and on several occasions were forcibly removed.

"Testimony from many of the young men in the unit revealed that these civilians were supporting the enemy, sometimes to the point of using small children to lead our boys into ambush. Many of the women set booby traps and alerted the Cong when our Marines arrived."

The congressman said Boyd and the other four Marines have been crunched between the requirements of battle and the politics of an unpopular war.

"These young men have been caught in the middle of a dispute between the Marine field commanders whose responsibility is eliminating Viet Cong and the politically motivated military here in Washington who are concerned with world opinion," he said.

Boyd and two of the other four Marines have been awarded Purple Hearts, i.e. wounded in action. He has been in Vietnam since August.

Evansville relatives and friends of Boyd have collected 5,000 signatures on petitions to Zion asking that the young Marine be absolved of the blame.

At this point, Walter Dilbeck stepped into the picture. Evansville is his home town. His commercial Headquarters is at the Ramada Inn—Suite 821. He undertook to engage a first-class local firm of attorneys: "Trockman, Lloyd, Flynn & Swain."

Mr. Trockman, Esq. will fly to Saigon and represent the Evansville man, at his upcoming court-martial. Dilbeck will accompany him and finance the entire operation.

SPACE EXPLORATION AND THE FUTURE

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, writing in the Mankato Free Press recently, Editor Ken Berg made the point that while reductions in space spending are "proper," it would be a mistake to abandon the space program entirely because of many real and intangible benefits that are important to the United States and because future space discoveries may help to lift all mankind to a better life. I request the inclusion of Mr. Berg's thoughtful editorial in full at this point in my remarks.

CAN'T ABANDON SPACE

Quickly now. Who was the first man to set foot on the moon?

Any difficulty in recalling immediately that it was Neil Armstrong is symbolic of the fate that has overtaken the space program a year-and-a-half after the silent footsteps of man initially disturbed the lunar dust.

The tremendously successful flight of Apollo 14 has only momentarily diverted our attention from the needs of Spacecraft Earth.

Diminished enthusiasm about the moon is reflected in the exploratory program itself. Only three more such flights are planned; previously, there were to have been six additional manned flights. Some additional unmanned flights to Mars and Venus also will be forthcoming.

Changes in schedules have resulted from budget cuts and altered priorities. Three space facilities have been ordered closed. Space-industry employment, has dropped more than 70,000 in two years. The over-all budget is down from \$6 billion in 1969 to \$3.3 billion, with more trimming in sight.

A sign of the times is NASA's increasing stress on earth resources and ecology, together with the nation's concentrating on closer-to-home issues as welfare and the economy.

This is proper, of course.

Dividends from our space missions will be slow in coming, but they will come. While cutbacks surely are in order, space exploration should be continued on a programmed basis.

Despite our present economic difficulties, most of mankind yearns—with little prospect of fulfillment—toward the material and even social accomplishments of the U.S. The contention that we must forgo all further achievements in space to put society in order therefore rings somewhat hollow.

We should hate to see a virtually abandoned space program strengthening the foreign image that views America as a wholly materialistic, profit-grubbing society. Little America has done recently has evoked as much admiration as its space record. It would be unfortunate if we make it appear that Americans strive almost exclusively for immediate gain.

After all, knowledge of the moon's nature and origin is still slight after only three landings. There is much more to know, before we can begin comprehending fundamental questions of the universe. Then, too, space research provides channels for directing money to stimulate economic activity, as the current layoffs illustrate in a negative way, and realizing that our chief economic problem is not production but distribution.

The quest for knowledge in both space and vast oceans is a noble endeavor, highly productive in the broadest social, intellectual sense and the narrower practical, economic sense.

Although the U.S. and other favored nations cannot endure as islands of prosperity amid seas of misery, no economic or technical tools now available can transform the economies of the depressed two-thirds of mankind.

Only new techniques and new frontiers can enable the depressed to make better material and intellectual lives by our collective efforts.

DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN ADDRESSES TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of escorting Dr. Wernher Von Braun to Texas Christian University several weekends ago where he

addressed a large segment of the student body and citizens of the Fort Worth area. He made a most interesting speech in which he vindicated our space program and science in general.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the February 22 edition of the Fort Worth Star Telegram:

MORE SCIENCE, NOT LESS, IS NEEDED

Dr. Wernher von Braun, deputy administrator of NASA, speaking at Texas Christian University the other day, delivered a timely vindication of the American space program and, by extension, of American science and technology in general.

Dr. Von Braun's remarks were appropriate for there seems to be today a massive turning away from traditional faith in science. It is reported that some 50,000 U.S. scientists and engineers are presently walking the streets, driving taxis or running gas stations. Research projects once welcomed are so thinned out that the president of the National Academy of Sciences talks grimly of the whole national research structure becoming a "shambles."

And all of this at a time when the country needs more science, not less, than ever before.

Dr. Von Braun noted in his TCU address

that the gross national product nearly doubled in the past decade, and that half of the real growth can be attributed to new technological knowledge from research and development investments. This is an important point, for in our concern for social reform we run the risk of paying too little attention to the economic base necessary to support this reform.

Many politicians and conservationists have turned inward in assessing priorities. They want to know why we aren't using resources for better housing, education, health, law enforcement, pollution control. Why build a better plane or go to the moon when we can build a better hospital or school?

The people who ask these questions are on the track of something very good and wonderful—but what they fail to understand is that without strong industry and a healthy economy, social reform is impossible.

If we really intend to keep the planet livable, we are going to need all the applied science we can get—to build machinery for recycling waste, to develop better fuels, to pursue much-needed breakthroughs in medicine, biology, oceanography.

It is time to stop blaming science for all the sour products of materialism, rather than the other way around.

We are indebted to Dr. Von Braun for putting things in better perspective.