

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 25, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rt. Rev. Nikolaj Lapitzki, Byelorussian Orthodox Church of St. Euphrosynia, South River, N.J., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

O eternal God, and our Father, the source of all life and light, on this day commemorating the proclamation of independence of anniversary of Byelorussia, we humbly bow our heads and pray, that Byelorussia, and all other captive nations may soon receive a new birth of freedom.

O Generous God, the source of kindness, bless and instruct the leaders and legislators of the United States of America, so that they would arrive at the decisions, which would lead to peace and freedom of all mankind.

O Merciful God, source of love, send Your blessing on all people of our glorious country, United States of America, save them from discord, giving them the spirit of love, wisdom, and true brotherhood. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 468. Joint resolution making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that, pursuant to Public Law 84-1028, the Vice President appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. HARRIS as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy; and Mr. STENNIS, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, appointed Mr. DOMINICK as a member of the same Board of Visitors.

The message also announced that, pursuant to Public Law 84-1028, the Vice President appointed Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. FONG, and Mr. PEARSON as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy; and Mr. STENNIS, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, ap-

pointed Mr. CANNON as a member of the same Board of Visitors.

### NUMBERING OF RECORDED TELLER VOTES AND ROLL CALL VOTES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to announce that recorded teller vote No. 1—on the public debt and interest rate limitation—and recorded teller vote No. 2—on deleting appropriations for the supersonic transport—be renumbered as "roll No. 30" and "roll No. 31," respectively. The Clerk will henceforth number all recorded teller votes in sequence with roll numbers.

Without objection, the permanent RECORD and the Journal will be changed accordingly: and, in the future, recorded teller votes will be carried in the single "roll number" series.

There was no objection.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will this in any way change the results as they appear in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. Not in the least. The purpose is to have just one set of numbers on recorded votes instead of two.

Mr. GROSS. Since they have already been changed from what the Chair announced the totals were, that is why I raised the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

### RT. REV. NIKOLAJ LAPITZKI

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

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this March 25, the people of Byelorussia are commemorating the 53d anniversary of their declaration of independence; and what could be more fitting than to have one of their own clergymen open this day's activities of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, today we had the distinction of listening to Rt. Rev. Protoperbyter Nikolaj Lapitzki of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church of St. Euphrosynia, located in South River, N.J., deliver the opening prayer.

Reverend Lapitzki, although not a resident of my congressional district, has been a friend and has done an impressive and dedicated job both to his church and to the community. He is the guiding spirit within his community of Byelorussian people in keeping their hopes alive for the resurrection of Byelorussian freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to welcome Reverend Lapitzki to the Halls of Congress.

### BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. Speaker, the highest hopes and aspirations of the Byelorussian people for a free and independent nation were fulfilled on March 25, 1918, when the Byelorussian National Republic was born.

It was during World War I that the Byelorussians took advantage of a weakened Russian regime and took steps to liberate themselves from the Russian powers. The All-Byelorussian Congress met in December 1917, in the city of Miensk, and, on March 25, 1918, proclaimed the Byelorussian Republic.

Byelorussia's provisional constitution was adopted which provided for freedom of speech, press, and assembly; national and cultural autonomy of all minorities; a direct and secret ballot open to all Byelorussians; an 8-hour workday with a right to strike—all guarantees of human rights.

Acknowledging the right of Byelorussia to its freedom and independence, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was accorded recognition by over a dozen states, and Byelorussian legations and consulates were set up in some foreign capitals. Unfortunately, the new Byelorussian free and independent state was unable to enjoy its new found freedom for very long. The Russian Communists invaded Byelorussia and turned the territory into a battlefield, and the nation soon found itself in Russian captivity.

World War II provided a period of relative calm and, under the German occupation, resulted in a spontaneous revival of Byelorussian national institutions. In 1944, in Miensk, the Second Byelorussian Congress was convened and it reaffirmed the desire of the Byelorussian people for complete political independence.

Today, the Byelorussian people cannot claim their former lands as an independent and free state. What resemblance there is to show that Byelorussia is an independent state is only an external facade, while the inner workings reflect the strict hand of Moscow control, which do not represent the hopes of the Byelorussian people.

There is no joy in Byelorussia today, there are no celebrations, there are no family gatherings on this, their day of the 1918 proclamation of independence. Today, in Byelorussia it is a day of work for the economic benefit of the oppressor, the Soviet Socialist Republic.

We all know that we cannot physically help Byelorussia regain her status as a free and independent nation. We can only express our hopes that this once proud nation will soon become a member of the free nations family.

I wish to join in this universal struggle for Byelorussian freedom and urge my colleagues to express themselves in seeking justice for these subjugated people.

Mr. Speaker, at this point of my remarks I would like to include a well-prepared treatise on the subject of what is presently the situation in Byelorussian

sian territory, which I wish to share with my colleagues of this honorable body.

The material referred to follows:

BYELORUSSIAN CONGRESS  
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,  
Queens, N.Y., March 10, 1971.

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The United Nations recently has celebrated 1st 25th anniversary. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic belongs to the United Nations and is one of its founding members. However, the Byelorussian people are not represented at this international organization. The people of Byelorussian SSR have been and remain under the oppression of Soviet Russia and have been denied the basic human freedom and rights. The Byelorussian people are unable to express their opinion because the Byelorussian SSR is not a sovereign state; it is merely a colony of Soviet Russia. Thus we, the Byelorussians living in the free world, would like to focus your attention upon the following points: 1. the status of Byelorussian people in the Byelorussian SSR; 2. the real status of the Byelorussian Mission at the UN; and the role of the Byelorussian Mission at this important international body.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is a nominal state. The Constitution of the BSSR has one purpose—to promote the BSSR as an independent state outside of the Soviet Russian Empire. The Byelorussian SSR, in reality, is one of many non-Russian provinces which, for all practical purposes, do not have any characteristics of an independent state. The political power in the BSSR is concentrated in the hands of Russian Communists and all aspects of political life are directed and guided entirely by the Central Committee in Moscow. The Byelorussian Government in Minsk merely executes the orders coming from Moscow. All of the most important Branches of Government of the BSSR are, in fact, parts of All-Union Government Departments and thus receiving orders from Moscow. Out of 35 ministers of the BSSR only seven are under direct orders of the Government in Minsk. These seven are automobile transportation, construction and exploitation of highways, department of urban construction, local industries, ministry of collective farms and social security. However, even these seven departments are working within the framework established and controlled by the Moscow government.

All key positions in the Byelorussian SSR are occupied by the Russians. Russian nationals are coming to Byelorussian cities by the thousands and taking over almost all important positions in all levels of government. These Russian newcomers virtually control entire Byelorussian life and Byelorussian territory. The so-called "House of Representatives" of Byelorussian SSR consists mainly of Russian nationals and is superimposed by the Russian Communist party. The "candidates" in the election campaign are usually the key persons from the Army and the administration. These people are almost all of Russian descent. The only Byelorussians in the "Parliament" of the BSSR are farmers and mechanical workers from collective farms. The election procedures in the BSSR are below standard for they proceed under constant pressure. In view of these facts, it should be understood why the Byelorussian Government of the BSSR during the past 52 years never voiced its own opinion or an idea, or had expressed a single voice of protest against Soviet Russian occupation of Byelorussia.

At the same time, the Soviet Russian government is conducting a continuous policy of deportation of professional people and skilled workers from the BSSR to other parts

of Soviet Russia. The same holds true for Byelorussian students—they must leave Byelorussia in order to get jobs in their professions. Many of these deported specialists never return back to Byelorussia and are completely lost to Byelorussian nationhood.

The Government of Soviet Russia carries out a policy of genocide toward the Byelorussian Nation. It is a statistically proven fact that during the Soviet Russian occupation the demographic deficit of the Byelorussian SSR was 6,045,000; only one-third of that number were direct or indirect losses of WW II; two-thirds, or over 4,000,000, are direct consequences of political terror, mass deportations and forced resettlements of Byelorussians to the Asian parts of the Soviet Russian Empire. And such a genocide had been carried out by the Russians for many decades, regardless of the fact that the Soviet Union was a signing member of the UN document against genocide which was adopted at the UN convention as far back as December 9, 1948.

The genocidal policy of Soviet Russia has its long history in Byelorussia. During the late 20's and early thirties millions of Byelorussian farmers and workers were forced to leave Byelorussia and to go to the eastern parts of Siberia. Such a policy of Soviet Russia is a magnified replica of the policy of Czarist Russia in regard to the Byelorussian people.

During the early history of Soviet Union a great part of Byelorussian territory was sliced from Byelorussia and attached to the Russian SFSR. The Byelorussian population in that part of the Byelorussian territory is continuously russified and directed towards complete destruction.

Presently the Byelorussian ethnic territory is divided at Moscow's will among four neighboring states, and the Byelorussian SSR includes less than half of the ethnographical Byelorussian territory. Loss of a great part of its territory and such a genocidal policy diminishes considerably Byelorussian national potential. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is not a Byelorussian State and was not created by the Byelorussian people. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was created by the Russian Bolsheviks in 1919 in order to subvert the aspirations of the Byelorussian people, who had proclaimed their own independent Byelorussian Democratic Republic in March 1918. In 1919 the Soviet Russian State conquered by military force of the Independent Byelorussian State and proclaimed the BSSR. In 1922 the Byelorussian SSR was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Russian regime in Byelorussia is carrying out a systematic Russification campaign. The Byelorussian language has been almost completely eliminated from official use in business relations, from institutions of higher education and from schools. The number of Byelorussian theaters, movies and cultural institutions shows a continuous decrease and the number of Russian-language institutions is increasing.

Streets, parks, monuments and even Byelorussian cities are named for Russian heroes and famous Russian dignitaries. Names of Byelorussian national heroes are virtually banned. The administration carries on a campaign of continuous destruction of Byelorussian historical monuments and architectural structures. Instead the Soviet Russian Government introduces a typical Russian addition of pseudoclassical style, and introduces it across the entire Soviet Union.

In view of the above, it is clearly understood why a traveller from the West entering the border town of Brest feels like he is in Russia. The Byelorussian features of this city have disappeared and a Byelorussian historical city of Bierasce has become a "Russian fortress in the western border."

Since 1927 in the BSSR there has been a continuous process of liquidation of Byelo-

russian national life. During the first stages of Russian Communist terror, the Russian Communists liquidated several hundred Byelorussian National Communists. In the 1930's the Russian Communists arrested thousands of Byelorussian scholars, artists and engineers. Many hundreds of thousands of Byelorussian farmers were deported to Siberia, where they perished. Among the first victims of Soviet Russian terror were Byelorussian leaders, such as the first president of the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences, most authoritative Byelorussian historians, economists, etc.

The ruthless purges continued also in 1937. Thousands of political leaders, former Byelorussian representatives in the Polish Parliament, were killed.

Byelorussian National Culture under Soviet Russian rule has undergone uncalculable losses. The Soviet Russian government has shut down all Byelorussian Learned Societies and literary clubs. The Government has banished publication of hundreds of Byelorussian artistic and scholarly journals. Byelorussian language and linguistic studies have suffered even greater losses. In 1933, by a Government decree, a reform was introduced into the Byelorussian grammar aiming to incorporate Byelorussian grammar into the Russian. The Byelorussian language was deprived of an independent path of development, and, instead, since 1933 its development is forcefully guided toward unification with the Russian language.

The Byelorussian libraries and archives were stolen and those books which have significance and importance for Byelorussian culture were removed from the country and were stored in Moscow or Leningrad. Since 1935 special indexes were published with the purpose of listing "outlawed" titles in Byelorussia. About 2,000 Byelorussian book titles numbering millions of copies were burned and totally destroyed.

Newspapers, journals and pamphlets in the Russian language are published in the BSSR, as a rule, in considerably larger numbers than the journals in the Byelorussian language. The publications in the Byelorussian language gradually decrease and the Russian publications increase. The language of Byelorussian publications is continuously russified.

In the field of religious affairs to general situation in Byelorussia remains very dark. Twice the Autocephalic Church of Byelorussia was completely destroyed, in 1937 and again in 1944. The Byelorussian Religious Hierarchy was mostly executed or exiled to Siberia. Thousands of Byelorussian Churches were completely demolished. A few churches which were rebuilt during World War II are forcefully incorporated into Moscow Patriarchate, the same as the remaining Byelorussian Hierarchy was incorporated into the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Moscow.

These are only a few characteristic features of a Russification program carried out by the Soviet Russian Government in the BSSR. Now a few words about the Byelorussian Delegation at the UN.

Byelorussian representatives at the United Nations Organization do not truly represent the people of Byelorussia and the records of the last 25 years will show that they have never taken any position which was in the slightest way different from that of the Soviet Russia.

Such an accord with the Soviet Russian Delegation has certainly its ground and explanation. The Byelorussian SSR is not an independent state but a colony of Soviet Russia; the Byelorussian SSR is represented at the United Nations by Russian nationals and the name of Byelorussia is used as a cover for Russian expansion policy. Mr. V. Smirnof, for example, present Byelorussian Representatives at the UN, is a Russian. Only occasionally the Byelorussian Delegation will include one or two Byelorussian

writers or a Byelorussian national; however, their role and degree of freedom are very limited. Byelorussian delegates, as a rule, are accompanied by a Russian delegate or a "guide". If a Byelorussian writer wants to buy some Byelorussian language books in New York, he must check them at the entrance of the UN Mission. Such was the case with Mr. P. Glebko. Mr. Glebko checked his books at the entrance of the UN Mission and has never received them in the USSR.

These are only a few characteristics of the present situation of Byelorussian within the Soviet Union. From this analysis it is understood that neither the government of the BSSR nor the Byelorussian delegation at the UN represents the Byelorussian people. They merely serve as a cover for the Russian expansion policy.

In view of the above, we respectfully request your assistance in stopping the genocidal policy of Soviet Russia in the BSSR in helping the Byelorussian people to regain their independence, as this has been recently occurring in many colonial countries of Africa and Asia.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN KOSIAK,  
President.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5981**

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 5981.

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

There was no objection.

**LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 29, 1971**

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

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

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the program of the House of Representatives for the week of March 29 is as follows:

On Monday: Senate Joint Resolution 55, wage and price control extension;

H.R. 5352, maritime authorization supplemental for fiscal year 1971, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 4724, maritime authorization for fiscal year 1972, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 5981, feed grain bases, subject to a rule being granted.

Tuesday and the balance of the week: H.R. 6531, Military Service Act amendments, subject to a rule being granted. Conference reports may be called up at any time.

Mr. BOW. May I ask the distinguished gentleman one further question: Is any other legislative business scheduled for today except the resolution creating a select committee to be known as the Se-

lect Committee on the House Restaurant?

Mr. BOGGS. Not to my knowledge.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the distinguished majority leader like to correct the statement on Senate Joint Resolution 55, "subject to a rule being granted"? It is my understanding that a rule has been granted.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes. I did not make the statement the gentleman read.

Mr. GROSS. However, it appears on the notice.

Mr. BOGGS. In reply to the gentleman, I am told that the first rule was a faulty rule, and the committee will have to again consider the matter.

**ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1971**

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

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

There was no objection.

**DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT**

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

**CREATING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RESTAURANT**

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 317 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

**H. RES. 317**

*Resolved*, That (a) there is hereby created, as of January 3, 1971, a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on the House Restaurant, which shall be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, not more than three of whom shall be of the majority party, and one of whom shall be designated as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) In the Ninety-second Congress, the select committee shall exercise direction and supervision over the immediate management and operation of the House Restaurant and the cafeteria and other food service facilities of the House of Representatives, subject to the authority of the Committee on House Administration as provided in section 2 of this resolution.

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other authority with respect to the jurisdiction and control over the management of the House

Restaurant and the cafeteria and other food service facilities of the House of Representatives, the jurisdiction over such restaurant and facilities and authority over the direction and supervision of the immediate management and operation thereof shall be vested in the Committee on House Administration; and the immediate management and operation of such restaurant and facilities may be vested in such official or other authority, acting as the agent of the committee, as the committee may designate; and the official or authority so designated shall perform the duties vested in the Architect of the Capitol by section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 1056; Public, No. 812, Seventy-sixth Congress; 40 U.S.C. 174k).

(b) The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to transfer, as the Committee on House Administration directs, all accounts, records, supplies, equipment, and assets of the House Restaurant and the cafeteria and other food service facilities of the House which are in the possession or under the control of the Architect of the Capitol in order that all such items may be available for the maintenance and operation of the House Restaurant under the authority of, and as directed by, the Committee on House Administration.

(c) All authority, responsibility, and functions vested in or imposed upon the Architect of the Capitol in connection with the special deposit account established by section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (40 U.S.C. 174k), shall be vested in or imposed upon such other official, authority, or authorities as the Committee on House Administration may designate.

(d) The provisions of this section shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month beginning after the date of adoption of this resolution, until otherwise provided by law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution came before the Rules Committee with two witnesses, both of whom indicated there was no disagreement on either of the committees involved. The two witnesses were the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) and the chairman of the House Restaurant Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI). They agreed that they both favored and the members of their committees favored the proposal contained in House Resolution 317, which, in effect, continues the House Restaurant Committee and takes the jurisdiction of the House restaurants and other facilities now vested in the Architect of the Capitol and places it rather in the Committee on House Administration.

As far as I know there is no disagreement with this. There was an indication that this might save a little bit of money, because the Committee on House Administration had an adequate number of auditors to handle the various accounts of the House restaurant and cafeteria facilities and thus there would not have to be an auditing staff in the Capitol Architect's office for that purpose.

As far as I know, there is no opposition to this.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have no opposition to the resolution, but I wonder if the need is more for an audit than it is for a collection agency to take over in certain areas with respect to the dining rooms?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman really has no knowledge on which to base a comment in reply to the gentleman's remarks.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The Committee on House Administration has no information on that, because there has never been vested in the committee the power to find out about it.

I believe the gentleman is aware that if the thing he mentions exists nobody like the Architect of the Capitol is going to put much pressure on any Member of the House to pay up. On the other hand, if such conditions exist—and I have only heard rumors—I believe a committee of the House would be in a position to apply pressure.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure they have in the past, if not in the present. I hope that this will cure some of the things that have been going on.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding of House Resolution 317 is the same as that which was just given by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) both testified before our committee this was what was wanted, this was a desirable thing to do. Accordingly, that is what we are suggesting the House do.

I have no requests for time, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 317.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 92-75)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

When I suggested in my State of the Union Message that "most Americans today are simply fed up with government at all levels," there was some surprise that such a sweeping indictment of government would come from within the government itself. Yet it is precisely there, within the government itself, that

frustration with government is often most deeply experienced.

A President and his associates often feel that frustration as they try to fulfill their promises to the people. Legislators feel that frustration as they work to carry out the hopes of their constituents. And dedicated civil servants feel that frustration as they strive to achieve in action the goals which have been established in law.

#### GOOD MEN AND BAD MECHANISMS

The problem with government is not, by and large, the people in government. It is a popular thing, to be sure, for the public to blame elected officials and for elected officials to blame appointed officials when government fails to perform. There are times when such criticism is clearly justified. But after a quarter century of observing government from a variety of vantage points, I have concluded that the people who work in government are more often the victims than the villains when government breaks down. Their spirit has usually been willing. It is the structure that has been weak.

Good people cannot do good things with bad mechanisms. But bad mechanisms can frustrate even the noblest aims. That is why so many public servants—of both political parties, of high rank and low, in both the legislative and executive branches—are often disenchanting with government these days. That is also why so many voters feel that the results of elections make remarkably little difference in their lives.

Just as inadequate organization can frustrate good men and women, so it can dissipate good money. At the Federal level alone we have spent some \$1.1 trillion on domestic programs over the last 25 years, but we have not realized a fair return on this investment. The more we spend, the more it seems we need to spend and while our tax bills are getting bigger our problems are getting worse.

No, the major cause of the ineffectiveness of government is not a matter of men or of money. It is principally a matter of machinery. It will do us little good to change personnel or to provide more resources unless we are willing to undertake a critical review of government's overall design.

Most people do not pay much attention to mechanical questions. What happens under the hood of their automobile, for example, is something they leave to the specialists at the garage. What they do care about, however, is how well the automobile performs. Similarly, most people are willing to leave the mechanical questions of government organization to those who have specialized in that subject—and to their elected leaders. But they do care very deeply about how well the government performs.

At this moment in our history, most Americans have concluded that government is not performing well. It promises much, but it does not deliver what it promises. The great danger, in my judgment, is that this momentary disillusionment with government will turn into a more profound and lasting loss of faith.

We must fight that danger. We must

restore the confidence of the people in the capacities of their government. In my view, that obligation now requires us to give more profound and more critical attention to the question of government organization than any single group of American leaders has done since the Constitutional Convention adjourned in Philadelphia in September of 1787. As we strive to bring about a new American Revolution, we must recognize that central truth which those who led the original American Revolution so clearly understood: often it is *how* the government is put together that determines how *well* the government can do its job.

This is not a partisan matter, for there is no Republican way and no Democratic way to reorganize the government. This is not a matter for dogmatic dispute, for there is no single, ideal blueprint which will immediately bring good order to Federal affairs. Nor is this a matter to be dealt with once and then forgotten. For it is important that our political institutions remain constantly responsive to changing times and changing problems.

#### RENEWED INTEREST IN COMPREHENSIVE REFORM

The last two years have been a time of renewed interest in the question of how government is organized. The Congress has instituted a number of reforms in its own procedures and is considering others. Judicial reform—at all levels of government—has also become a matter of intense concern. The relationship between various levels of government has attracted increased attention—and so, of course, has the subject of executive reform.

This administration, with the counsel and the cooperation of the Congress, has taken a number of steps to reorganize the executive branch of the Federal Government. We have set up a new Domestic Council and a new Office of Management and Budget in the Executive Office of the President. We have created a new Environmental Protection Agency and a new United States Postal Service. We have worked to rationalize the internal structure of Federal departments and agencies.

All of these and other changes have been important, but none has been comprehensive. And now we face a fundamental choice. We can continue to tinker with the machinery and to make constructive changes here and there—each of them bringing some marginal improvement in the Government's capacities. Or we can step back, take a careful look, and then make a concerted and sustained effort to reorganize the executive branch according to a coherent, comprehensive view of what the Federal Government of this Nation *ought* to look like in the last third of the twentieth century.

The impulse for comprehensive reorganization has been felt before in recent decades. In fact, the recommendations I am making today stem from a long series of studies which have been made under several administrations over many years. From the report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management (the Brownlow Committee) in 1937, down through the findings of

the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (the Hoover Commission) in 1949, the President's Task Force on Government Organization in 1964, and my own Advisory Council on Executive Organization during the last two years, the principles which I am advancing today have been endorsed by a great number of distinguished students of government and management from many backgrounds and from both political parties.

I hope the Congress will now join me in concluding, with these authorities, that we should travel the course of comprehensive reform. For only if we travel that course, and travel it successfully, will we be able to answer affirmatively in our time the fundamental question posed by Alexander Hamilton as the Constitution was being debated in 1788: "whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice. . . ."

#### THE FRAGMENTATION OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

As we reflect on organizational problems in the Federal Government today, one seems to stand out above all others: the fact that the capacity to do things—the power to achieve goals and to solve problems—is exceedingly fragmented and broadly scattered throughout the Federal establishment. In addressing almost any of the great challenges of our time, the Federal Government finds itself speaking through a wide variety of offices and bureaus, departments and agencies. Often these units trip over one another as they move to meet a common problem. Sometimes they step on one another's toes. Frequently, they behave like a series of fragmented fiefdoms—unable to focus Federal resources or energies in a way which produces any concentrated impact.

Consider these facts:

Nine different Federal departments and twenty independent agencies are now involved in education matters. Seven departments and eight independent agencies are involved in health. In many major cities, there are at least twenty or thirty separate manpower programs, funded by a variety of Federal offices. Three departments help develop our water resources and four agencies in two departments are involved in the management of public lands. Federal recreation areas are administered by six different agencies in three departments of the government. Seven agencies provide assistance for water and sewer systems. Six departments of the government collect similar economic information—often from the same sources—and at least seven departments are concerned with international trade. While we cannot eliminate all of this diffusion, we can do a great deal to bring similar functions under common commands.

It is important that we move boldly to consolidate the major activities of the Government. The programmatic jumble has already reached the point where it is virtually impossible to obtain an accurate count of just how many Federal grant programs exist. Some estimates go as high as 1,500. Despite impressive at-

tempts by individual legislators and by the Office of Economic Opportunity, there is still no agreement on a comprehensive list. Again and again I hear of local officials who are unable to determine how many Federal programs serve their areas or how much Federal money is coming into their communities. One reason is that the assistance comes from such a wide variety of Federal sources.

#### THE CONSEQUENCES OF SCATTERED RESPONSIBILITY

What are the consequences of this scattering of Federal responsibility? There are many.

In the first place, the diffusion of responsibility makes it extremely difficult to launch a coordinated attack on complex problems. It is as if the various units of an attacking army were operating under a variety of highly independent commands. When one part of the answer to a problem lies in one department and other parts lie in other departments, it is often impossible to bring the various parts together in a unified campaign to achieve a common goal.

Even our basic analysis of public needs often suffers from a piecemeal approach. Problems are defined so that they will fit within established jurisdictions and bureaucratic conventions. And the results of Government action are typically measured by the degree of activity within each program rather than by the overall impact of related activities on the outside world.

The role of a given department in the policy making process can be fundamentally compromised by the way its mission is defined. The narrower the mission, the more likely it is that the department will see itself as an advocate within the administration for a special point of view. When any department or agency begins to represent a parochial interest, then its advice and support inevitably become less useful to the man who must serve *all* of the people as their President.

Even when departments make a concerted effort to broaden their perspectives, they often find it impossible to develop a comprehensive strategy for meeting public needs. Not even the best planners can set intelligent spending priorities, for example, unless they have an opportunity to consider the full array of alternative expenditures. But if one part of the problem is studied in one department and another part of the problem is studied elsewhere, who decides which element is more important? If one office considers one set of solutions and a separate agency investigates another set of solutions, who can compare the results? Too often, no official below the very highest levels of the Government has access to enough information to make such comparisons wisely. The result is that the Government often fails to make a rational distribution of its resources among a number of program alternatives.

Divided responsibility can also mean that some problems slip between the cracks and disappear from the Government's view. Everybody's business be-

comes nobody's business and embarrassing gaps appear which no agency attempts to fill. At other times, various Federal authorities act as rivals, competing with one another for the same piece of "turf."

Sometimes one agency will actually duplicate the work of another; for instance, the same locality may receive two or more grants for the same project. On other occasions, Federal offices will actually find themselves working at cross purposes with one another; one agency will try to preserve a swamp, for example, while another is seeking to drain it. In an effort to minimize such problems, government officials must spend enormous amounts of time and energy negotiating with one another that should be directed toward meeting people's needs. And even when they are able to work out their differences, officials often reach compromise solutions which merely represent the lowest common denominator of their original positions. Bold and original ideas are thus sacrificed in the quest for intragovernmental harmony.

Scattered responsibility also contributes to the overcentralization of public decision making. Because competing offices are often in different chains of command, it is frequently impossible for them to resolve their differences except by referring them to higher authorities, a process which can mean interminable delays. In an attempt to provide a means for resolving such differences and for providing needed coordination, an entire new layer of bureaucracy has emerged at the *interagency* level. Last year, the Office of Management and Budget counted some 850 interagency committees. Even so, there are still many occasions when only the White House itself can resolve such interjurisdictional disputes. Too many questions thus surface at the Presidential level that should be resolved at levels of Government closer to the scene of the action.

Inefficient organization at the Federal level also undermines the effectiveness of State and local governments. Mayors and Governors waste countless hours and dollars touching base with a variety of Federal offices—each with its own separate procedures and its own separate policies. Some local officials are so perplexed by the vast array of Federal programs in a given problem area that they miss out on the very ones that would be most helpful to them. Many State and local governments find they must hire expensive specialists to guide them through the jungles of the Federal bureaucracy.

If it is confusing for lower levels of government to deal with this maze of Federal offices, that challenge can be even more bewildering for individual citizens. Whether it is a doctor seeking aid for a new health center, a businessman trying to get advice about selling in foreign markets, or a welfare recipient going from one office to another in order to take full advantage of Federal services, the people whom the Government is supposed to be serving are often forced to weave their way through a perplexing obstacle course as a condition of receiving help.

## THE HOBBLING OF ELECTED LEADERSHIP

Perhaps the most significant consequence of scattered responsibility in the executive branch is the hobbling effect it has on elected leadership—and, therefore, on the basic principles of democratic government. In our political system, when the people identify a problem they elect to public office men and women who promise to solve that problem. If these leaders succeed, they can be re-elected; if they fail, they can be replaced. Elections are the people's tool for keeping government responsive to their needs.

This entire system rests on the assumption, however, that elected leaders can make the Government respond to the people's mandate. Too often, this assumption is wrong. When lines of responsibility are as tangled and as ambiguous as they are in many policy areas, it is extremely difficult for either the Congress or the President to see that their intentions are carried out.

If the President or the Congress wants to launch a program or change a program or even find out how a program is working, it often becomes necessary to consult with a half dozen or more authorities, each of whom can blame the others when something goes wrong. It is often impossible to delegate to any one official the full responsibility for carrying out a specific mandate, since the machinery for doing that job is divided among various agencies. As a result, there is frequently no single official—even at the Cabinet level—whom the President or the Congress can hold accountable for Government's success or failure in meeting a given need.

No wonder bureaucracy has sometimes been described as "the rule of no one." No wonder the public complains about programs which simply seem to drift. When elected officials cannot hold appointees accountable for the performance of government, then the voters' influence on government's behavior is also weakened.

## HOW DID THINGS GET THIS WAY?

The American people clearly pay a very high price for the incapacities of governmental structures—one that is measured in disappointment, frustration and wasted tax dollars. But how did things get this way?

What happened, essentially, was that the organization of Government—like the grant-in-aid programs which I have discussed in my special messages to the Congress concerning revenue sharing—grew up in a haphazard, piecemeal fashion over the years. Whenever Government took on an important new assignment or identified an important new constituency, the chances were pretty good that a new organizational entity would be established to deal with it. Unfortunately, as each new office was set up, little or no attention was given to the question of how it would fit in with the old ones. Thus office was piled upon office in response to developing needs; when new needs arose and still newer units were created, the older structures simply remained in place.

Of the twelve executive departments

now in existence, only five can trace their origins to the beginnings of our country. The Departments of State and Treasury were set up in 1789; so was the War Department—the predecessor of the Department of Defense. The positions of Attorney General and Postmaster General were also established in 1789, though it was not until later that the departments they head were set up in their present form. One of these five units, the Post Office Department, will soon become an independent corporation. But, under my proposals, the other four "original" departments would remain intact. It is the seven newer departments of the Government which would be affected by the changes I recommend.

These seven departments were set up to meet the changing needs of a growing nation, needs which have continued to change over the years. The Department of the Interior, for example, was established in 1849 to deal with newly opened western lands and especially with the Indians who inhabited them. The Department of Agriculture was also added in the nineteenth century, at a time when the overwhelming majority of our people were directly affected by the tremendous expansion of agricultural enterprise. In the early years of the twentieth century, in a time of rapid and unsettling industrial growth, the Department of Commerce and Labor was set up. The Labor Department was split off from it in 1913, in response to feelings that labor was suffering from an imbalance of power and needed additional influence. The three newest departments of the Government—Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation—were all created after World War II. Each represented a first step toward bringing together some of the new Federal offices and agencies which had proliferated so rapidly in recent decades.

## ORGANIZING AROUND GOALS

As we look at the present organization of the Federal Government, we find that many of the existing units deal with methods and subjects rather than with purposes and goals. If we have a question about labor we go to the Labor Department and if we have a business problem we go to the Commerce Department. If we are interested in housing we go to one department and if we are interested in highways we go to another.

The problem is that as our society has become more complex, we often find ourselves using a *variety of means* to achieve a *single set of goals*. We are interested, for example, in economic development—which requires new markets, more productive workers and better transportation systems. But which department do we go to for that? And what if we want to build a new city, with sufficient public facilities, adequate housing, and decent recreation areas—which department do we petition then?

We sometimes seem to have forgotten that government is not in business to deal with subjects on a chart but to achieve real objectives for real human beings. These objectives will never be

fully achieved unless we change our old ways of thinking. It is not enough merely to reshuffle departments for the sake of reshuffling them. We must rebuild the executive branch according to a new understanding of how government can best be organized to perform effectively.

The key to that new understanding is the concept that the executive branch of the government should be organized around basic goals. Instead of grouping activities by narrow subjects or by limited constituencies, we should organize them around the great purposes of government in modern society. For only when a department is set up to achieve a given set of purposes, can we effectively hold that department accountable for achieving them. Only when the responsibility for realizing basic objectives is clearly focused in a specific governmental unit, can we reasonably hope that those objectives will be realized.

When government is organized by goals, then we can fairly expect that it will pay more attention to results and less attention to procedures. Then the success of government will at last be clearly linked to the things that happen in society rather than the things that happen in government.

Under the proposals which I am submitting, those in the Federal Government who deal with common or closely related problems would work together in the same organizational framework. Each department would be given a mission broad enough so that it could set comprehensive policy directions and resolve internally the policy conflicts which are most likely to arise. The responsibilities of each department would be defined in a way that minimizes parochialism and enables the President and the Congress to hold specific officials responsible for the achievement of specific goals.

These same organizational principles would also be applied to the *internal* organization of each department. Similar functions would be grouped together within each new entity, making it still easier to delegate authority to lower levels and further enhancing the accountability of subordinate officials. In addition, the proposals I submit today include a number of improvements in the management of Federal programs, so that we can take full advantage of the opportunities afforded us by organizational restructuring.

The administration is today transmitting to the Congress four bills which, if enacted, would replace seven of the present executive departments and several other agencies with four new departments: the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Community Development, the Department of Human Resources and the Department of Economic Affairs. A special report and summary—which explain my recommendations in greater detail—have also been prepared for each of the proposed new departments.

## THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

One of the most notable developments in public consciousness in recent years has been a growing concern for protecting the environment and a growing

awareness of its highly interdependent nature. The science of ecology—the study of the interrelationships between living organisms and their environments—has experienced a sudden rise in popularity. All of us have become far more sensitive to the way in which each element of our natural habitat affects all other elements.

Unfortunately, this understanding is not yet reflected in the way our Government is organized. Various parts of the *interdependent* environment are still under the purview of highly *independent* Federal offices. As a result, Federal land policies, water programs, mineral policies, forestry practices, recreation activities and energy programs cannot be easily coordinated, even though the manner in which each is carried out has a great influence on all the others.

Again and again we encounter intra-governmental conflicts in the environmental area. One department's watershed project, for instance, threatens to slow the flow of water to another department's reclamation project downstream. One agency wants to develop an electric power project on a certain river while other agencies are working to keep the same area wild. Different departments follow different policies for timber production and conservation, for grazing, for fire prevention and for recreational activities on the Federal lands they control, though the lands are often contiguous.

We cannot afford to continue in this manner. The challenges in the natural resource field have become too pressing. Some forecasts say that we will double our usage of energy in the next 10 years, of water in the next 18 years, and of metals in the next 22 years. In fact, it is predicted that the United States will use more energy and more critical resources in the remaining years of this century than in all of our history up until now. Government must perform at its very best if it is to help the Nation meet these challenges.

I propose that a new Department of Natural Resources be created that would bring together the many natural resource responsibilities now scattered throughout the Federal Government. This Department would work to conserve, manage, and utilize our resources in a way that would protect the quality of the environment and achieve a true harmony between man and nature. The major activities of the new Department would be organized under its five subdivisions: Land and Recreation Resources, Water Resources, Energy and Minerals Resources, Oceanic, Atmospheric and Earth Sciences, and Indian and Territorial Affairs.

The new Department of Natural Resources would absorb the present Department of the Interior. Other major programs which would be joined to it would include: The Forest Service and the soil and water conservation programs from the Department of Agriculture, planning and funding for the civil functions of the Army Corps of Engineers and for the civilian power functions of the Atomic Energy Commission, the interagency Water Resources Council, the oil and gas

pipeline safety functions of the Department of Transportation, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration from the Department of Commerce. Because of their historical association with the Department of the Interior, the programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs would be administered by the new Department until such time as an acceptable alternative arrangement could be worked out with Indian leaders and other concerned parties.

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

A restless and highly mobile people, Americans are constantly creating new communities and renewing old ones throughout our land. In an era of rapid change, this process—which once took generations—can now be repeated in just a few years.

At the same time, the process of community development is becoming even more complex, particularly as the problems of urban and rural communities begin to merge. The elements of community life are many and the mark of a cohesive community is the harmonious way in which they interrelate. That is why we hear so much these days about the importance of community planning. And that is why it is essential that Federal aid for community development be designed to meet a wide range of related needs in a highly coordinated manner.

Often this does not happen under the present system. The reason is that the basic community development programs of the Federal Government are presently divided among at least eight separate authorities—including four executive departments and four independent agencies.

A community that seeks development assistance thus finds that it has to search out aid from a variety of Federal agencies. Each agency has its own forms and regulations and timetables—and its own brand of red tape. Each has its own field organizations, often with independent and overlapping boundaries for regions and districts. Sometimes a local community must consult with Federal offices in three or four different States.

The result is that local leaders often find it virtually impossible to relate Federal assistance programs to their own local development strategies. The mayor of one small town has observed that by the time he finishes dealing with eight Federal planning agencies, he has little time to do anything else.

Occasionally, it must be admitted, a community can reap unexpected benefits from this diffusion of Federal responsibility. The story is told of one small city that applied to six different agencies for help in building a sewage treatment plant and received affirmative responses from all six. If all the grants had been completed, the community would have cleared a handsome profit—but at the Federal taxpayers' expense.

To help correct such problems, I propose that the major community development functions of the Federal Government be pulled together into a new Department of Community Development. It would be the overriding purpose of this Department to help build a wholesome

and safe community environment for every American. This process would require a comprehensive series of programs which are equal to the demands of growing population and which provide for balanced growth in urban and rural areas. The new Department would operate through three major administrations: a Housing Administration, a Community Transportation Administration and an Urban and Rural Development Administration. A fourth unit, the Federal Insurance Administration, would be set up administratively by the Secretary.

The new Department of Community Development would absorb the present Department of Housing and Urban Development. Other components would include certain elements of the Economic Development Administration and the Regional Commission programs from the Department of Commerce, the independent Appalachian Regional Commission, various Department of Agriculture programs including water and waste disposal grants and loans, the Rural Electrification Administration, and rural housing programs. The Community Action and Special Impact Programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity would be included, as would the Public Library construction grant program from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and certain disaster assistance functions now handled by the Office of Emergency Preparedness and the Small Business Administration. Most Federal highway programs and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration would be transferred from the present Department of Transportation.

I would note that while the Department of Transportation is a relatively new entity, it, too, is now organized around methods and not around purposes. A large part of the Department of Transportation would be moved into the new Department of Economic Affairs—but those functions which particularly support community development would be placed in the Department which is designed to meet that goal.

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

The price of obsolete organization is evidenced with special force in those Government programs which are directly designed to serve individuals and families. In part this is because there has been so much new legislation in the human resource field in recent decades; the old machinery is simply overstrained by its new challenges. But whatever the reasons, human resource programs comprise one area in which the Government is singularly ill-equipped to deliver adequate results.

I have already commented on the broad dispersion of Federal health and education activities. Similar examples abound. Income support programs, including those which administer food stamps, welfare payments, retirement benefits and other forms of assistance, are scattered among three departments and a number of other agencies. The Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity all handle food and nutrition matters.

Child care programs, migrant programs, manpower programs, and consumer programs often suffer from similarly divided attention.

In one city, two vocational training centers were built three blocks apart at about the same time and for the same purpose, with money from two different Federal agencies. And for every case of overattention, there are many more of neglect. Consider the plight of a poor person who must go to one office for welfare assistance, to another for food stamps, to another for financial counseling, to still another for legal aid, to a fifth office for employment assistance, to a sixth place for job training, and to a number of additional offices for various kinds of medical help. The social worker who might guide him through this maze often works in still another location.

Such situations are clearly intolerable, yet the Federal Government—which ought to be working to reform these confused systems—actually is responsible for much of the confusion in the first place.

I believe that we can take a major step toward remedying such problems by establishing a new Department of Human Resources which would unify major Federal efforts to assist the development of individual potential and family well-being. This Department would be subdivided, in turn, into three major administrations: Health, Human Development, and Income Security.

This new Department would incorporate most of the present Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the following significant additions: A number of food protection, food distribution, and nutrition programs from the Department of Agriculture, the College Housing program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the independent Railroad Retirement Board, various programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity (including nutrition, health, family planning, alcoholism, and drug rehabilitation efforts), and the Manpower Administration, the Women's Bureau, the Unemployment Insurance program and a number of other employment service and training activities from the Department of Labor.

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

One of the first things most students learn about economics is that the material progress of our civilization has resulted in large measure from a growing division of labor. While a single family or a single community once provided most of its own goods and services, it now specializes in providing only a few, depending increasingly on a far-flung, intricate network of other people and other organizations for its full economic well-being.

The only way the Federal Government can deal effectively with such a highly interdependent economy is by treating a wide range of economic considerations in a comprehensive and coordinated manner. And—as our gross national product moves beyond the trillion-dollar level and as our productive system, which now accounts for approximately 40 percent of the world's wealth, encounters new challenges from other nations—it is becoming

even more important that Federal economic policies be carried out as effectively as possible.

But again, the organization of the Government works against the systematic consideration of economic complexities. The step by step evolution of our Federal machinery has created a series of separate entities—each handling a separate part of the economic puzzle. Some of these entities are relatively autonomous units within departments. Others are independent agencies. But perhaps the most dramatic evidence of our fragmented approach to the economy is the existence of four major executive departments which handle highly interdependent economic matters: Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and Transportation.

This situation can seriously impair governmental efforts to respond effectively to economic challenges. One department, for example, may be concerned with the raw materials a given industry receives from the farms, while a second department is concerned with getting these materials to the factory and getting the product to its market. Meanwhile, a third department is concerned with the workers who harvest the crops, run the transportation systems and manufacture the product, while a fourth department is concerned with the businessmen who own the plant where the product is made and the stores where it is merchandised.

Such a division of responsibility can also create a great deal of overlap. The Agriculture Department, for instance, finds that its interest in agricultural labor is shared by the Labor Department, its regard for agricultural enterprise is shared by the Small Business Administration, and its concern for providing sufficient transportation for farm products is shared by the Department of Transportation. The Commerce, Labor and Agriculture Departments duplicate one another in collecting economic statistics, yet they use computers and statistical techniques which are often incompatible.

It has sometimes been argued that certain interest groups need a department to act as their special representative within the Government. In my view, such an arrangement serves the best interests of neither the special group nor the general public. Little is gained and much can be lost, for example, by treating our farmers or our workers or other groups as if they are independent participants in our economic life. Their problems cannot be adequately treated in isolation; their well-being is intimately related to the way our entire economy functions.

I would not suggest these reforms if I thought they would in any way result in the neglect of farmers, workers, minorities or any other significant groups within our country. To the contrary, I propose these reforms because I am convinced they will enable us to serve these groups much better. Under my proposals, the new Department of Economic Affairs would be in a much stronger position really to do something about the wide-ranging factors which influence

farm income than is the present Department of Agriculture, for example. It could do more to meet the complex needs of workingmen and women than can the present Department of Labor. It would be able to pull together a wider range of resources to help minority businessmen than can the present Department of Commerce.

Federal organization in the economic area has been the target of frequent criticism over the years. During the previous administration alone, two special studies of executive organization recommended that it be substantially altered. I have received a similar recommendation from my Advisory Council on Executive Organization.

I am therefore recommending to the Congress that a new Department of Economic Affairs be established to promote economic growth, to foster economic justice, and to encourage more efficient and more productive relationships among the various elements of our economy and between the United States economy and those of other nations. As this single new Department joined the Treasury Department, the Council of Economic Advisers and the Federal Reserve Board in shaping economic policy, it would speak with a stronger voice and would offer a more effective, more highly integrated viewpoint than four different departments can possibly do at present. The activities of the new Department would be grouped under the following six administrations: Business Development, Farms and Agriculture, Labor Relations and Standards, National Transportation, Social, Economic, and Technical Information and International Economics.

The new Department of Economic Affairs would include many of the offices that are now within the Departments of Commerce, Labor and Agriculture. A large part of the Department of Transportation would also be relocated here, including the United States Coast Guard, the Federal Railroad Administration, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the National Transportation Safety Board, the Transportation Systems Center, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Motor Carrier Safety Bureau and most of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The Small Business Administration, the Science Information Exchange program from the Smithsonian Institution, the National Institute for Occupational Health and Safety from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Technology Utilization from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration would also be included in the new Department.

#### OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL REFORMS

Regrouping functions among departments can do a great deal to enhance the effectiveness of government. It should be emphasized, however, that regrouping functions within departments is also a critical part of my program for executive reform. Just as like tasks are grouped together within a given department, so similar operations should be rationally assembled within subordinate units. Such a realignment of functions, in and of itself, would make it much easier for

appointed officials to manage their agencies and for both the President and the Congress to see that their intentions are carried out.

Toward this same end, I am recommending to the Congress a number of additional steps for bringing greater managerial discipline into Government. In the first place, I am proposing that the Department Secretary and his office be considerably strengthened so that the man whom the President appoints to run a department has both the authority and the tools to run it effectively. The Secretary would be given important managerial discretion that he does not always enjoy today, including the ability to appoint many key department officials, to delegate authority to them and to withdraw or change such delegations of authority, and to marshal and deploy the resources at his command so that he can readily focus the talent available to him at the point of greatest need.

Each of the new Secretaries would be provided with a Deputy Secretary and two Under Secretaries to help him meet his responsibilities. In addition, each major program area within a department would be headed by a high-level administrator who would be responsible for effectively managing a particular group of related activities. These officials would be appointed by the President and their appointments would be subject to Senate confirmation.

It is my philosophy that we should give clear assignments to able leaders—and then be sure that they are equipped to carry them out. As a part of this same effort, we should do all we can to give the best new management tools to those who run the new departments. There is no better time to introduce needed procedural changes *within* departments than a time of structural change *among* departments. We can reap great benefits if we take advantage of this opportunity by implementing the most advanced techniques and equipment for such tasks as planning and evaluation, data collection, systematic budgeting, and personnel administration.

Finally, I would again stress in this message—as I have in my discussions of revenue sharing—the importance of decentralizing government activities as much as possible. As I have already observed, the consolidation of domestic departments would do a great deal to facilitate decentralization, since it would produce fewer interagency disputes that require resolution at higher levels. It is also true, as many management experts have pointed out, that as the reliability and scope of information expand at higher levels of government, officials can delegate authority to lower levels with greater confidence that it will be used well.

In addition to the consolidation of functions, I am also proposing a reform of the field structures of the Federal Government that would also promote decentralization. Each Department, for example, would appoint a series of Regional Directors who would represent the Secretary with respect to all Department activities in the field. Planning, coordination and the resolution of

conflicts could thus be more readily achieved without Washington's involvement, since there would be a "Secretarial presence" at the regional level. Further coordination at lower levels of government would be provided by strengthening the ten Regional Councils which include as members the Regional Directors of various departments in a given area of the country.

In the first months of my administration I moved to establish common regional boundaries and regional headquarters for certain domestic departments. I observed at that time that the Federal Government has never given adequate attention to the way in which its departments are organized to carry out their missions in the field. It is now time that we remedied this pattern of neglect. Even the best organized and best managed departments in Washington cannot serve the people adequately if they have to work through inadequate field structures.

Industry and government both have found that even the largest organizations can be run effectively when they are organized according to rational principles and managed according to sound techniques. There is nothing mystical about these principles or these techniques; they can be used to make the Federal Government far more effective in a great many areas.

As we consolidate and rationalize Federal functions, as we streamline and modernize our institutional architecture, as we introduce new managerial techniques and decentralize Government activities, we will give Government the capacity to operate far more efficiently than it does today. It will be able to do more work with fewer mechanisms and fewer dollars. It will be able to use its work force more productively. This could mean significant savings for our taxpayers. I would emphasize, however, that any reductions in the Federal work force attributable to this proposal would come by normal turnover; no civil servant should lose his job as a result of this plan.

It is important that these reforms be seen by our civil servants not as a threat to their security but as an opportunity for greater achievement. We have worked hard to bring able people into Government employment. Executive reorganization can help the Nation make even better use of their talent and their dedication and it can also make it easier for us to attract more men and women of great vision and competence into public service at the Federal level.

#### FOCUSING POWER WHERE IT CAN BE USED BEST

These proposals for reorganizing the Federal Government are a natural complement to my proposals for revenue sharing; there is a sense in which these two initiatives represent two sides of the same coin. Both programs can help us decentralize government, so that more decisions can be made at levels closer to the people. More than that, both programs are concerned with restoring the general capacity of government to meet its responsibilities.

On the one hand, through revenue

sharing, we would give back to the States and localities those functions which belong at the State and local level. To help them perform those functions more effectively, we would give them more money to spend and more freedom in spending it. At the same time, however, we must also do all we can to help the Federal Government handle as effectively as possible those functions which belong at the Federal level. Executive reorganization can help us achieve this end by bringing together related activities which are now fragmented and scattered.

A healthy Federal system is one in which we neither disperse power for the sake of dispersing it nor concentrate power for the sake of concentrating it. Instead, a sound Federal system requires us to *focus* power at that place where it can be used to the greatest public advantage. This means that each level of government must be assigned those tasks which it can do best and must be given the means for carrying out those assignments.

#### THE CENTRAL QUESTION

Ever since the first settlers stepped upon our shores more than three centuries ago, a central question of the American experience has been: How do we best organize our government to meet the needs of the people? That was the central question as the colonists set up new governments in a new world. It was the central question when they broke from their mother country and made a new nation. It was the central question as they wrote a new Constitution in 1787 and, at each critical turning point since that time, it has remained a dominant issue in our national experience.

In the last forty years, as the Federal Government has grown in scope and complexity, the question of how it should be organized has been asked with even greater intensity and relevance. During this time, we have moved to formulate responsive answers to this question in an increasingly systematic manner. Searching studies of Government management and organization have been made under virtually every national administration since the 1930s and many needed reforms have resulted.

What is now required, however, is a truly comprehensive restructuring of executive organization, one that is commensurate with the growth of the Nation and the expansion of the government. In the last twenty years alone our population has increased by one-third and the Federal budget has quintupled. In the last two decades, the number of Federal civilian employees has risen by almost 30 percent and the domestic programs they administer have multiplied tenfold. Three executive departments and fourteen independent agencies have been tacked on to the Federal organization chart during that brief span.

Yet it still is the same basic organization chart that has set the framework of governmental action for decades. While there have been piecemeal changes, there has been no fundamental overhaul. Any business that grew and changed so much and yet was so patient with old organizational forms would

soon go bankrupt. The same truth holds in the public realm. Public officials cannot be patient with outmoded forms when the people have grown so impatient with government.

Thomas Jefferson once put it this way: "I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions," he wrote, "but . . . laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

"Institutions must advance." Jefferson and his associates saw that point clearly in the late 18th century, and the fruit of their vision was a new nation. It is now for us—if our vision matches theirs—to renew the Government they created and thus give new life to our common dreams.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 25, 1971.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the last four decades more and more power has been concentrated in the Washington bureaucracy.

During that time the Congress appears to have been fascinated by sheer numbers—a fantastic increase in numbers of Government programs, numbers of Federal dollars allocated to those programs, and numbers of Federal workers employed in those programs.

The problems remain. In fact, the problems have become worse. And in recent years when Presidents have tried to point to progress they have talked in terms of increased dollar outlays rather than results.

This has brought crushing disappointment to the American people—a bitter realization that performance has fallen far short of political promises.

There is an inescapable conclusion—that the system is at fault, that thorough-going changes are needed in the fundamental structure of the Federal Government and the Federal aid system.

The President has sent us his proposals for Federal revenue sharing—and these are most welcome.

Today we have received the President's proposal for governmental reorganization. This, combined with revenue sharing, places us on the threshold of a new era in American political history, an era in which the people are given more control over their own destinies.

We need only look at the record and we must recognize that governmental reorganization is a must. In the past 20 years the number of Cabinet departments has increased from 9 to 12; the number of major independent agencies has increased from 27 to 41; the number of Federal employees has increased from 2.1 million to 2.7 million; the Federal

budget has increased from \$42 billion to more than \$200 billion; and the number of Federal programs has jumped more than ten fold to about 1,400.

We need wholesale reorganization of the Federal Government. We need to reorganize the executive branch along the lines of the functions served by various departments and agencies, not the constituencies they now serve.

This is the thrust of the President's plan—to organize the Federal Government by function. This, I believe, would eliminate overlapping and clear away the present complicated maze.

Our citizens are sick of the complexity of big government. They are sick of waste. They are sick of the miles and miles of red tape in which Government now is entangled—and the people with it.

I urge the Congress to give careful study to the President's proposals and to bring order out of chaos. The Congress must not stand in the way of progress.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have before us in the administration's proposals for executive branch reorganization one of the most important pieces of legislation in recent years. I hope we will begin hearings on the proposals promptly and take steps to enact reform of the Federal bureaucracy.

During the 1960's we established a number of Federal programs to alleviate human needs and to raise the quality of life in this country. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of these efforts was nullified by having to append them to departments and agencies not really geared to handle the increased work.

While we were eager to enact new legislation, we overlooked the necessity of seeing that the Government was structured in such a way as to execute the intent of the new laws. Education programs were scattered throughout several offices, as were health, welfare, and manpower training programs. This added to the overlapping of programs which had been slowly taking place for years.

Now we find that a total of 29 agencies have responsibilities for 180 education programs. Eight agencies look into cancer research. Thirty-eight groups have authority in the field of water resources. The list goes on and on.

If the programs we have enacted are to operate efficiently with the maximum aid to our constituents and a minimum of bureaucratic overlap, then we must reorganize the structure of the entire executive branch. We must draw together the related education programs, similar health programs, and so on in order that they can be managed effectively.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the subject of the President's proposal for governmental reorganization.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the need for the right to privacy bill becomes more self-evident with each day. Today we read in our newspapers that the FBI has engaged in surveillance, pursuant to the directions of its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, of school groups "organized to project the demands of black students." Last week we learned that Assistant Attorney General William H. Rehnquist who appeared before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights took the position that the Federal Government would be within its constitutional authority if it put Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., under surveillance. Mr. Rehnquist maintained that the Government has a right to gather information on citizens so long as it did not force an individual to disclose information or did not use the information in a court action. As a result of earlier testimony before Senator ERVIN's subcommittee we learned that the Army has been conducting surveillance of civilians from mid-1967 to mid-1970. I am appending some interesting correspondence that I have had on the subject of Army surveillance, with Robert E. Jordan III, General Counsel to the Department of the Army.

At the present time there are 76 cosponsors of H.R. 854. H.R. 854 would require each Government agency which maintains records concerning any individual to: notify the individual that such a record exists; notify the individual of all transfers of such information; disclose information from such records only with the consent of the individual or when legally required; maintain a record of all persons inspecting such records; and permit the individual to inspect his records, make copies of them, and supplement them.

I hope that the Government Operations Committee before which this bill is pending will hold hearings on this vital subject.

I urge our colleagues who are not yet cosponsors to join those of us who are.

The correspondence follows:

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL,

Cambridge, Mass., December 28, 1970.

HON. STANLEY RESOR,  
Secretary of the Army,  
Department of Defense,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RESOR: As former president of the student body of one of New York University's colleges (Washington Square College), I want to express to you my anger and disgust with the domestic espionage activity of the Army. That activity has caused immense damage to the nation; to the respect for the Constitution, to the relationship between the people and the government, to any remnant of faith in its institutions.

If the Government disapproves of this espionage and seeks to divest itself of responsibility, it cannot merely disassociate itself from the acts and internally reorganize. It must apply to itself its own method for correcting the wrongs of others. Those responsible—who planned and ordered—for this espionage against the people ought to be subject to criminal prosecution for abuse of authority. The Government must be willing to place its personnel and agents under

the same rule of law it promulgates for the people. Perhaps one of your agents was enrolled in a European History course and could report to you on the rise of constitutionalism.

I hope you have the integrity to deal with this scandal. However, I cannot help but wonder if I haven't just made myself a candidate for surveillance.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN BOCKIAN.

MEMORANDUM

To: Rep. Edward Koch  
From: Jonathan Bockian  
Subject: Army surveillance at N.Y.U.

The enclosed letter was sent to Secretary Resor regarding the recently disclosed surveillance of four New York City colleges. You will note from the letter my personal interest in the matter.

As a constituent of yours (60 East 8 Street) I would like you to try to find out for me if I or my government was under surveillance. I am interested in the period from January, 1969, to May, 1970. The name of our organization is the Washington Square College Student Council. To me, the uncertainty of Government espionage is as harmful as the fact.

Please write to me at: Shaw Hall No. 310, Everett Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Thank you.

JONATHAN BOCKIAN.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1971.

CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON,  
Department of the Army, The Pentagon,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about a matter brought to my attention by Jonathan Bockian, Shaw Hall No. 310, Everett Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

I have received the enclosed letter from Mr. Bockian regarding his desire to ascertain if he and/or the Washington Square College Student Council was under surveillance at any time during January 1969 through May 1970. In accordance with your existing procedures, I would appreciate receiving your comments on this matter so that I might advise him.

Thank you for your interest in this inquiry.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1971.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: The Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison has referred your letter to me for reply.

Your constituent has asked about a particular instance of surveillance by Army personnel. As you may know, all civil disturbance files kept at the local level were ordered destroyed as a result of a June 9, 1970 Army policy letter. Thus, it is difficult as well as time-consuming to attempt to investigate each allegation. Furthermore, since most of the specific incidents in question relate to situations which could not arise where personnel follow revised policies in effect in June 1970 or earlier, most such investigations serve no useful purpose. The enclosed statement of Mr. Robert F. Froehke, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), delivered on March 2, 1971 to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee does, however, indicate generally the results of previous Department of the Army and Department of Defense investigations into recent allegations by former military intelligence personnel.

Rather than focusing on the past, however, I believe it is much more worthwhile to recognize that the Department of the Army and Department of Defense have re-

cently devised a series of policies which will prevent the recurrence of the type of activities which are alleged to have occurred. Secretary Froehke's statement discusses these policies in considerable detail.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. JORDAN III,  
General Counsel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1971.

HON. ROBERT E. JORDAN III,  
General Counsel,  
Department of the Army,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JORDAN: Thank you for your letter of March 22 informing me that all civil disturbance files kept at the local level were ordered destroyed by the Army in June 1970. However, I understand that these files were duplicated by the Department of Defense and are now located at a higher echelon than the local level. Of what value is it to destroy the local level records if, in fact, their duplicates are still being retained? Consequently, I am still interested in ascertaining if the Washington Square College Student Council and the constituent who inquired were under surveillance at any time from January 1969 to May 1970.

I have no desire, as you stated you have no desire, to focus on the past and do appreciate the apparent change in your policies. But, it is important that if there is a continuing injustice, as appears to be present in this case, that it be rectified. This can only be accomplished by the destruction of all of these records relating to the subjects of my inquiry and all others similarly situated.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

[From the New York Times, March 25, 1971]  
OF STUDENTS, BLACKS, WAR FOES  
(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—Copies of Federal Bureau of Investigation documents that have been mailed anonymously to several newspapers and individuals indicate that the agency is engaged in active surveillance of student, Negro and peace groups.

The F.B.I. acknowledged today the authenticity of the documents and said they had been stolen from the two-man bureau office in Media, Pa., near Philadelphia, on March 8.

The documents suggest that F.B.I. surveillance of dissenters on the political left has been far more extensive than was generally known. They also show that the subjects of inquiries include obscure persons marginally suspected of illegal activity.

The disclosures come at a time of mounting controversy over reports of widespread Government surveillance.

A Justice Department source said that a distorted picture on the bureau activities had been given because the thieves had thus far circulated only 14 documents—relating to investigations of students, blacks and new Left groups—out of more than 800 documents that were stolen.

Surveillance discussed in the documents that have been put into circulation, ranges from an order by the bureau director, J. Edgar Hoover, to investigate all student groups "organized to project the demands of black students," to a paper noting an Idaho Boy Scout leader's plans to take his troop to the Soviet Union.

There is also a discussion of a bureau order to investigate all students, teachers, and scientists who had been in the Soviet Union at least a month, to determine if there had been attempts by Soviet intelligence agencies to recruit them.

In addition, the papers disclose that Mr. Hoover has given his approval for the limited recruitment of informers in the 18-to-21 age group.

Copies of the documents are known to

have been received by Senator George S. McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota; Representative Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat of Maryland; The New York Times, The Washington Post and The Los Angeles Times. The copies sent to The Times came in an envelope addressed to Tom Wicker, an associate editor and columnist. It bore a Princeton, N.J. postmark.

A letter signed by the Citizen's Commission to Investigate the F.B.I. said the documents had been taken as part of an effort to scrutinize the bureau's surveillance activities.

Apart from the 14 internal bureau communications and memorandums, most of which were typed on Government stationery, there was a report from the Swarthmore (Pa.) Police Department about black militant activities at Swarthmore College.

MEMO FROM HOOVER

The bureau's interest in student militancy is reflected in a memorandum of Nov. 4, 1970, by Mr. Hoover.

It said in part:

"Increased campus disorders involving black students pose a definite threat to the nation's stability and security and indicate need for increase in both quality and quantity of intelligence information on Black Student Unions and similar groups which are targets for influence and control by violence-prone Black Panther party and other extremists. . . .

We must target informants and sources to develop information regarding these groups on a continuing basis to fulfill our responsibilities and to develop such coverage where none exists.

"Effective immediately, all B.S.U.'s and similar organizations organized to project the demands of black students, which are not presently under investigation, are to be subjects of discreet, preliminary inquiries, limited to established sources and carefully conducted to avoid criticism. . . .

"Open individual cases on officers and key activists in each group to determine background and if their activities warrant active investigation."

Mr. Hoover specified that "this program will include junior colleges and two-year colleges as well as four-year colleges."

INFILTRATION ATTEMPTED

Other papers disclose that the bureau attempted to infiltrate a conference of war resisters at Haverford (Pa.) College in August, 1969, and at a convention of the National Association of Black Students at Wayne State in June, 1970.

There was also a report on a Berkeley University coed from Philadelphia who was said by one informer to be "an inveterate Marxist revolutionist" and by another informer to be an "average, liberal-minded student." The girl was not placed on the "Security Index."

One memorandum said that the telephone operator at an Eastern college showed to an F.B.I. agent long-distance telephone records of a philosophy teacher who was apparently suspected of harboring fugitives. The college security officer and the city's chief of police also provided information.

Several documents urged discretion in campus investigations, which are apparently governed by a special manual for checking on student groups.

Documents concerning black militant groups disclose that minute details are recorded involving activities within the Black Panther party and the National Black Economic Development Conference, which campaigned in 1969 to collect reparations from the nation's churches for "racial injustices."

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

The memorandums, apparently based on information from informers within the Philadelphia chapters of these two organizations, quote conversations involving financial difficulties and personal bickering. They also

include copies of the checking account statements of the Economic Conference's Philadelphia branch, obtained from the Southeast National Bank.

Assistant Attorney General William H. Rehnquist has argued in Senate hearings that noncoercive surveillance does not have a "chilling effect" on free political expression.

However, a newsletter from the Philadelphia bureau office has urged increased interviewing of people identified with the new left because "it will enhance the paranoia endemic in these circles and will further serve to get the point across there is an F.B.I. agent behind every mailbox."

"In addition," it said, "some will be overcome with the overwhelming personalities of the contacting agents and volunteer to tell all—perhaps on a continuing basis."

#### WHERE ARE THE MINING ENGINEERS? DEMAND INCREASES, SUPPLY DWINDLES

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, news stories day after day outline the plight of scientists and engineers and their various professions. Technological unemployment in specific fields is climbing while careers in other fields go begging. The glamour and enticements of the new fields of engineering ushered in with the atomic and space ages drained off much of the talent which normally would have gone into career fields related to mining and mineral resources.

Very few people can claim to have been farsighted about the effect of the new ideas demanding advanced technological skills after World War II.

As our universities turned their attention and curriculum development toward the stars and contemplated the promises of the atomic age, the traditional fields of science were relegated to lower and lower places in the academic hierarchy. Surely this was not by design, however, the effect of the atomic/space malaise on fundamental courses of engineering study was just as severe. We see the results now.

The science and technology which supports the exploration, extraction, processing, and utilization of the materials and energy which drives our Nation in a serious state. The number of universities with accredited mining departments has decreased in the past decade alone from 26 to 15. Last year, only 111 mineral engineers were graduated in the entire United States while the Soviet Union was training thousands in this field. I mentioned "demand"—the Bureau of Mines, alone, could have absorbed all of those graduated with mining specialties last year.

The state of technology in mineral industries in America is at a crisis point. This situation is not only a result of the lack of available new techniques in mining, but also because there is an inadequate supply of trained personnel to carry what new developments there are into the field. Support for research and instructional programs in institutions capable of providing it has been nothing short of scandalous. While every land-grant college is spending millions for

growth of our agricultural products, no such program of support exists for the mineral resources industry.

Every State in the Nation has a significant mineral industry component whether it be sand, gravel, building stone, oil, natural gas, coal, or metallic ores. Thus, every State has, or should have, an interest in seeing that the condition of the mining art is improved. Lands need not be destroyed forever. The 10,000 miles of acid streams in Appalachia need not be increased. Technology can do what must be done to extract our resources from the earth and at the same time preserve the quality of the environment. It is important to point out that the devastation of our land, air, and water has not been the result of technology, rather, it has been due to the lack of using the proper technology.

Cleaning up the environment is not the only pressure requiring a program to improve our mineral industry. There has been too little attention paid to the fact that with each day that passes, the United States becomes more and more dependent on foreign supplies; the ratio of the value of mineral imports to exports has tripled in the last decade. Are we going to let this trend continue unabated and thus place ourselves at the mercy of other nations?

The need for a strong, progressive, and environmentally aware U.S. mineral industry is obvious. But that segment of America's economic strength cannot grow, cannot develop new techniques of extraction and processing, cannot attract new talent, cannot encourage new capital investment, cannot develop methods of environmental protection unless there is a commitment to improvement. I believe such a declaration of intent must be made first by the Congress of the United States.

I have introduced a bill today to do just that. Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, of Washington; and Congressmen JAMES A. McCLURE, of Idaho; JOHN H. DENT and JOSEPH M. McDADE, of Pennsylvania; and WENDELL WYATT, of Oregon; have joined in sponsoring H.R. 6788 which would establish research centers throughout the country to promote a more adequate national program of mining and minerals research. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the text of the proposed legislation follows:

A bill to establish mining and mineral research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of mining and minerals research, to supplement the Act of December 31, 1970, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) This Act may be cited as the "Mining and Minerals Resources Research Act of 1971".*

(b) In recognition of the fact that the prosperity and future welfare of the Nation is dependent in a large measure on the sound exploration, extraction, processing and development of its unrenewable mineral resources, and in order to supplement the Act of December 31, 1970, Public Law 91-631, commonly referred to as the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, the Congress declares that it is the purpose of this Act to stimulate, sponsor, provide for and/or supplement present programs for the conduct of

research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, exploration, extraction, processing, development, production and the training of mineral engineers and scientists in the fields of mining, mineral resources and technology.

#### TITLE I—STATE MINING AND MINERAL RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTES

Sec. 100(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1972, and for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter the sum of \$500,000 to assist each participating State in establishing and carrying on the work of a competent and qualified mining and mineral resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency (hereinafter referred to as "institute") at one college or university in that State, which college or university shall be a college or university established in accordance with the Act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts" or some other institution designated by Act of the legislature of the State concerned: *Provided*, That (1) such moneys when appropriated shall be made available to match, on a dollar for dollar basis, non-Federal funds which shall be at least equal to the Federal share to support the institute; (2) if there is more than one such college or university in a State, established in accordance with said Act of July 2, 1862, funds under this Act shall, in the absence of a designation to the contrary by act of the legislature of the State, be paid to the one such college or university designated by the Governor of the State to receive the same subject to the Secretary's determination that such college or university has, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work under this Act; (3) two or more States may cooperate in the designation of a single interstate or regional institute, in which event the sums assignable to all of the cooperating States shall be paid to such institute; and (4) a designated college or university may, as authorized by appropriate State authority, arrange with other colleges and universities within the State to participate in the work of the instituted.

(b) It shall be the duty of each such institute to plan and conduct and/or arrange for a component or components of the college or university with which it is affiliated to conduct competent research, investigations, demonstrations, and experiments of either a basic or practical nature, or both, in relation to mining and mineral resources and to provide for the training of mineral engineers and scientists through such research, investigations, demonstrations, and experiments. Such research, investigations, demonstrations, experiments and training may include, without being limited to, exploration; extraction; processing; development; production of mineral resources; mining and mineral technology; supply and demand for minerals; conservation and best use of available supplies of minerals; the economic, legal, social engineering, recreational, biological, geographic, ecological and other aspects of mining, mineral resources and mineral reclamation, having due regard to the interrelation on the natural environment, the varying conditions and needs of the respective States, to mining and mineral resource research projects being conducted by agencies of the Federal and State Governments, and others, and to avoid any undue displacement of mineral engineers and scientists elsewhere engaged in mining and mineral resources research.

Sec. 101. (a) There is further authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for fiscal year 1972, and the four succeeding fiscal years thereafter the sum of \$5,000,000 annually, which shall remain available until expended. Such moneys when

appropriated shall be made available to institutes to meet the necessary expenses of specific mineral research and demonstration projects of industry-wide application, which could not otherwise be undertaken, including the expenses of planning and coordinating regional mining and mineral resources research projects by two or more institutes.

(b) Each application for a grant pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall, among other things, state the nature of the project to be undertaken, the period during which it will be pursued, the qualifications of the personnel who will direct and conduct it, the estimated cost, the importance of the project to the Nation, region, or State concerned, and its relation to other known research projects theretofore pursued or being pursued, and the extent to which it will provide opportunity for the training of mining and mineral engineers and scientists, and the extent of participation by non-governmental sources in the project. No grant shall be made under said subsection (a) except for a project approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and all grants shall be made upon the basis of merit of the project, the need for the knowledge which it is expected to produce when completed, and the opportunity it provides for the training of individuals as mineral engineers and scientists.

Sec. 102. Sums available to the States under the terms of sections 100 and 101 of this Act shall be paid to their designated institutes at such times and in such amounts during each fiscal year as determined by the Secretary, and upon vouchers approved by him. The Secretary may designate a certain proportion of the funds authorized by section 100 of this Act for scholarships, graduate fellowships and post-doctoral fellowships. Each institute shall set forth its plan to provide for the training of individuals as mineral engineers and scientists under a curriculum appropriate to the field of mineral resources and mineral engineering and related fields; set forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes of this title, and in no case supplant such funds; have an officer appointed by its governing authority who shall receive and account for all funds paid under the provisions of this Act and shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year, on work accomplished and the status of projects underway, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursements, on schedules prescribed by the Secretary. If any of the moneys received by the authorized receiving officer of any institute under the provisions of this Act shall by any action or contingency be found by the Secretary to have been improperly diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be replaced by the State concerned and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be allotted or paid to any institute of such State.

Sec. 103. Moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act in addition to being available for expenses for research, investigations, experiments, and training conducted under authority of this Act, shall also be available for printing and publishing the results thereof and for administrative planning and direction. The institutes are hereby authorized and encouraged to plan and conduct programs under this Act in cooperation with each other and with such other agencies and individuals as may contribute to the selection of the mining and mineral resources problems involved, and moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for paying the necessary expenses of planning,

coordinating, and conducting such cooperative research.

Sec. 104. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the responsibility for the proper administration of this Act and, after full consultation with other interested Federal agencies shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its provisions. The Secretary shall require a showing that institutes designated to receive funds have, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work. The Secretary shall furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this Act, participate in coordinating research initiated under this Act by the institutes, indicate to them such lines of inquiry as to him seem most important, and encourage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of cooperation by and between the institutes and between them and other research organizations, the United States Department of the Interior and other Federal establishments.

On or before the first day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain whether the requirements of section 102 have been met as to each State, whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriations for mining and mineral resources research under section 100 of this Act, and the amount which it is entitled to receive.

The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of the receipts, expenditures, and work of the institutes in all States under the provisions of this Act. The Secretary's report shall indicate whether any portion of an appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

Sec. 105. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relationship existing between any of the colleges or universities under whose direction an institute is established and the government of the State in which it is located, and nothing in this Act shall in any way be construed to authorize Federal control or direction of education at any college or university.

#### TITLE II—ADDITIONAL MINING AND MINERAL RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM

Sec. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1972, increasing \$2,000,000 annually for five years, and continuing at \$20,000,000 annually thereafter from which the Secretary may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations or other institutions with private firms and individuals, and with local, State and Federal government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of mining and mineral resources problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied. The Secretary shall, insofar as it is practicable utilize the facilities of institutes designated in Section 100 of this Act to perform such special research, authorized by this section, and shall select the institutes for the performance of such special research on the basis of the qualifications of the personnel who will conduct and direct it, the nature of the facilities available in relation to the particular needs of the research project, special geographic, geologic, or climatic conditions within the immediate vicinity of the institute in relation to any special requirements of the research project, and the extent to which it will provide opportunity for training individuals as mineral engineers and scientists.

#### TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 300. The Secretary of the Interior shall obtain the continuing advice and cooperation of all agencies of the Federal Government concerned with mining and mineral

resources of State and local governments, and of private institutions and individuals, to assure that the programs authorized in this Act will supplement and not duplicate established mining and minerals research programs, to stimulate research in otherwise neglected areas, and to contribute to a comprehensive, nationwide program of mining and minerals research. The Secretary shall make generally available information and reports on projects completed, in progress, or planned under the provisions of this Act, in addition to any direct publication of information by the institutes themselves.

Sec. 301. Nothing in this Act is intended to give or shall be construed as giving the Secretary of the Interior any authority or surveillance over mining and mineral resources research conducted by any other agency of the Federal Government, or as repealing, superseding, or diminishing existing authorities or responsibilities of any agency of the Federal Government to plan and conduct, contract for, or assist in research in its area of responsibility and concern with mining and mineral resources.

Sec. 302. Contracts or other arrangements for mining and mineral resources research work authorized under this Act with an institute, educational institution, or non-profit organization may be undertaken without regard to the provisions of section 3684 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, advance payments of initial expense are necessary to facilitate such work.

Sec. 303. No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exception and limitation as the Secretary may determine, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this section shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any rights which that owner may have under that patent.

Sec. 304. There shall be established, in such agency and location as the President determines to be desirable, a center for cataloging current and projected scientific research in all fields of mining and mineral resources. Each Federal agency doing mining and mineral resources research shall cooperate by providing the cataloging center with information on work underway or scheduled by it. The cataloging center shall classify and maintain for general use a catalog of mining and mineral resources research and investigation projects to progress or scheduled by all Federal agencies and by such non-Federal agencies of government, colleges, universities, private institutions, firms and individuals as voluntarily may make such information available.

Sec. 305. The President shall, by such means as he deems appropriate, clarify agency responsibility for Federal mining and mineral resources research and provide for inner-agency coordination of such research, including the research authorized by this Act. Such coordination shall include (a) continuing review of the adequacy of the government-wide program in mining and mineral resources research, (b) identification and elimination of duplication and overlap between two or more agency programs, (c) identification of technical needs in various mining and mineral resources research categories, (d) recommendations with respect to

allocation of technical effort among the Federal agencies, (e) review of technical manpower needs and findings concerning management policies to improve the quality of the government-wide research effort, and (f) actions to facilitate inter-agency communication at management levels.

Sec. 306. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall appoint an advisory committee on mining and minerals resources research composed of—

(1) the Director, Bureau of Mines, or his delegate, with his consent;

(2) the Director of the National Science Foundation, or his delegate, with his consent;

(3) the President, National Academy of Sciences, or his delegate, with his consent;

(4) the President, National Academy of Engineering, or his delegate, with his consent; and

(5) such other persons as the Secretary may appoint who are knowledgeable in the field of mining and mineral resources research.

(b) The Secretary shall designate the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee shall consult with and make recommendations to, the Secretary of the Interior on all matters involving or relating to mining and mineral resources research. The Secretary of the Interior shall consult with, and consider recommendations of, such committee in the conduct of mining and mineral resources research and the making of any grant under this Act.

(c) Advisory committee members, other than officers or employees of Federal, State, or local governments, shall be, for each day (including travel time) during which they are performing committee business, entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the appropriate Secretary but not in excess of the maximum rate of pay for grade GS-18 as provided in the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code, and shall, notwithstanding the limitations of sections 5703 and 5704 of title 5 of the United States Code, be fully reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and related expenses.

#### PROGRESS IN COMBATING SICKLE CELL ANEMIA

(Mrs. GRASSO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that since my first mention of sickle cell anemia, an inherited and deadly blood disease primarily afflicting black citizens in this country, positive progress has been made to alert possible carriers of the sickle cell trait of its effect and to promote further research, treatment, and counseling services for those who suffer from this long-ignored disease which claims the lives of half of its victims before they are 20.

Good news came yesterday when the Foundation for Research and Education in Sickle Cell Disease announced that a nationwide drive will begin to alert black Americans to the peril of sickle cell anemia. Financed through a \$50,000 grant from the Chase Manhattan Bank Foundation, the program will consist of a nationwide network of volunteer groups to make potential carriers aware of the disease and what they can do about it.

The efforts to combat this nemesis, the lack of concern for which up to now has been a national disgrace, is due in large measure to the dedicated campaign of WTIC-TV in Hartford, Conn., and its

president, Leonard J. Patricelli, who through a series of editorials and special programs informed viewers of sickle cell anemia and its effects. This example has stimulated the Nation and its Government to act.

Mr. Patricelli's latest constructive attempt to attain priority status for the need to develop a treatment and cure for this dread disease has been a fund drive in the Greater Hartford community to benefit the Center for the Study of Sickle Cell Anemia at Howard University. With a goal of \$25,000 to provide the Center at Howard with a full-time director for their sickle cell program, the WTIC drive quickly realized over \$27,000, and more funds are on the way. Contributions were received from a wide variety of sources; however, a great deal of credit must be given to the young people in the Hartford area—particularly high school and grammar school children—who have held assorted functions and pooled their own resources to assist in the fund drive. Students at Weaver High School in Hartford are planning a rock concert on March 31, the proceeds of which will be given to the sickle cell fund. Young residents of the State Receiving Home at Warehouse Point have contributed \$200, as have inmates at the Somers State Prison.

Channel 3—WTIC is performing a humane and timely public service and is providing an opportunity for thousands of youngsters to have the chance to enjoy a healthy start in life by seeking to remove the dangers of sickle cell anemia from our midst.

The President has allocated \$6 million in the new budget for a genetic counseling program in a pilot effort to identify prospective marriage partners with the disease trait and alert them to the danger facing their offspring. This is a commendable beginning; however, much more in the way of Federal assistance must be allocated to meet the need for finding a successful treatment and cure for the disease. Doctors at Howard estimate they would require \$60 million to properly establish full treatment and research facilities at that university.

The neglect of sickle cell anemia has ended; but a great challenge remains to commit the necessary resources to ridding our people of the doubts and fears surrounding this terrible blood disease. This crusade requires the cooperation of Government and people; this crusade demonstrates again the effectiveness of this cooperation in the public service. The pioneer efforts of Leonard Patricelli and WTIC-TV finds new allies and recruits in a campaign for life that is in our finest tradition.

#### RALPH NADER AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, no individual has done more than Ralph Nader in the past 5 years in attacking corporate irresponsibility

and bureaucratic insensitivity. Now Mr. Nader has enlisted hundreds of public-spirited assistants to multiply his effectiveness as this Nation's greatest battler for the public interest.

In two articles in the March 21, 1971 New York Times Magazines and the April, 1971 issue of the Progressive, Julius Duschka has made a cogent analysis of the nature and influence of this remarkable, tireless, and dedicated man:

STOP IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST!

(By Julius Duschka)

WASHINGTON.—They said that he couldn't last, that he would spread himself too thin, that he would burn himself out, that the press and the public would tire of his moralistic, monastic, Martin Luther life style and that then he, too, would succumb to the pleasures of the flesh. That was what they were saying about Ralph Nader after he burst upon the public conscience five years ago at a supercharged Senate hearing, challenging the gumshoe tactics General Motors had used against him.

Well, they were all wrong. Some of the Chevrolets of 1966 are already on the junk heap, but not Ralph Nader. He has become an institution at least as formidable as General Motors. Some say Nader and his followers constitute a corporation, perhaps even a conglomerate. Wow! Ralph Nader, Chairman of the Board.

Nader, now 37 years old, is no longer a lonely figure bravely fighting off the excesses of governmental and corporate bureaucracy and standing up all by himself for consumers. With him now are Nader's Raiders—hundreds of students, housewives, lawyers, professors, engineers and scientists throughout the country who are working or have worked for him part-time and a handful of lawyers, a teacher or two and a few other professionals who have enlisted full-time and who operate from his several redoubts in Washington.

The result is an avalanche of reports, books, television programs, testimony at Congressional and administrative hearings, lawsuits, petitions, letters to government and corporate administrators and campaigns to organize college students in a nationwide consumers' crusade.

It is not all just talk, either. Nader and his Raiders get things done. Last year they were moving forces in pushing a tough air-pollution bill through Congress; in getting workmen's safety legislation approved by Congress; in persuading the Senate to turn a mushy consumer bill into a meaningful Consumer Protection Agency; in winning a court case that forced the Administration to review all the remaining uses of the herbicide 2,4,5-T, and in convincing the National Highway Safety Bureau that 200,000 G.M. trucks had potentially dangerous wheels.

And that's not all Nader's Raiders accomplished last year. Reacting to their first assault on a Government agency, the Federal Trade Commission continued to implement suggestions made by some of the early Raiders back in 1969. The Interstate Commerce Commission and the Food and Drug Administration instituted some long-overdue reforms pin-pointed by Raider reports on those two agencies.

Two Raiders dispatched to West Virginia mounted an assault on Union Carbide's pollution smokestacks and low tax bill in the state. Partly as a result of the Raiders' activities, the company agreed to clean up its polluting plants and pay higher taxes.

Some Raiders have even joined the Establishment. William Howard Taft IV, one of the first Raiders, is a special assistant to Caspar W. Weinberger, Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Raider

Reuben B. Robertson III is Chairman of the Consumer Advisory Committee to the Civil Aeronautics Board. Nader himself is a member of the National Highway Safety Bureau's Advisory Council, but sends Lowell Dodge of his Center for Auto Safety to represent him at meetings because he doesn't think the council is important enough for his time. And Edward F. Cox, another of the original Raiders, appears to be about to marry Tricia Nixon.

There are only 20 or so full-time members of Nader's Raiders (the name was coined by a newspaperman), but their energy and effectiveness make it seem as if there were at least 2,000. A half-dozen senior Raiders, most of them around 30, work out of Nader's three-year-old Center for Study of Responsive Law. Each earns only \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year.

A few blocks away a dozen Raiders just out of law school (each paid about \$4,500 a year) make up Nader's newly organized Public Interest Research Group. In adjoining closetlike offices in the National Press Building, Nader's Center for Auto Safety and Professionals for Auto Safety operate with a full-time staff of one and many volunteers.

Then there is the Center for Law and Social Policy, a five-man public-interest law firm with 12 law-student interns, which is not directly associated with Nader but represents him and his Raiders in some of their suits. Finally, the Project for Corporate Responsibility runs the Campaign to Make General Motors Responsible with the advice of Nader and the help of a Raider.

Ralph, as everyone in Washington calls Nader, continues to work out of his \$80-a-month room near Dupont Circle and a \$90-a-month unmarked office in the National Press Building, dropping in daily on his various enterprises and scoffing at the idea that he has become a corporation.

"This," he says, "is an experiment in not developing a bureaucracy. We bring people in who are interested in a particular subject and give them front-rank responsibility. They don't report to somebody who then reports to somebody else. I get together with them regularly. We have a constantly fluid, conversational system."

"It's orchestrated chaos," says 25-year-old Mark J. Green, a lawyer attached to the Center for Study of Responsive Law. "Have you been down to that office? It's impossible. I work at home because I can't get anything done when I go down there."

Institution, corporation, conglomerate, fluid conversation pit, orchestrated chaos—whatever it is that Nader has wrought, it works surprisingly well for him.

He has found a way to turn youthful energy into amazingly productive work. Beginning in the summer of 1967 with five law-school internes, he built up his corps of summer Raiders to 100 in 1969 and 200 last year. While they are in Washington, the young Raiders do a lot of spadework for the reports Nader and his senior Raiders publish later in the year. And once the Raiders are back at school they are eager to help with problems Nader would like checked out in New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco or wherever a Raider happens to be.

The concept is that reasonably bright young men and women with a background in the law, engineering or the sciences can easily grasp the deficiencies of governmental and corporate bureaucracies. Nader now seems to have institutionalized the program on a year-round basis, and the part-time Raiders continue to churn out more material than Nader and his handful of full-time Raiders know what to do with.

And Nader still inspires youth, though he is no gentle perpetrator of participatory democracy. He is an authoritarian with a mania for detail and perfection. He does not approve of cigarette-smoking, let alone

marijuana, and at times last summer his dictatorial handling of the Raider program pushed many of its participants to the brink of revolt. But still young people are attracted to him because he accomplishes things.

"I had done all sorts of antiwar protesting," said 22-year-old Mrs. Collet Bruce, the blond daughter of novelist Albert Guerard. She is the part-time director of Professionals for Auto Safety and a full-time Georgetown University law student. "But I didn't think I could change anything that way. At first the idea of working on auto safety didn't appeal to me. I'm more concerned about corporate collusion, but now I'm convinced that I can help make corporations more responsive through auto safety."

Mrs. Bruce is typical of Nader's Raiders—white, upper-middle-class, from one of the best schools (in her case Radcliffe), modishly dressed but not determinedly sloppy. Blacks are not attracted, and many Negro activists regard Nader's attacks on the Establishment as middle-class protests and irrelevant to their causes. Nor are there any freaked-out long-long-hairs around.

Not only is Nader authoritarian with his own Raiders: he can also be ruthless in his legislative tactics and his bouts with bureaucrats. During the drafting of consumer legislation last year he frequently got his way by threatening to go over the heads of Congressional staff aides to their patron Senators or Representatives or to the press.

"If you don't do what he wants," one staff aide said, "he's prepared to go to his friends in the press and publicly denounce you."

And Nader has no qualms about denouncing his friends, either. A 1970 report by some of the Raiders scathingly criticized Senator Edmund Muskie's record on air pollution. Liberal Senators were appalled, but the report stiffened Muskie's backbone and helped push him into supporting a tough bill requiring a 90 per cent reduction in automobile pollution by 1975.

Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, the man who in 1966 provided Nader with the forum in which he exposed G.M.'s efforts to shadow him, also felt Nader's wrath last year. When, during debate on the Senate floor, Ribicoff accepted several compromising amendments to his consumer bill, which Nader had been so active in shaping, Nader emerged from the galleries where he had been watching the horse-trading and denounced Ribicoff to reporters.

In dealing with governmental bureaucracy, Nader has perfected a familiar Washington tactic which drives administrators up walls. Through a friend working in an agency, Nader will find out that a long-pending decision favorable to one of his causes is about to be made public. He then will write a letter to the administrator in charge demanding to know why this decision has not been made for 10! these many months. Copies of the letter go to Nader's many friends in the Washington press corps, and when, within a few days, the governmental decision is dutifully announced, Nader gets credit for once again cracking open the bureaucracy.

As Senators and Raiders alike have discovered, joining up with Nader is like enlisting in the Army. He demands total fealty to his concept of the public good.

Raider pay is low and the hours are long. "One hundred hours a week is ideal," Nader says, and he's not kidding. He still works those hours himself, and recently told a friend that he had spent only \$5,000 on his personal needs last year. The friend believes him because Nader is as meticulous in keeping track of his own expenses as he is in following amendments on the Senate floor.

Nader frowns on Raiders' going off for summer weekends at the beach, and was unhappy with one aide who took a long Thanksgiving weekend last year without leaving behind a telephone number where he

could be reached. Raiders quickly get used to midnight calls from the boss with his marching orders for the next day or two.

He hassles his Raiders over cigarettes (but half of them still smoke) and over the cars they drive (he still does not have one). A lot of Raiders own Volkswagens, which Nader considers to be particularly dangerous but which the Raiders like because they are economical. Despite the pressures, though, few Raiders resign.

"I'll still be a Raider when I'm 60," says Mark Green, who has 35 years to go and is finishing a mammoth study of Government antitrust activities. "Imagine sitting up in a Wall Street office being the 10th man on an antitrust suit, working on the 13th count of the suit. The responsibility I have here is the largest I could possibly think of having at my age."

Nadar is a lawyer and has great faith in a lawyer's approach to problems and in legal solutions to them. Usually he finds out what a Raider is interested in and tries to give him a research assignment within that range. He tells the Raider to begin by reading everything he can find about the subject. The reading is followed by extensive interviewing. Finally Nader sits down with the Raider to decide whether the end product should be a report, a book, a letter to a Government administrator or a public denunciation of some person or agency.

But the styles of the Raiders vary enormously. Some, like 30-year-old John C. Esposito, can be abrasive and arrogant, spoiling for a public confrontation. A dark-haired, brooding man with penetrating eyes and a penchant for sports shirts and bell-bottom trousers, Esposito went to work for Nader in the summer of 1966 and is now a senior Raider.

Esposito wrote the report on "Vanishing Air" which Nader put out last spring and which sought to tear apart Senator Muskie's record on air-pollution legislation. But such is the power of Nader and his Raiders that Esposito was routinely admitted thereafter to meetings organized by Muskie aides to get industry and reformers together for discussions of the 1970 air-pollution legislation.

Like 36-year-old Gary Sellers, other Raiders become fascinated with the legislative process and its inevitable compromises, and learn how to use the system on Capitol Hill to their advantage. Now the senior Raider in charge of the neophytes at Nader's Public Interest Research Group, Sellers also works part-time for Democratic Representative Phillip Burton of San Francisco.

A short man with longish brown hair, a taste for long cigars and a generally conspiratorial view of the world, Sellers spent much of last year helping steer occupational-safety legislation through Congress. Burton is a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, which handled the legislation, and Sellers used his position on Burton's staff as a way to get into secret committee meetings where legislative tactics were discussed.

"I have no problem serving two masters," Sellers said. "Ralph's and Phil's passion and concern are coextensive. The arrangement turned out very well for both of them."

Like William Harrison Wellford, some Raiders look and talk as if they were displaced scholars. Nearly bald at 31, Harrison Wellford is a soft-spoken North Carolinian who was a valedictorian at Davidson College, has a master's degree from Cambridge University, is a doctoral candidate in government at Harvard and has won Marshall, Danforth and Woodrow Wilson Fellowships.

More than any other single person, Wellford is responsible for the recent decision by the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a crash study to determine whether all uses of the herbicide 2,4,5-T should be ended.

During a lengthy study of the Agriculture Department which has resulted in a two-volume book, "Sowing the Wind," to be published this spring, Wellford became an expert on herbicides and pesticides. His knowledge was used by four environmental organizations which filed a suit that led to the decision by the new Environmental Protection Agency, which recently took over the Agriculture Department's authority to regulate herbicides and pesticides.

Raiders have shown again and again what one man can do in Washington if he spends full-time on a single issue or bird-dogging one agency, and no one has been more successful than 30-year-old Lowell Dodge, the director of Nader's Center for Auto Safety. Dodge's office in the National Press Building is hardly wider than the door leading into it and not much deeper than a walk-in closet.

Dodge's sole assignment is the National Highway Safety Bureau, which was created by the first piece of legislation resulting from Nader's crusade in Washington—the 1966 Highway Safety Act. A neat, black-haired man who rides a bicycle to work from his Capitol Hill apartment, Dodge supervises the activities of three paid assistants (one makes \$30 a week, another \$40 and the third \$75) and several volunteers.

The aides range from a young man fulfilling his conscientious-objector's obligation, to a young woman who goes to law school at night and by day studies the use of air bags to prevent injuries in automobile crashes, and a physicist who works at the U.S. Patent Office.

It was Dodge who put together information about potentially dangerous wheels on 200,000 G.M. trucks built between 1960 and 1965. By pressing their case, Dodge and some public-interest lawyers got the Highway Safety Bureau to reverse a previous decision and issue a warning about the truck wheels.

Dodge has also completed work with Nader and an engineer named Ralf Hotchkiss on a book entitled "What to Do With Your Bad Car: A Manual for Lemon Owners." Profits from the book will be used to help finance and expand the center.

"Sure, that little Center for Auto Safety is effective," said an official of the Highway Safety Bureau. "Many a night I've spent late at the office trying to 'Nader-proof' a regulation. The pipelines this guy has into the agency are unbelievable."

Another Raider, James S. Turner, is Nader's expert on the Food and Drug Administration and the author of "The Chemical Feast," a critical study of the F.D.A. Still another is James R. Michael, who is completing a massive citizens' handbook on access to the Federal agencies.

Other reports and studies are under way on supermarkets; property taxes; consumer credit; banks; the influence of large law firms like Washington's Covington & Burling, whose most celebrated partner is Dean Acheson; the domination of the state of Delaware by the du Pont Company; the power of the First National City Bank in New York; the pollution caused by pulp and paper mills in Maine; General Motors' commitment to safety work and the abatement of air pollution; and the relationship of Government agencies to think tanks.

Helping Nader keep track of everything is 30-year-old Theodore Jacobs, a classmate at Princeton and Harvard Law School who gave up a Wall Street law practice three years ago to come to Washington, first as chief counsel to the National Commission of Product Safety and since last spring as Nader's chief of staff.

"When I was practicing law in New York," said Jacobs, an intense man with receding but bushy hair and rimless glasses, "Ralph would drop into my office when he was in town, pick up some will or trust I was working on, glance at it, put it down with disdain

and ask: 'How can you spend the rest of your life on stuff like that?'"

Jacobs is bringing some order out of Nader's orchestrated chaos, but he is also seen by some Raiders as a divisive influence. Some consider Jacobs an opportunist who waited to sign on until Nader was firmly established. Others believe Jacobs shields Nader too much from his staff. And still others think Jacobs is not a true believer in the Nader muckraking style, but is more interested in steering old friend Ralph into politics.

Jacobs and Nader's senior Raiders work in an old three-story office building just below Dupont Circle. There is not even a sign on the door, and the offices are furnished with second-hand desks and hand-me-down chairs (one in a corner of Jacob's office is propped up with a chunk of 2 by 4). Everywhere there are files—in old metal cabinets, in cardboard boxes, in wooden apple crates, on book shelves made from planks and bricks. The Public Interest Research Group is jammed into a warren of offices in an old apartment house five blocks away.

The Center for Study of Responsive Law is tax-exempt and meets its \$250,000-a-year budget largely with money from foundations and profits from the sales of Raiders' books. Major contributions have come from the Philip M. Stern Family Fund, Carnegie Corporation, Norman Fund, Jerome Levy Foundation and from the automobile muffler king turned liberal philanthropist, Gordon Sherman of Midas International.

The Public Interest Research Group is not tax-exempt, and is thus free to lobby. Its annual budget of \$170,000 comes from Nader's speaking fees, which range up to \$2,000 an appearance, and from the \$280,000 out-of-court settlement in his libel suit against G.M. The Center for Auto Safety is financed by Consumer's Union, and Professionals for Auto Safety stays in gear with money from speaking fees.

Finances are a constant problem, and Nader is frequently criticized, even by his friends, for failing to build a dues-paying constituency. He is thinking about trying to raise money through magazine and newspaper advertisements and direct-mail solicitations. Nader has put an experimental ad in *The Progressive* magazine, and it met with some success. But it costs money to raise funds through ads and mailings, and Nader is reluctant to expend what little capital he has. He is also impatient with Raiders who keep after him to find a financial angel.

"People are always asking me why we can't get some Jean Paul Getty to finance us," Nader says, "but it doesn't work that way. You have to go at it 60 different ways. If someone will come in and work for room and board, fine, or if his family will support him, fine. That's the same as a \$4,000 or \$5,000 contribution right there. It's always going to take bits and pieces like that."

Despite Nader's great impact in some areas, most of the governmental and corporate bureaucracy still sits there, impassive and largely unmoved by the Raiders.

"It troubles me," says Jacobs, "that we haven't got the formula to translate concern for public problems into effective means for change."

It troubles Nader, too. In a recent conversation in Jacobs's office at the Center for Study of Responsive Law, Nader munched on some cookies baked by a Raider's wife and talked about his and the Raiders' future. He hasn't changed much in five years—wavy black hair a little longer but by no means modish; the shadows under his eyes a little more pronounced; his dark features perhaps a little sharper. But he looked as though he were wearing the same rumpled dark gray suit, narrow dark green tie, white shirt and scuffed black shoes he wore in 1966.

Offering the tin of cookies to the others in the room—"Have one; they're good Home-made"—and then taking a couple himself,

Nader began: "What we've been trying to do is all converging now. Wherever you look the consumer is defied, whether it be the goods and services he buys, the Government services with which he is supposed to be provided or governmental and corporate pollution of the environment.

"Take the Government first," he continued, reaching for another cookie. "There have been more studies than I care to count on the Civil Service which show men willfully changing regulatory law, willful lassitude, willful manipulation of legal processes.

"How can we develop rights for citizens to initiate censure actions for public officials? Now they get decorated instead of being fired. When a citizen is adversely affected by pesticides and the Agriculture Department knowingly suppresses information about violators of the laws regulating pesticides, as has happened, why shouldn't a citizen have the right to make the public officials more responsible for their actions?"

"We're interested in the development of initiatory democracy, and this is more fundamental than participatory or representative democracy. We need a fundamental change in our structure so that people can initiate actions to make sure public officials are acting responsibly. I'm talking about rights plus remedies plus legal responsibilities so it can be a citizen versus the I.O.C. or the F.D.A. A civil servant should be forced to make the law work, and if he won't do it he should be censured or expelled from the Government."

Turning to corporations—and taking another cookie—Nader said: "The question of the constitutionality of the corporation will be one of the biggest struggles of the next decade. It will be a greater struggle than the New Deal. The corporations must assume more responsibility for what they do. We have a right to know how much pollution is being dumped where by what corporation. Corporations are now running the ball game, and we must look at them in terms of the scene today, not in terms of their origins in the 18th and 19th centuries."

One way Nader sees to attack the problem of individual responsibility in the bureaucracies of both the Government and corporations is to turn what he calls "whistle-blowing" into an honorable action. "A 'whistle-blower,'" says Nader, "is anyone in any organization who draws a line in his own mind where responsibility to society transcends responsibility to his organization."

An example of "whistle-blowing" that Nader often cites is the G.M. engineer who first came to him with details of the tendency of Corvairs to roll over. To encourage more people to put public responsibilities above bureaucratic allegiances, Nader had one of his Raiders organize a "Whistle-Blowers' Conference" in Washington recently. At the all-day meeting in the Mayflower Hotel, speakers included Ernest Fitzgerald, a former Defense Department employe who first blew the whistle on the excessive costs in the C-5A plane contracts.

Nader has also advocated legislation giving protection to persons working for the Government or for corporations so they may be free to speak out on public-interest problems within their bureaucracies. He also has urged professional societies to make known their readiness to defend members who seek to put the public interest above their private interests as employes.

Ever the optimist, but still pragmatic, Nader likes to reply to questions about his successes and failures with: "We always fail. The whole thing is limiting the degree of failure."

But Nader is not a man to dwell on the past. He is always looking ahead, at the moment to his "whistle-blowing" concept, to the expansion of an Oregon project that encourages students to tax themselves to

finance public-interest law and research groups, to the passage of consumer legislation this year—"It will be a vintage year for consumers"—and to the development of more public-interest law offices in Washington.

"Ideally," he says, "after a report comes out on an agency like the I.C.C., filled with facts and statistics, we ought to see to it that at least a four-man law firm is set up to specialize in the I.C.C., to begin filing suits, to be a full-fledged pressure group. We need to begin this institutional monitoring on a mass basis. We know exactly what has to be done, but it takes a lot of people and money to do it."

Although Nader is usually tagged simply as a "consumer advocate" by the newspapers, he is much more than that. He is an ombudsman; a symbol to all the little people of the world; a one-man court of last resort that receives an average of 1,500 letters a week from the helpless; an inspiration to college students; the man who turned the phrase "public-interest law" into a whole new concept of the legal profession. But is he a revolutionary?

"To what extent is he interested in basic reform?" mused a Senate staff aide who has dealt extensively with Nader and is a personal friend. "I honestly don't know. He's not much of a philosopher, is he? A lot of guys up here think that he deliberately tallors his strategy so as not to frighten off too many people."

"Ralph wants change," says old friend Ted Jacobs, "but we're not revolutionaries. Basically, Ralph wants people to be accountable for their actions. Ralph believes that the system of injustice in this country was built up block by block, and that any effort to remedy it will have to be done block by block. The basic problem we're dealing with is law and order—the law and order of corporations."

A former Government official who has dealt extensively with him says: "Nader more than any other single individual has contributed to the denigrating attitude America's young people have toward government. He has deprecated government on every major campus in this country."

"For a fellow who is so critical of the law," noted a prominent Washington lawyer who has fought more than one battle with Nader, "he has an extravagant faith in the ability of the law to right wrongs, but all of us are doing things quite differently because he's around."

"He's changed the realities we all had to deal with," said Charles Halpern, who heads up the public-interest law firm that handles many of Nader's suits, "and he's made a new world for us."

"People working for Ralph," said Raider Mark Green, "are not imbued with a sense of politics and power but with a concern for issues. We're not on ego trips. Ralph has a very effective way of psyching up his staff. He has so much enthusiasm, and that gets a lot of work out of people. Ralph would have been a great camp counselor."

"Ralph's ideal is true competition, with vigorous Government regulation to keep people competing. Socialism doesn't interest Ralph. When Ralph thinks of socialism, he doesn't think of Lenin. He thinks of Paul Rand Dixon [the former F.T.C. chairman so mercilessly criticized in the first Raider report] because he knows there will always be guys like Dixon trying to run things."

#### NADER'S RAIDERS PUT THE WASHINGTON PRESS CORPS TO SHAME (By Julius Duschka)

The other day I had lunch with the chief of a Washington bureau for one of the nation's leading newspapers. Over coffee, the conversation turned to what the chief's staff ought to be doing. What stories was his bu-

reau missing? What trivia were the reporters masquerading as news? What was being over-covered? And as we talked, I kept thinking about Ralph Nader.

"Why don't you go see Ralph Nader and some of his people?" I suggested. "Find out what they're doing and what they don't have time to do but would like to do. He's closer to the cutting edges of issues in Washington than anyone else I know."

"Good idea," the bureau chief said. "In fact, we probably should have someone covering Nader full-time."

His response was typical of the way the Washington press corps views Nader and his Raiders. In Washington and elsewhere the press is almost totally oriented to reacting to events, or, in too many cases, to pseudo-events carefully contrived for press coverage. In the eyes of editors and reporters, Ralph Nader is a "consumer advocate" who makes news by holding press conferences, publicizing reports compiled by his Raiders, and releasing the texts of letters to public officials.

But what much of the press fails to appreciate is that Nader is much more than a consumer advocate. He is a reformer challenging not only the responsibilities of public officials but also the accountability of corporations and their officials and employes.

Nader is also a muckraker in the best sense of that word. While so much of Washington journalism continues to wallow in analysis written off reporters' sleeves and in columns belaboring the obvious, Nader and his Raiders are doing the most serious, factual, and consistent job of public service muckraking in the nation's capital.

There are some other watchdogs in Washington: Jack Anderson and his staff; Morton Mintz of *The Washington Post* with his exposes of the drug industry; Jerry Landauer of *The Wall Street Journal* with his vigilant reporting on the judiciary; Robert Walters of *The Washington Star* with his tenacious quest for facts in a number of strategic areas; Jack Nelson of *The Los Angeles Times* with his sharp coverage of civil rights issues; Seymour Hersh, whose brilliant exposure of My Lai was in the best traditions of crusading journalism. And a few more.

But in general the hundreds of reporters who make up the Washington press corps still spend an inordinate amount of time serving up rewrites of White House and agency handouts, once-over-lightly accounts of legislative maneuverings and meaningless "scoops" on the size of the Federal budget to be announced officially tomorrow.

With the help of only twenty full-time Raiders, Nader puts the Washington press corps to shame. In agency after agency and on issue after issue, Nader and his Raiders know more about what is going on than any reporter or editor in Washington—and they have learned how to bring their findings to public attention.

The list of muckraking achievements by Nader and his Raiders is impressive. Some examples:

Nader was one of the first to call attention, a couple of years ago, to the rot within the United Mine Workers, a significant story which, with one or two exceptions, the press virtually ignores.

Two Raiders dispatched to West Virginia by Nader succeeded in getting Union Carbide Corporation to begin cleaning up their polluting smokestacks and pay a fair share of local taxes.

Without the work of one Raider who provided essential data for lawsuit, the Environmental Protection Administration would not have been forced to move swiftly to remove DDT and 2,4,5-T pesticides from the market.

Because of the persistence of another Raider, the Federal Highway Safety Bureau was forced to order General Motors to warn the purchasers of 200,000 GM trucks of potential wheel defects. Nader's undermanned

Center for Auto Safety is one of the most effective goads to bureaucracy that Washington has ever seen, and is a thorn in the side of the Bureau.

A report compiled by Nader and some of his Raiders meticulously dissected Senator Edmund Muskie's record on air-pollution legislation and raised serious questions about the efficacy of his approach and about his concern for the sensibilities of major industrial polluters.

The first Nader report, on the failures of the Federal Trade Commission to protect the consumer, is still having an effect on that agency more than two years after it was issued; it remains a model of first-rate muckraking.

In all of the above cases, and in many more, Nader and his forces are doing no more than what good reporters are supposed to do. His operations are what good newspapering ought to be all about.

Nader picks and issue, an agency, a target, and embarks on a careful comprehensive study. He or one of his Raiders sticks with it. Not just for a day or a week, but for weeks, months, even years, as is the case with his long and fruitful investigation of auto safety—or the lack of it.

Nader himself is a lawyer, and nearly all of his Raiders have been trained in the law. But in the exacting art of investigation the techniques of the law and of journalism are—or should be—much the same. First must come the extensive study of the background of an issue, largely through research in books, articles, Congressional reports, and official documents. Then follows the interviewing of key sources to discover as much as possible about the current situation. Finally, there are the conclusions to be drawn and the courses of action to be charted.

Nader's Raiders, however, seem to have two special qualities that not enough reporters command. One is a quality of mind that seeks the answer to a fundamental question: Why don't private and public institutions work the way they are supposed to work? The other quality is tenacity in digging out the answer.

Reporters like to blame their generally short attention spans on the demands of their editors for daily copy. There is some truth in this complaint, but it is also true that too many reporters, editors, and publishers are content with the superficialities of stories quickly churned out to meet daily deadlines. Moreover, publishers do have their sacred cows, whether political, bureaucratic or corporate.

Yet, as the trade press, lawyer, and lobbyists have shown over the years in Washington, and as Nader and his raiders are now demonstrating, it is possible for almost any reasonably intelligent reporter or lawyer to discover what is really going on within an agency.

Nader's Center for Auto Safety provides what amounts to a casebook study for the journalist—or lawyer or lobbyist, for that matter—who wants to know how to stay on top of a complicated but extremely important issue with ramifications extending to every person in the United States. Working out of a tiny office in the National Press Building and surrounded by bookshelves jammed with government reports and correspondence, thirty-year-old Lowell Dodge operates the Center with Nader's advice and counsel and the help of three paid employes (one at \$30 a week, one at \$40, and the third at \$75) and a few part-time volunteers. The hours are long (twelve to fourteen-hour days are not uncommon) but the dedication is great.

Dodge, a neat New Hampshireman out of Yale Law School, does what lawyers for special interests and reporters for the trade press—written and edited for specific industries—have done in Washington ever since New Deal days. Dodge's primary responsibility is to keep track of what is going on at the

Highway Safety Bureau, which probably would not have been created by Congress had it not been for the extraordinary impact of Nader's 1965 book, *Unsafe at Any Speed*, and the subsequent clumsy efforts of General Motors to "get something on" Nader.

Helping Dodge are several law students and engineers. One of the students, for example, is, in Dodge's words, "our man at the Highway Safety Bureau." He is Justin Klein, a full-time law student at George Washington University.

"He's a great vacuum cleaner," says Dodge. "He's got short hair. He's un-threatening, well-mannered, well-groomed, very conscientious."

Other students work with the mail complaints about automobile defects that pour into the offices of Nader's operations in Washington, and into the boarding house off Dupont Circle where he still lives. Nader does not have the staff to investigate and answer individual complaints but there are enough people at the Center for Auto Safety to look for patterns in the complaints and to let the Highway Safety Bureau know what the problems are. Nader gets more mail on auto safety problems than the Bureau itself does, and Nader and Dodge see that this mail gets to the Bureau.

The mail often turns up cases which lead to action by the Bureau. Not long ago, for instance, Nader received a steady stream of letters from owners of 1970 Buicks complaining about a sticking accelerator pedal. The letters led to a Bureau decision ordering Buick to tell owners of the affected models about the potential safety defects, and that dealers were ready to correct them.

But perhaps what is most important about the Center for Auto Safety is that it is there, and is always ready to light fires under complacent bureaucrats.

"Every time they take some action over there," Dodge says, "they have to ask themselves whether we're going to explode it in their faces."

That is pretty close to the truth. Employees of the Highway Safety Bureau acknowledge that they have frequently stayed up until two or three in the morning to try to "Nader-proof" a decision or a new regulation.

A major newspaper or one of the wire services could keep track of auto safety problems the same way Nader and Dodge do. This would require a commitment of journalistic and clerical manpower, but, as Nader's mail indicates, the subject is one of widespread public interest that touches the lives of almost all Americans.

Another example of the essentially journalistic approach of Nader and his raiders is the work of Jim Turner, who became interested in Nader's operations when he was assigned by a law professor at Ohio State University to play the role of Nader in a seminar on auto safety.

Turner first worked for Nader as a summer Raider in 1968. Nader put him on his Food and Drug Administration project, and Turner has stayed with FDA ever since. He was responsible for the breaking of the cyclamates story by an NBC News Washington correspondent in the fall of 1969. This story led Robert Finch, then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to order an end to the widespread use of cyclamates as an artificial sweetener in soft drinks any many foods.

By carefully keeping track of what was going on in the FDA, Turner was able to establish that the scientists in the agency were convinced cyclamates were potentially harmful, but that for some reason these scientific findings had been pigeonholed by the FDA policy-makers.

More recently, Turner is concerned with such FDA matters as the safety of saccharine, another widely used artificial sweetener, the use of brominated vegetable oils, the fat content of foods, and the labelling of foods containing additives. His book, *The Chemical*

*Feast*, written with the help of several other Raiders, is a devastating critique of the FDA. It is one of a series of muckraking books resulting from Raider forays into the depths of the Washington bureaucracy.

Turner is now working on a book about supermarkets and the food industry. The central issue he is exploring, Turner says, is why supermarkets do not make more information available to consumers. He is investigating such proposed reforms as unit pricing, grade labeling, and complete disclosure of the contents of food.

Food and supermarkets have always been sensitive issues for newspapers because of real or feared pressures from advertisers. Even such a prestigious newspaper as *The Washington Post* still runs a weekly food section in which advertising is surrounded with recipes and stories that are often puffs for promotion campaigns by food companies.

But, as Nader's Raiders have demonstrated, there is a great deal of news in what food additives may be doing to us, as well as in the economics of a food industry that has changed rapidly over the last two decades. With twenty percent or so of many a family's income going for food each week, it is reasonable to expect that reader interest in the subject would be high.

Turner is one of a half a dozen or so senior Raiders who work with Nader out of old office space not far from Dupont Circle. This particular Nader operation is the Center for Study of Responsive Law, now almost three years old. A few blocks away, near the Statler-Hilton and Sheraton-Carlton hotels, is Nader's new Public Interest Research Group, set up last summer, where about a dozen young men and women just out of law school are working as interns for only \$4500 a year.

The projects under way or recently completed in the two offices ought to make a modern city editor chew his pencil in envy. John Esposito, the air-pollution expert and the author of the Nader Report, *The Vanishing Air*, is looking into the question of the uses and sources of electrical energy. Mark Green is investigating the failures of the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute monopolists. Jim Michael is compiling a handbook on the Federal regulatory agencies.

At the Public Interest Research Group's offices young lawyers are researching such problems as the inequities of local property taxes, the public consequences of corporate acts, the responsibilities to the public of government employees and officials, the interest-free use banks have of income-tax and social-security-tax money deposited with them by employers as required by Federal law, and the costs of consumer credit.

"We're a combination of lawyer, journalist, and political theorist," explains senior Raider John Esposito, who first went to work for Nader in the summer of 1966 and has researched such problems as gas pipelines, anti-trust policies, professional societies, meat inspection laws, consumer financing, and air pollution.

Nader and his Raiders are interested in much more than muckraking. They are seeking to reform existing governmental and corporate bureaucracies, and some of the Raiders spend a good deal of their time actively working for reform through lobbying and other techniques. The average journalist, on the other hand, usually must content himself only with the exposure of facts.

But not only do Nader and his Raiders do a far better job of reporting than do most of the Washington press corps; they have also invoked or threatened to invoke the 1967 Freedom of Information Act, which opens long closed doors to official proceedings, more than have the reporters for whom this long-sought piece of legislation supposedly was designed. Once again, this fact reflects the patience of Nader's Raiders, their willingness to wait out the bureaucratic process for a

few weeks or months. On the other hand, journalists, bent on a story today, become impatient when a definitive answer is not immediately forthcoming.

Why is the press generally unwilling to do the kind of in-depth investigative work that is the guts of the approach to public issues by Nader and his aides? The major reason is the way editors and reporters are oriented toward the reporting of events. But there are other reasons.

A principal one is the failure of newspapers to comprehend what is genuinely news. The big, obvious story, like the war in Vietnam or a Presidential campaign, is always covered and often over-covered. But when it comes to stories of a second magnitude, the press generally lags behind the interests of its readers and is too often beholden to its advertisers.

Take the issue of automobile safety. For years the press dutifully ran auto-accident statistics and regularly deplored them on the editorial page—usually placing the blame on drivers. Press coverage of automobiles seldom went beyond puff stories, and frequently whole sections are devoted to the wonders of the new models. Few reporters ever looked into the public record on auto safety, as Nader did in researching *Unsafe at Any Speed*.

Most of the changes that chemicals and marketing practices have made in food and drugs over the last twenty-five years can be found in public records, but only a few dedicated investigators like Nader have bothered to explore these records, while most newspapers have continued to glorify the supermarket economy which contributes so much each week in advertising.

Not all of this glorification is by any means the result of advertising pressure, however, because in these days of one-newspaper communities advertisers such as supermarkets have nowhere to go but to the monopoly paper in their town. The other part of the problem is the definition of news.

In Washington, news media all too often concentrate on what the President is doing or, more likely, saying; what bill is being approved by what subcommittee on Capitol Hill; and what the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of State is announcing as "news." There is little systematic coverage of such departments as Agriculture and Interior. Coverage of such agencies as the FTC, the Federal Power Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission is virtually nonexistent. Yet, what these departments and agencies do—or do not do—is often more important to more Americans than what the President is saying.

As Nader has demonstrated, editors need to turn loose their reporters for in-depth investigations; they also need to redefine Washington news. It is no excuse to say that not enough happens at some departments and agencies to justify full-time coverage. Most major, and many smaller, newspapers, have men covering politics full-time; yet the truth is that the political beat is often dull and reader interest in politics is limited in the years when there are no Presidential or Congressional elections.

Ralph Nader has become more than a beat to be covered by Washington reporters. He and his Raiders are the best examples to be found of what journalism ought to be in the capital of a country that has produced such great muckrakers in the public interest as Lincoln Steffens, Ida Tarbell, Frank Norris, and Upton Sinclair.

#### PETITION TO SEC FOR PUBLIC INVESTIGATION OF UNION CARBIDE POLLUTION DOCUMENT

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most refreshing and healthy developments in the field of modern corporate management is the attempt by many concerned stockholders to exercise their legal rights and responsibilities, both as good citizens and stockholders, to prevent further environmental destruction by this country's giant corporation.

Just last week, my attention was called to a petition filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on March 12, 1971, in behalf of Mr. Larry J. Silverstein, Mr. William Osborn, Mr. Roger S. Foster, and the Project on Corporate Responsibility, all owners of stock in the Union Carbide Corp. The petitioners seek a public investigation of a document on pollution control issued by Union Carbide last November.

Exposes of Carbide's irresponsibility in the field of pollution control have been many—so many, in fact, that the corporation's directors evidently felt compelled to distribute the document to their stockholders and employees, painting a rosy picture, indeed, of the corporation's puny efforts at its plants all over the country. The document, entitled "Summary of Union Carbide's Programs for Pollution Control," gives the impression that Carbide's overall environmental pollution has been moderate and largely unavoidable and that Carbide has been public spirited, forward looking, and cooperative with public authorities in this area.

On the contrary, the petition charges, Carbide is, and has been, one of the Nation's worst corporate polluters; has been resistant to efforts of public authorities to curb pollution; and resulting public criticisms have tarnished its reputation. The public is all too familiar with the sorry excuses which Carbide has used over the years to escape the consequences of its actions. Despite the best efforts of Carbide's public relations department, the public has not been fooled.

Ostensibly, the purpose of the misleading document which Carbide distributed was to keep their employees—who are eligible to participate in a special stock-purchasing plan—and stockholders "informed," but it is the petitioners' contention that the corporation's real purpose was to influence shareholders and potential shareholders in their decisions as to the purchasing and disposition of their stock and the use of their proxies, and, by so doing, constituted a direct violation of SEC rules.

The petition fully documents the many news stories which show that Carbide's document was so false and misleading as to require a public investigation, with the object of requiring Carbide to issue a correcting statement. Such an investigation is the least that the public should expect of the Securities and Exchange Commission, so I take this opportunity to urge all Members to join me in calling for an affirmative response to the petition. I also call on all Union Carbide stockholders across the Nation, who want to see their corporation conform to its professed policy of concern for its re-

sponsibilities as a citizen, to join with the petitioners in their efforts to swing the corporation around to a more honest and exemplary stance.

For the benefit of the Members and the public in general, I include, as part of my remarks in the RECORD, the "Summary of Union Carbide's Programs for Pollution Control" and the "Petition to the Securities and Exchange Commission":

[Exhibit A]

UNION CARBIDE CORP.,

New York, N.Y., November 6, 1970.

TO OUR STOCKHOLDERS AND EMPLOYEES:

Because of the nature of recent publicity regarding pollution problems at certain Union Carbide facilities, we think you may be interested in additional information about these problems and our plans for dealing with them.

Unfortunately, accomplishments in environmental pollution abatement are not often considered sufficiently newsworthy to warrant space in the popular press. For this reason, we are addressing you directly, in order to make it clear that Union Carbide has been making major commitments to this effort for some time, and that we fully intend to meet our responsibilities at all of our plant locations.

It would appear that there may be continuing pressure to discredit our intentions and programs. If, at any time, you have questions as to the actual facts relating to these matters, we urge you to write to us for further information.

Sincerely,

BIRNY MASON, Jr.,  
Chairman.

SUMMARY OF UNION CARBIDE'S PROGRAMS FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

NOVEMBER 1970.

Industrial operations throughout the United States, with few exceptions, create waste materials in the normal course of their manufacturing processes. These wastes will escape into the air, water, and ground unless they are collected and disposed of in a proper manner. Pollution from production facilities is not peculiar to one industry or one corporation. All of industry is faced with the problem of adequately controlling effluents and emissions.

The industrial operations of Union Carbide are no exception to this creation of waste material. The important thing is to devise and implement feasible programs to protect our environment from the disposition of these materials. Ever since the 1930's we have been installing pollution-abatement equipment. Throughout the intervening years, we have continued to develop technology required to improve the disposal of our waste materials. Many of our programs have been completely successful; others have been partially successful; some have failed.

WASTE-WATER CONTROL

Union Carbide was the first corporation in the United States to enter into a joint waste water treatment project with a municipality. This venture resulted in the construction of such a plant at South Charleston, West Virginia, in 1959. Since that time, this plant has served as a guide to the development of similar programs in many other communities. At our Anmoore, West Virginia plant we have constructed and are operating a sewage-treatment plant, which was recently doubled in size. Also, we have developed the Unox System, which uses oxygen to treat municipal and industrial waste water at a capital cost of up to 50 per cent less and an operating cost of up to 30 per cent less than conventional facilities. Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel has called the Unox System "one of the most significant technological

breakthroughs in the history of the activated sludge process."

We have been generally successful with our waste-water control efforts to keep within the limits of applicable permits and standards and to improve those efforts over the years. Water-effluent standards, like air-quality standards, are changing. The facility that is in compliance today may well be out of compliance tomorrow. Union Carbide will continue to upgrade its pollution-abatement facilities appropriately.

PROGRESS IN SOLID-WASTE DISPOSAL

Solid-waste problems have come to be recognized as necessary companions to the abatement of air and water pollution. At many corporate locations, we have instituted incineration programs that assure complete combustion of wastes, are smokeless, and are well within compliance of air-pollution regulations. Our three major facilities in the area of South Charleston, West Virginia, are participating in the only licensed chemical landfill project in the state. Under very strict controls, a blending-inerting technique is used to dispose of solid-chemical wastes so that they will become converted to useful soil. This landfill project was cited in 1970 by the Consulting Engineers Council as a major contribution to technical, economic, and social advancement.

CURRENT AIR-QUALITY PROBLEMS

The major air-pollution problems of Union Carbide's manufacturing facilities are associated with the burning of coal to produce steam and electricity, the production of alloys, and the manufacture of carbon electrodes.

Power-station emission controls

The Corporation is giving high priority to steps to combat air pollution resulting from the production of power (i.e., burning coal at our plants located at Alloy, West Virginia; South Charleston, West Virginia; Institute, West Virginia; and Marietta, Ohio. The steam and power stations at Alloy, South Charleston, and Institute require equipment, in addition to that already installed, to control fly-ash emissions. Electrostatic precipitators, which are more than 99 per cent effective, are currently being installed at these locations, at a cost of approximately \$11 million. The control of sulfur-oxide emissions is not a problem at these three sites because we are able to acquire fuel that is low in sulfur content.

At Marietta, Ohio, we have an unresolved problem resulting from the unavoidable use of high-sulfur coal to produce steam and electricity for a ferroalloy plant and an adjacent chemical plant. The reduction of both sulfur-oxide and fly-ash emissions at the Marietta power station has been recommended by an interstate air-pollution abatement conference. Because low-sulfur coal is not available, it is imperative that some form of stack-scrubbing equipment be devised to capture the sulfur-oxide emissions. Up to the present time, there is no commercially developed process available for the removal of sulfur dioxide from the Marietta power-station stacks. Congress has provided for the joint funding by government and industry for development of research technology in situations of this type.

Consequently, we proposed to the National Air Pollution Control Administration (NAPCA) a program aimed at such technology through a jointly funded program. Completion of the proposal would effectively demonstrate a commercial method for removal of sulfur oxide from coal with a sulfur content of 4 to 6 per cent. This development would be available to industry generally, but would have very limited use to Union Carbide beyond the bounds of the Marietta steam station. A successful demonstration would assure the continued use of the high-sulfur coal of Ohio, Kentucky, and West Vir-

ginia as an energy source in a nation where 44 per cent of the coal supply is considered to be high in sulfur content. NAPCA has rejected our proposal as originally presented, but we will be discussing with them alternative approaches to the abatement of sulfur dioxide emissions at Marietta.

#### *Alloy process-emissions control*

At Alloy, West Virginia, where we produce ferroalloys, Corporation scientists and engineers have made progress toward abatement of process emissions, but much more will be accomplished through implementation of a compliance schedule now approved by the West Virginia Air Pollution Control Commission. On July 1, 1970, the Commission adopted its Regulation VII, setting up specific guidelines and criteria for air-pollution control measures. Our ferroalloys plant is covered by these regulations. As required by the Commission, Union Carbide presented a schedule designed to attain the standards set forth in Regulation VII. The Commission has approved procedures and time schedules that establish specific plans for the Corporation to reduce pollution. When all of the planned abatement measures are completed by December, 1974, 99 per cent of the particulate emissions will be eliminated at the Alloy plant.

The ferroalloys produced at Alloy, West Virginia, are basic raw materials used by the steel, aluminum, and foundry industries for among other things, the production of stainless steel. The problems associated with air-pollution control equipment for these furnaces are unique and vary considerably with the type of furnaces and the products they make. Our progress in attacking this air pollution has been such that other ferroalloy producers have visited our Alloy facilities to obtain information on the technological advances the Corporation has made.

#### *Marietta process-emissions control*

Recent newspaper articles have been critical of the air-pollution control measures at our Marietta, Ohio, plant, which also produces ferroalloys. The operation of this facility has been reviewed by the Parkersburg, West Virginia/Marietta, Ohio Interstate Air Pollution Abatement Conference, which issued recommendations on March 19, 1970, relating to process emissions to the air. On September 18, 1970, the Corporation presented a detailed progress report showing that process emissions from the ferroalloy furnaces had already been reduced to the September, 1971, level recommended by the interstate conference group. This was accomplished through the installation of new air scrubbers, improved operating conditions, and the upgrading of existing pollution-control equipment on older furnaces.

The Marietta ferroalloys plant currently possesses the most advanced degree of emission control yet achieved by any major ferroalloy producer. This is due, in large part, to the fact that this plant was designed to incorporate the most modern pollution-control devices available.

#### *Anmoore process-emissions control*

A third major air-pollution problem facing Union Carbide results from the production of carbon electrodes at our Anmoore, West Virginia plant. Emissions from these production processes until very recently, were technologically impossible to control. Since the required technology could not be purchased, Union Carbide developed and engineered its own abatement innovations to control emissions from graphitizing furnaces. This recent technological breakthrough has been applied at our Anmoore plant, eliminating the emissions from this source. The technology is also being put to use at our other electrode manufacturing locations.

In recent months, Corporation engineers determined that troublesome emissions from another step in the electronic manufacturing

process (i.e., carbon baking furnaces) can only be eliminated by a complete rebuilding of these furnaces to enable incineration of the emissions. Our Anmoore, West Virginia plant has now received approval from the West Virginia Air Pollution Control Commission to proceed with such a program to meet the guidelines of Regulation VII. This will be accomplished by July, 1973.

#### NEW PLANT CONTROLS

New construction projects initiated by the Corporation in recent years all provide for environmental protection. At Taft, Louisiana, a modern automated petrochemical plant, control devices include process waste sumps, water clarifiers, settling ponds, a 29-million gallon equalizing pond, oil skimmers in the central canal system, and a fully equipped pollution-control testing laboratory. Expansion of the petrochemical complex at Ponce Puerto Rico, includes comparable pollution-control devices and facilities. These two operations represent a major, coordinated effort by Union Carbide to "design pollution out" of its operations.

#### MANAGING ENVIRONMENTAL EFFORTS

Union Carbide Corporation has been accused of arrogance and indifference to the environmental quality around its plants. As a matter of fact, each production facility of Union Carbide throughout the United States has personnel assigned specifically to the task of pollution control. In addition, within the research and engineering segments of each operating group, teams of experts have the responsibility for assisting and supplementing the pollution-abatement efforts at each plant location. These groups help monitor effluents and emissions, establish control measures, and assist in implementing the necessary improvements in sanitary waste disposal, waste incineration, and the elimination of noxious emissions. Union Carbide has a Director of Environmental Affairs, who is responsible for coordinating the Corporation's total effort.

Throughout the United States and Puerto Rico, we have expended approximately \$90 million to abate pollution. We work continually with the properly constituted commissions and officials to devise and implement feasible and acceptable programs to resolve our remaining problems. Our plans and programs to resolve these problems will require the expenditure of \$20 to \$25 million each year for the next five years.

The programs designed to bring our facilities at Marietta, Ohio; Alloy, West Virginia; and Anmoore, West Virginia, into compliance with the latest regulations and recommendations will, by themselves, require capital expenditures in excess of \$47 million.

It must be recognized that control programs for Marietta and Alloy are based on the assumption that control techniques, not now available, can be developed within the required compliance schedules. Every effort will be made to perfect the technology required for this purpose. Because of the importance of these problems, we will keep you informed of our progress.

#### PETITION BY STOCKHOLDERS OF UNION CARBIDE CORP. FOR PUBLIC INVESTIGATION AND OTHER RELIEF

(1) Petitioners are holders of common stock of Union Carbide Corporation, (herein called "Carbide").

(2) Such stock is a security registered on the New York Stock Exchange, and is actively traded in the exchange and non-exchange markets.

(3) On or about November 6, 1970 Carbide distributed through the mails and instrumentalities of interstate commerce a communication entitled "Summary of Union Carbide's Programs for Pollution Control" dated November 1970, a copy of which communication marked Exhibit A is attached to this petition.

(4) Exhibit A contains untrue statements of material fact and omits to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading (hereinafter referred to as material misstatements and omissions). The nature of such material misstatements and omissions and questions raised thereby are stated in paragraphs 13, and 14.

(5) Exhibit A was distributed to stockholders of record of Carbide.

(6) Distributees in their capacity as such stockholders of record, and otherwise, included most of the leading brokerage firms and a substantial number of registered investment companies, investment advisers, both those registered under the Investment Advisers Act and those exempt from registration.

(7) Exhibit A was also distributed to employees of Carbide, including those who are offered participation in an Employees Savings Plan contemplating investment in Carbide common stock which is registered with the Commission under the Securities Act of 1933 (file no. 2-37077), which had over 58,000 participants as of February 1, 1970 and under which securities are currently being offered.

(8) Exhibit A was distributed in connection with purchases and sales of the common stock of Union Carbide in that

(a) Exhibit A was calculated to induce reasonable investors to rely thereon and in connection therewith, so relying, cause them to purchase or sell Carbide's securities as part of the active trading of such securities in the exchange and over the counter markets, as well as the participation by employees in the said Employees Savings Plan. See *Heit v. Weitzen* 402 F. 2d, 909, 913 (CA2 1968) citing S.E.C. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. 401 F. 2d, 833 at 839.

(b) The management of Carbide and their immediate families hold substantial amounts of stock of Carbide, as well as options granted under a so-called Stock Option Plan. Such plan has the ostensible purpose of providing an incentive to management tied to the market price of Carbide's securities, including the opportunity to buy stock below the market price at the time of the exercise, and thereafter to sell the stock at a profit if the market price should be higher than such exercise price at the time of sale. The plan thus contemplates future purchases and sales of Carbide stock by such participants, the extent of such sales depending upon future market prices for such stock. See Part 3 Report of Special Study of Securities Markets at p. 71 discussing impact of issuers' public relation activities, upon purchases and sales of securities.

(9) Carbide's 1969 Annual Report contains a statement under the heading, "Public Affairs" which begins "Union Carbide continues to manifest its concern for its responsibilities as a citizen in a number of ways during 1969". After citing examples the statement continues, "These small items are in their own way indicative of a multimillion dollar corporate program to fight environmental pollution—one of the most urgent problems facing man today."

(10) Exhibit A states at page 10 under the heading "Managing (sic) Environmental Efforts" that "Union Carbide Corporation has been accused of arrogance and indifference to the environmental quality around its plants". The tenor of Exhibit A as a whole is to answer such criticisms. As such and in the context of the statements referred to in paragraph 9, Exhibit A shows a conscious recognition by Carbide's management of stockholders' interest in having management conduct its operations in accordance with its claimed "concern for its responsibilities as a citizen" inter alia with reference to fighting the "urgent" problem of "environmental pollution" particularly as that problem may be aggravated by Carbide's operations.

(11) In addition to their direct financial impact, the misstatements and omissions contained in Exhibit A are material to the decision of investors who share the "good citizenship" concern expressed by Carbide's management, in the statements quoted in paragraph 9 and 10 above, either to purchase or sell Carbide stock or to give or withhold proxies from time to time in support of or in opposition to management proposals.

(12) Distribution of Exhibit A was "reasonably calculated to result in the procurement of proxies", in connection with the ensuing annual meeting of Carbide and constituted a solicitation as defined in Rule 14 a -1. See *Okin v. S.E.C.* 132 F. 2d 784, 786; and see 1969 Report on Disclosure to Investors from the Disclosure Policy Study at p. 367.

(13) On the basis of facts which have been reported in the press, or are matters of public record in the files of state or federal governmental agencies, petitioners allege that Exhibit A in the following specific respects contains untrue statements of material fact and omissions to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made not misleading:

(a) Exhibit A by its title and tenor purports to be a comprehensive summary of Carbide's pollution control programs and problems. It gives the impression that Carbide's overall contribution to pollution of the environment has been moderate in relation to the scope of its operations and largely unavoidable under current technology; that Carbide has been public spirited and forward looking in endeavoring to meet these problems and to cooperate with the public agencies having responsibilities for the protection of the environment. Exhibit A admits that there have been criticisms of Carbide but fails to specify the nature and extent of the criticisms and thus implies that they have been limited in scope and undeserved. On the contrary; Carbide is, and has been, one of the nation's worst corporate polluters; has been uncooperative and resistant to the efforts of public agencies to curb pollution and the public criticisms have been so extensive as to tarnish its reputation and apparently have led to substantial changes in management, all as stated in more detail below.

(b) A stockholder looking to Exhibit A as a source of information would hardly be aware of "the tarnish that has accumulated over a period of time making Union Carbide—a manufacturer of chemicals, plastics, carbon metals and consumer products—appear as one of the worst corporate polluters in the country." See an article by Gerd Wicke in the New York Times for Sunday, February 14, 1971 and see references to "the horror story of" Carbide in an article by E. W. Kenworthy in the New York Times for July 6, 1970. Nor would the stockholder learn that Carbide's plant at Alloy, West Virginia mentioned in Exhibit A gives the town "a highly visible claim to infamy" as "home for what may be the smokiest factory in the world: a Union Carbide ferroalloys plant that pours out 70,000 tons of particulates a year—slightly more than the total emitted in all of New York City. . . ." See an article in Business Week for February 6, 1971 at p. 54 which states further:

"By Carbide measurements, each cubic meter of air around the plant contains about 400 micrograms of soot, some of it fine as face powder. That is four times the level that HEW says causes children to 'experience an increased incidence of respiratory disease' and five times the level that can cause 'a noticeable increase in mortality among the elderly and middle-aged.'"

(c) Under the heading "Waste-Water Control" Carbide states (p. 4) "We have been generally successful with our waste-water control efforts to keep within the limits of applicable permits and standards. . . ." citing changing standards and its continuing purpose to "upgrade its pollution-abatement

standards" and also pointing to specific technological and other breakthroughs. This statement is misleading in failing to state that as of the date thereof all five of Carbide's West Virginia facilities were dumping waste into navigable streams without permits from the Army Corps of Engineers as required by the Refuse Act of 1899. Shortly prior to the distribution of Exhibit A, the Charleston Daily Mail for October 30, 1970 reported with respect to Carbide's South Charleston area:

"Meanwhile, F. Douglas Bess, assistant manager of environmental control for Carbide's 16 plants, including those at South Charleston and Institute, told State Atty. Gen. Chauncey Browning Jr. that the area plants turn loose more than 36 tons of chemical waste daily into the Kanawha River which draws on the oxygen needed for living things. He said it goes without treatment.

"Virtually none of the water is recycled, he testified at Browning's Blue Ridge project hearing, and from an economic standpoint it is nearly 'impossible to treat these large volumes of water.'

"Chemical oxygen demand material, largely unbiodegradable, is also released into Ward Hollow in the amount of 43,000 pounds daily, Bess said. The hollow is drained by Davis Creek which flows into the river. Davis Creek has been the scene many times of massive fish kills.

"Another 136,000 pounds of industrial waste, or 68 tons, flows from the South Charleston waste treatment plant each day, Bess said."

Petitioners do not know of comparable published figures as to water pollution by Carbide in other areas.

(d) Under the sub-heading Power-Station Emission Controls, Exhibit A states, "The Corporation is giving high priority to steps to combat air pollution resulting from the production of power . . . at our plants at Alloy, West Virginia, South Charleston, West Virginia, Institute, West Virginia; and Marietta, Ohio." This statement, if literally true as of today is misleading in failing to summarize Carbide's long history of past neglect and resistance to efforts of state and federal authorities to obtain relief against pollution from these plants. This omission is highly material, since the need for Carbide giving "high priority" today, and any practical difficulties in meeting schedules proposed, or ordered by regulatory \* \* \*.

The mayor of Vienna, West Virginia has struggled since 1961 without significant response from Carbide to obtain relief from Carbide's plant across the river in Marietta, Ohio. Passage of the 1963 Clean Air Act set up a slow moving procedure for federal relief, but Carbide appears to have taken full advantage of the inherent delays in implementing that legislation. Pursuant to that Act, the National Air Pollution Control Administration (NAPCA) held an abatement conference concerning pollution in the Vienna area. Carbide was invited but declined to present evidence at that conference. A Public Health Service study was presented to show "marked increases in respiratory diseases in the area and pinpointed the Marietta Plant as the region's major polluter." (See the 2/6/71 Business Week article at page 54 which continues "For the next two years Carbide refused to supply complete data on emissions, and, at one point, barred federal inspectors from the Marietta Plant." NAPCA called a second abatement conference in October 1969 which Carbide failed even to attend and the conference failed to result in any immediate recommendations. Threats of litigation on the part of HEW, in 1970, finally resulted in Carbide supplying requested information, followed in April 1970 by formal "recommendations" for the control of sulphur oxides by Carbide—a 40% reduction by October 1970 and a 70% reduc-

tion by January 1972. Carbide failed to meet the October deadline. Thereafter the Environmental Protection Agency succeeded to the powers of the HEW Secretary, and further proceedings led to an order, in January 1971, (shortly after the distribution of Exhibit A), for an immediate 40% reduction, and timely compliance with the other conference recommendations. Carbide was the first company to be the subject of an enforcement order of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to air pollution.

The West Virginia Air Pollution Control Commission appears to have been met with similar delays on Carbide's part. A 1969 written agreement on the part of Carbide to cut power plant emissions at Alloy failed to result in timely compliance, as a result of Carbide's indecision as between modifying operations, or purchasing power as means of compliance. (See Business Week 2/6/71 at p. 55.)

(e) Exhibit A states at page 6 that an "unresolved problem" of pollution from its power plant at Marietta, Ohio results "from the unavoidable use of high-sulphur coal." This is misleading in its failure to disclose the ownership by Carbide of some 53 million tons of low-sulphur coal in reserve at its own Mammouth, West Virginia mine, and in its failure to discuss the feasibility of Carbide buying low sulphur coal; or the extent to which any actual difficulties with timely substitution of low sulphur coal were self-induced. Carbide had reported to anti pollution authorities that its own low sulphur reserves were unavailable to meet recommended pollution abatement schedules. If true, this ceased to be the case shortly after distribution of Exhibit A, following the January 1971 order of the EPA administration and subsequent termination of a contract calling for sales of Carbide low sulphur coal to an Ohio utility corporation.

(f) In a number of press reported interviews both before and subsequent to the distribution of Exhibit A, Carbide officers have admitted past overzealousness in resisting pollution control authorities. See the concluding paragraph of Kenworthy's report in the New York Times for July 6, 1970; Report by Burt Schorr on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal for March 4, 1971, entitled "Fighting Pollution; Why the Delay?"; article in 2/6/71 Business Week at page 56, column 1.

(g) Exhibit A states at page 8, "Recent newspaper articles have been critical of the air pollution control measures at our Marietta, Ohio plant, which also produces ferroalloys." This statement is misleading for failure to indicate the scope and extent of press criticisms with respect to the Marietta plant as well as other Carbide operations. A limited search by petitioners has turned up a number of pertinent criticisms over a period from July 6, 1970. We are making copies available to the Commission's investigatory staff.

It may be assumed that Carbide's public relations advisors have a far more extensive clipping file and petitioners suggest that Carbide should be required to produce such file. Reference to significant news reports, both before and after November 6, 1970, are listed below. It is not suggested that Carbide should have referred in Exhibit A to then non-existent news items. The post November 6, 1970 items are nevertheless relevant, both because in many instances the texts indicate references to long standing public criticisms of Carbide and because of the bearing of the more recent items on what would be an appropriate correcting statement.

#### I. ITEMS PRIOR TO NOVEMBER 6, 1970

7/2/70 *Charleston Gazette* refer to filing of a suit by an Anmore, West Virginia couple in the U.S. District Court against Carbide, the West Virginia Air Pollution Control Commission and the NAPCA for compensatory and punitive damages from Carbide and

injunctive relief in respect of Carbide caused air pollution at Anmoore.

7/6/70 *New York Times* article (signed by E. W. Kenworthy) quoting criticism by Representative Ken Hechler of West Virginia concerning pollution from Carbide's Marietta plants and his correspondence with Carbide as a "horror study" buttressing the need for further Federal legislation.

9/19/70 "Environment Action" at page 9 describing complaints concerning unhealthy working conditions in Carbide's plant at Tonawanda, New York.

10/1/1970 *Charleston Gazette* article by Mary Walton concerning a then pending proceeding before the West Virginia Air Pollution Control Commission and quoting a statement of Director Beard of that agency, "The record of Union Carbide has not been good. It's been sorry," later adding "You started in 1963, and you want until 1975. Ridiculous."

10/13/70 *Charleston Gazette* referring to a petition of 200 Anmoore, West Virginia residents, asking Union Carbide to make public its plans for abating air pollution in Anmoore, West Virginia. The article further states that about 50 families have agreed to join the suit referred to in the above mentioned 7/2/70 *Charleston Gazette* item.

10/15/70 *Bridgeport, West Virginia Spotlight*, noting that the fight against Carbide of a "Citizens for Clean Air" Anmoore group has attracted the attention of the national press, National Education Television, and concerned citizens from other areas.

10/15/70 *Charleston Gazette* referring to copies of Ralph Nader correspondence criticizing pollution at the Alloy, West Virginia plant.

10/22/70 *New York Times* article signed by E. W. Kenworthy referring to a telegram to the HEW Secretary signed by Curtis M. Uhl, Mayor of Vienna, by Richard S. Cotterman of the West Virginia House of Delegates and by Grace Dils, a local businessman complaining of delays in abating pollution from the Carbide Marietta plants.

10/30/70 *New York Times*, page 69, reviewing proposals of Carbide, and requirements of state and federal authorities with respect to controlling pollution at Carbide's Alloy, Anmoore and Marietta plants.

10/30/70 *Charleston Daily Mail* article by Richard Grimes referring to Carbide plans for abatement of air pollution at Alloy, Anmoore and Marietta plants, also referring to daily discharge of some tons of chemical wastes by Carbide plants into the Kanawha River.

11/2/70 *Charleston Gazette* article by Mary Walton describing visits to the homes of Carbide plant managers in the hills high above the pollution suffered by valley dwellers, stating "I have heard these managers and their emissaries on countless occasions talk apologetically about pollution and what they say is that it's going to take a long time to do anything. This from people who don't shut their windows on hot summer nights to block out burning fumes and horrid smells that even an air conditioner can't stop."

## II. NEWS ITEMS SUBSEQUENT TO NOVEMBER 6, 1970

11/15/70 *News Register* of Parkersburg, West Virginia reviewing the struggle of Vienna, West Virginia, for relief from the Marietta, Ohio and referring to the action of a citizens' committee in urging the NAPA to move a little faster—particularly in regard to abatement recommendations at the Carbide Marietta plant.

11/24/70 *New York Times* article by Ben A. Franklin refers to plants at Alloy and Anmoore as "currently under fire."

12/28/70 *News Week* article entitled "Pollution: Puffery or Progress" discusses pollution and related public relation activities on the part of a number of companies including Carbide. See page 50, first column.

1/1/71 *Denver Post* report from Marietta, Ohio of the unsuccessful attempt of a defendant speeding past a Carbide factory at 80 m.p.h. to use the excuse "I was hurrying to pass the awful odor."

1/9/71 *Washington Post*, p. 6 Associated Press story referring to the rejection by the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency of a proposed clean up schedule on the part of Carbide at Marietta as the Director's first major anti-pollution enforcement action.

1/23/71 *Environmental Action* article entitled "Union Carbide: Village Villain" adapted from a two part story by Stewart Udall and Jeff Stansbury distributed by the *Los Angeles Times*.

2/6/71 *Business Week* article on Carbide entitled "A Corporate Polluter Learns the Hard Way" referred to in proceeding paragraphs of the petition.

2/14/71 *New York Times* article by Gerd Wilcke entitled "Untarnishing Carbide" also mentioned supra.

(h) The implications that Exhibit A is a comprehensive summary of Carbide's pollution problems and programs is misleading in omitting to deal at all with (i) pollution resulting from Carbide's extensive strip and other mining operations, (ii) emissions, including noxious odors from its chemical plants (iii) pollution from Carbide's coal burning power plants, alloy and carbon electrodes plants other than those mentioned in Exhibit A and (iv) pollution by Carbide's majority owned Canadian Subsidiary.

Carbide's chemical plants at Institute and South Charleston, West Virginia are a notorious source of objectionable odors as revealed in a 1970 joint report on air pollution in the Kanawa Valley. Carbide's Beauharnois, Quebec plant discharges almost 11,000 tons of silica dust into the atmosphere each year, an amount equal to approximately 1/7 of the total visible air pollution from all sources in the City of New York. The same subsidiary has an alloy plant at Welland, Ontario which has been the subject of recent pollution control orders of Ontario's Energy and Resources Minister which, as announced by Carbide on August 23, 1970, requires corrective action at an estimated cost of \$20,000,000. Petitioners are not informed of the extent of the pollution problems at Carbide's numerous other plants in the United States and elsewhere which are engaged in inherently pollution causing production of alloys and carbon products and chemicals, as well as its coal, asbestos, tungsten, vanadium-uranium mines and related mills, all types of operations associated with serious degradation of the earth, air and water.

(14) It is a reasonable inference from the misstatements and omissions described in paragraph 13 that there are other respects not known to or reasonably ascertainable by petitioners in which Exhibit A may contain material misstatements and omissions.

(15) By reason of the facts set forth in paragraphs 2 to 11 inclusive and paragraph 13, Petitioner's distribution of Exhibit A violated Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act and the Commission's Rule 10 b-5 thereunder, and section 17 of the Securities Act.

(16) By reason of the facts set forth in paragraphs 2 to 7 and 9 to 13, both inclusive, such distribution also violated the Commission's Rule 14 a-9. Petitioners regard such violation of Rule 14 a-9 as a matter of aggravation of the violation of Rule 10 b-5 and Section 17. Petitioner does not know whether Exhibit A was filed with or otherwise submitted to the Commission but any incidental violation of any requirements as to filing with or submission to the Commission is not material to the relief sought by petitioners.

(17) Petitioners' interest in obtaining re-

lief in respect of the misstatements are as follows:

(a) Petitioners agree with the professed policy of Carbide "to manifest its concern for its responsibilities as a citizen"; and wish to be in a position (i) to exercise their franchises as stockholders, (ii) to determine whether to continue as stockholders of Carbide and (iii) to enlist the support of fellow stockholders in trying to induce management to conform to such professed policy, all in the light of an adequately informed evaluation of the genuineness of Carbide's efforts to conform to that objective.

(b) Petitioners as stockholders have an interest in Carbide conducting its business in a lawful manner.

(c) Carbide's violation of Rule 10b-5 and section 17 of the Securities Act, unless corrected, is of continuing impact on the trading in respect of Carbide's securities in the exchange and over the counter markets and offerings of securities by Carbide and to an extent dependent on the future market prices of Carbide's securities, exposes Carbide to the risk of liabilities to security holders who may rely on Exhibit A in the purchase or sale of securities. As stockholders, petitioners have an interest in minimizing such liabilities.

Wherefore petitioners pray that the Commission:

I. Order a public investigation pursuant to section 21(a) of the Exchange Act of the facts set forth in the petition, and such further facts as may be pertinent to determine the extent that Exhibit A contains misleading statements and omissions. In the interest of expedition and economy of the Commission's time petitioner suggests that the scope of such investigation may be limited, initially at least, as specified in paragraphs II, III, and IV of this prayer for relief.

II. As part of such investigation require Carbide to file with the Commission, pursuant to the first sentence of said section 21(a), a statement in writing, signed by a responsible officer of Carbide, as to all the facts and circumstances concerning the matter, including specific answers to the allegations of fact contained in this petition, and to the matters specified in paragraph 14 as pertinent but not known to petitioners.

III. Direct Carbide to submit to the Commission its proposal as to an appropriate text and plan for distribution of a correcting statement, designed to mitigate so far as possible the consequences of the misleading statements and omissions in Exhibit A and require that the final text of such correcting statement be filed with the Commission pursuant to the first sentence of section 21(a), when and as distributed. (As a minimum, Carbide's correcting statement should describe, adequately, with details as to each major facility: (a) the full impact of Carbide's operations upon the environment; (b) the resulting press and other public criticisms; (c) the efforts of local, state and federal government authorities to curb pollution from Carbide's operations and related private litigation; and (d) the past and planned future steps of Carbide to curtail pollution caused by such operations and costs and estimated future costs thereof.)

IV. Direct Carbide to serve copies of such documents on petitioners and accord petitioners and any other interested stockholders an opportunity to comment, orally or in writing, on the adequacy of any statement or proposals of Carbide of the nature referred to in paragraphs II and III of this prayer for relief.

V. Take such, if any, additional steps as the Commission may consider necessary to ascertain the pertinent facts.

VI. On the basis of the facts ascertained by the Commission direct Carbide to take appropriate corrective action.

VII. Pending final action on the petition by the Commission, direct Carbide to defer future solicitation of proxies from its stock-

holders and/or action upon matters which have been the subject of such solicitation subsequent to the mailing of Exhibit A.

VIII. In the event of refusal of Carbide to comply with any requirements and directions of the Commission, institute procedures for appropriate administrative and/or judicial sanctions to compel such compliance and to deter future violations.

ROGER S. FOSTER,  
CHARLES R. HALPERN.

Washington, D.C.

Attorneys for Petitioners, whose names and ownership of Carbide stock is listed below:  
Project on Corporate Responsibility, 1600 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, beneficial owner of 3 shares of Carbide stock as a result of an uncompleted purchase contract.

Larry J. Silverman, 2310 Claridge Circle, South Charleston, West Virginia, owner of 1 share of Carbide stock.

William Osborn, 2310 Claridge Circle, South Charleston, West Virginia, owner of 10 shares of Carbide stock.

Roger S. Foster, one of the attorneys for petitioners, has been a stockholder of Carbide for approximately 40 years, is presently the holder of 258 shares of Carbide stock, and in that respect may be considered as petitioning in a dual capacity.

#### AMERICA'S PRIORITIES

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, in one of the most dramatic turnabouts in recent congressional history, the U.S. House of Representatives voted to terminate Government participation in the controversial SST. One of the primary reasons cited by many Members of the House was the issue of priorities. It was the issue which prompted my decision.

For several years now, I have contended that Federal spending priorities were way out of whack. Military spending went virtually unchecked until last year, while domestic needs remained woefully underfinanced. The Federal Government poured billions of dollars into subsidies for part-time farmers and at the same time failed to adequately fund our national housing programs. The situation was, and remains, intolerable.

One of the most scandalous examples of confused priorities which is presently surfacing involves our nationwide system of veterans hospitals and outpatient clinics. In the recently submitted Veterans' Administration budget, for fiscal 1972, the White House has proposed massive cuts, in terms of both actual dollars and services performed. The budget proposes to cut back medical service for approximately 5,000 hospital patients daily. In Syracuse alone, this will mean the elimination of 40 beds in the already short-bedded VA hospital. At the Bath hospital, 15 beds would be eliminated; in Canandaigua it would mean the loss of almost 100 units; and another 100 would be lost in Buffalo.

As many of you will no doubt recall, the White House last year attempted a similar cutback for the VA. That proposal ran into stiff opposition in Congress. After the battle was over Congress had succeeded in restoring \$155 million to the budget, but even this was far below the level of need. One of the amazing

statistics which came to light during the 1970 debate was the fact that some \$40 million worth of highly sophisticated medical equipment was laying idle in VA hospitals across the country because the hospitals didn't have enough money to hire adequately trained medical technicians. A very painful irony, indeed.

But the VA hospital system, important as it is to our our veterans, is not the only area to feel the cold blade of the White House knife. The new budget calls for the complete elimination of the direct home loan program, a program which over the years has aided some 300,000 veterans and their families and which, incidentally, has shown a profit of some \$218 million.

A short time ago, I met with Congressman OLIN TEAGUE of Texas, the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. I was deeply concerned about the administration's proposal. I was deeply concerned because I realized that our veteran population is rising every day and that a cutback in VA funds would place severe strains on them. Chairman TEAGUE assured me that the committee intends to lead the fight against any further cuts and that wherever possible to restore badly needed funds which were cut out in prior years.

It is certainly a sad reflection on our society when we have billions of dollars to throw away on nonessentials, and then attempt to make returning veterans the scapegoats. It is the kind of confused priorities with which the Congress will have to come to firm grips during the weeks and months ahead. The VA budget is not alone in this situation, to be sure. There are literally dozens of areas like housing and drug control which have become stepchildren in the Federal budget over the years. It is long past the time when we must seriously reorder our priorities and restore some semblance of sanity to our national goals.

We have the richest, most highly educated, most technologically advanced society in the history of the world. With those qualities of affluence come great moral and civic responsibilities. We cannot afford to shirk them.

#### THE NEW POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Senator GALE MCGEE, delivered a provocative speech about the new Postal Service. Senator MCGEE's penetrating comments deserve wide distribution and consideration by all of us who have a deep and abiding interest in improving the Postal Service throughout the country. A copy of Senator MCGEE's remarks follows:

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR GALE MCGEE

This occasion creates an opportunity for you as mail users, for your guest lecturers as experts on postal problems, and for me as the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to review some of the factors which were taken into account when we enacted the Postal Reorganization Act last year; to discuss what problems lay

ahead; and to lay out, as far as I am concerned, at least something akin to a blueprint for progress in postal operations.

First of all, I think it is important for all of us to keep in mind that there is no reason for establishing—or permitting to be established—a genuinely adversary situation between the post office and anyone else. By anyone else, I include the users of the mail, both in business enterprise as well as the millions of citizens who rely upon mail for all kinds of services, and the Congress; which is, after all, the Branch of our government which created the new United States Postal Service and is the only government agency which answers directly to the people. If we do not act to prevent the development of an adversary situation, if we allow our tempers to be riled, or our viewpoints to become too personal, too petty, or too prejudiced, then the movement for postal reform will go awry and the aftermath will be most unhappy.

So, although my words to you today may be strong and my criticisms pointed, I say them because of my very deep commitment to the fulfillment of the policies which Congress established in the Postal Reorganization Act, that

"The United States Postal Service shall be operated as a basic and fundamental service provided to the people by the Government of the United States, authorized by the Constitution, created by Act of Congress, and supported by the people."

I am glad to see that this symposium has some of the very fine participants that it does. Looking around this room and looking over the schedule of guest speakers convinces me that this kind of meeting can be most useful. There may be some feeling that permitting Postal Service officers or employees to hobnob with lawyers or junk mailers or Congressional aides or other people who have an interest—either official or business—in the Postal Service might somehow taint the parity of the Postal Service. That is a legitimate concern; but it is more important that officers of the Postal Service participate in meetings such as this so that businessmen and private citizens who look upon the Postal Service as a vital commercial service in the United States will not only have an opportunity to present their side of many issues but will also get the word from the "horse's mouth."

Some from outside the Government who are here and on other programs of this kind have extremely high qualifications. Tim May was planning the reorganization of the Post Office Department when the present postal administration was back home.

Ralph Nicholson, for eight years the Assistant Postmaster General for Finance who guided two major postal rate bills through Congress, and John Burzio, the Staff Director of the Senate Committee, wrote the first Postal Reorganization Bill at the request of the then Chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, S. 3726 of the 90th Congress. Fred Belen, after 15 years as the Chief of Staff of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, devoted 8 years to top-flight administrative and operations duties in the Post Office Department.

My point is there is no need for adversary conditions. I recognize that there is money involved, that an extra one-half cent of postage for second-class mailers means millions of dollars; but I was impressed from the beginning until the end of our consideration of postal reorganization last year that almost all business mailers, second-, third-, and fourth-class, recognized that in the long run, cost was not the most important factor. *Reliability of service is the most important factor.* If the Postal Service can work with business and Congress to achieve that goal, our efforts—and I might say our sacrifice—will have been worthwhile. I say sacrifice because many of my colleagues held and still adhere to the view that if this new govern-

ment agency is not successful, nobody is going to write Red Blount and complain. They are going to write Gale McGee, Hiram Fong, Ted Dulski or their own Congressman or Senator. The hen house where that plucked chicken will come home to roost is the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. If anyone believes that we are not fully aware of that truth then let him be dissuaded from now on.

Congress must carry out its responsibilities to the people to insure that the new postal agency is a success. The enactment of the new law does not mean that we will never act again. The establishment of a Board of Governors does not mean that we will refrain from exercising our Constitutional power to look into postal operations. I have never heard of an executive agency that appreciated that idea, but in maintaining the system of Separation of Powers and checks and balances in our Federal Government, the Founding Fathers must have thought it was a good idea. That's why they wrote that little sentence in Article I of the Constitution of the United States:

"All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

You notice that they didn't say "some" legislative powers or "such legislative power as the Postmaster General determines advisable." It says "all." We shall proceed in accordance with the Constitution.

Cabinet officers used to appear before our Committee and often referred to the Committee as the Post Office Department's "Board of Directors." They reported to us for legislation and for appropriations. The basic relationship has not changed. There is a Board of Governors in the Postal Service, but there's a little story about that. When Hiram Fong and I introduced S. 3842 last year we created a Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service and said:

"The executive authority of the Postal Service shall be vested in a Board of Governors."

That sentence so concerned the Postmaster General that he dispatched his aides to the Hill to insure that nobody would get the idea that this Board of Governors was actually going to run the post office. You may note that the final language adopted—in compliance with the Postmaster General's wishes—says:

"The exercise of the power of the Postal Service shall be directed by a Board of Governors."

On adopting its rules and regulations, the new Postal Service decided that the Governors wouldn't actually have to attend a meeting, they can just listen in on a telephone down on the ranch or wherever they are and be counted as present. If that is a businesslike way to conduct the affairs of a major commercial enterprise, then I understand a little more about Penn Central and Lockheed than I did.

Except for Fred Kappel, who served as the Chairman of the President's Commission on Postal Organization, no member of the Board has any experience with postal problems. I can think of a dozen men, in and out of government, active and retired, whose years of experience in the Congress, the Executive Branch, or postal labor unions make them highly qualified and who would contribute invaluable to improving the post office. It seems as if acquiring anyone with any knowledge of the post office was consciously disregarded.

Another aspect of the adversary situation which I regret to see arising is the relationship between the United States Postal Service and the United States Postal Rate Commission. There has been a good bit said by the Postmaster General and some of his subordinate officers about how the Commission is independent, and yet in his testimony pre-

pared to present to the Commission, the Assistant Postmaster General, Jim Hargrove, has implied very strongly that the Commission is rigidly confined in its power to investigate the Department's case for a rate increase.

Now it may be that the Postal Rate Commission has limitations upon its authority, but there is no doubt in my mind that the Postmaster General or anyone else in the Postal Service is not and can not be a judge of those limitations. The judge is the Commission itself, or a court of law if an appeal is taken from a Commission recommendation, or the Congress, which might exercise its law-making power to alter the Commission. But for an officer of the Postal Service to attempt to proscribe activities of the Commission is a direct attack upon the independence of the Commission. That is why, among other reasons, that in vesting in the Board of Governors the power to overrule a Commission recommendation we specifically excluded the Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General from voting on the issue. If further legislation is needed to clarify Congress' viewpoint, it will be enacted.

The other day, the Commission asked the Postal Service to grant permission for the Commission to go inside some post offices and take a look. Here is the answer and I quote from the Service's response to the Commission's request:

"To dragon the Post Office Department's limited manpower into conducting cooks' tours for an array of interveners, interveners officials, lawyers, economists, consultants and miscellaneous camp followers can only be expected to be counter-productive if this proceeding is to move forward expeditiously. By inviting other participants in its request, the litigation division had advantaged no one."

We on the Senate Committee created the Postal Rate Commission. If you look back to the original recommendation to establish a postal corporation you notice that the "Postal Rate Board" was a highly dependent part of the postal corporation, whose advice could be disregarded at will. The Commission which we created, and which we insisted upon over the strong objections of the Postmaster General, is a Commission independent of any outside influence. Although their judgment in the final analysis may be overruled by the unanimous written decision of the Governors—excluding the Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General—their powers otherwise are not limited. The Postal Reorganization Act is 69 pages of law; probably somewhere someone has counted the words. Let me assure you that the Senate Committee read and wrote and re-wrote all of those words. Chapter 36 of that law, regarding postal rates, classifications, and services went through 21 versions before the conferees finally agreed. The Postmaster General, I recall, was amused and critical that we would take so long to write a law and make so many changes. In my judgment, we knew exactly what we were doing. We said what we meant when we wrote a law saying:

"The Postal Rate Commission shall take any other action they deem necessary and proper to carry out their functions and obligations to the Government of the United States and the people. Such actions shall not be subject to any change or supervision by the Postal Service."

The Postal Service has the duty to deliver the mail in the best manner possible. The Postal Rate Commission has the duty to determine who will pay what rate to use that mail. For either to impose upon the other destroys the balance of power existing between them. Surely disagreements may arise; but for the whole system to work as we envisioned it, they must be resolved and they must be resolved specifically within the

boundaries of the law and with careful adherence to the policy which Congress established. There is no other policy-making body in the Federal Government. If they cannot be reconciled, then very clearly we have all failed: the Service, the Commission, and the Congress itself for failing to insist upon compliance.

In the months ahead the results of our effort will come to light. Some have suggested that the postal service in the United States is as poor as it is today because the Postal Service wants to show how much they can improve it two or three years from now. I have no evidence to prove that this is the policy, but I have received an unusually large number of complaints from the public in general about the deterioration of the service and I am concerned that public dissatisfaction might possibly reach a point requiring fairly drastic action. A whole lot of people, including some labor leaders, scoffed at the idea that postal workers would violate both the civil and criminal statutes of the United States by going out on strike. I think we should all keep that in mind and not reach a similarly unwise conclusion concerning the viewpoint of the people or the people's representatives in Congress about the necessity for good postal service now.

Postal costs mean a lot to you businessmen, millions of dollars a year, but that is a cost which in the last analysis you can usually—I emphasize the word usually—of respect to the Saturday Evening Post and other departed friends—pass on to your customer. But the housewife or the hod carrier cannot pass that cost on. They have no use for second-class mail, very little use for third-class mail, and only Christmas or birthday use for fourth-class mail. So when the housewife or the hod carrier steps up to the window at the post office—of course, that has to be on a week day during business hours—and pays 8 or 10 or 15 cents for the only postage stamp they can use to send a letter by the only legal means of sending a letter, they're going to spend some time thinking about it. And if the only thing they get for their extra money is reduced service and slower mail delivery, they just may express their dissatisfaction at the ballot box.

We in Congress are anxiously, hopefully, and I hope patiently, awaiting results from the "honest, efficient, and economical management" of the United States Postal Service.

#### PRIVATE FINANCING OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A PROTOTYPE SST

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today my bill to provide for private financing of the construction of a prototype SST, first submitted in 1966.

The bill would establish a supersonic transport authority to develop the prototype aircraft through flight tests.

If the development is successful, the bill provides for creation of a Supersonic Transport Corporation to undertake production and sale of the aircraft.

The bill requires the SST authority to work closely with the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency to overcome any hazards to the environment that may be encountered in the development of the prototype. The bill requires the President to make certain this cooperation is had.

Mr. Speaker, if my bill had been heard and my suggestion adopted in 1966 the

prototype would now be well underway and we would have avoided the great problems through which we have struggled recently. It is not too late to change to financing from the private sector and experts in finance assure me that the funds are available and the proposal is feasible.

I hope this bill can have immediate and careful consideration from all concerned, so that we may continue this important project with a minimum of delay.

#### ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR RAILPAX

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in the near future I will introduce legislation to provide an additional \$289,965,000 for the funding of Railpax during its first full year of operation as a reserve to add urgently needed service around the Nation, including westward service from Buffalo through Erie, Pa.; Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio; and South Bend, Ind., to Chicago.

I am sure my colleagues will take note of the fact that the above amount was the budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 in the Department of Transportation appropriation bill for civil supersonic aircraft development. I realize that some of the above budget estimate will be used up at the end of this month, but I still consider the \$290 million figure to be fitting and proper, for Railpax needs, this year and in the future.

Since the routes that Railpax announced on Monday would suspend 50 percent of the railroad passenger service in the Nation, I am sure there is no disagreement that Railpax is grossly undercapitalized. In addition, my proposal would save about 40 percent of the 16,000 jobs in railroad passenger service, which would be eliminated under the Railpax plan.

Mr. Speaker, SST opponents talked about priorities in generalities which I could not accept. Now that SST funds are no longer an issue, I am going to talk about specifics, and I will ask for cosponsors to my bill, but as yet I have not decided whether to increase the authorization under Public Law 91-518 or under special revenue sharing for the Department of Transportation.

#### OBITUARY

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, pondering the decision of the Congress to abandon the SST program after spending \$800 million of the taxpayers' money on the project, and with the cost of terminating it close to that of completing the prototypes has inspired certain thoughts which I include, herewith, for the edification of the Congress:

#### THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF THE SST

Turn back, Columbus, we may die!  
The quest is hard  
The sea too rough  
The price too high  
Turn back, Columbus, we may die!

Return, bold eagle, do not fly!  
Lest soaring where  
None flew before  
Dangers be there  
Return, bold eagle, do not fly!

Thus in the lives of nations  
And of men  
Does what was meant to be  
Become what might have been.

#### CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this week has been designated as National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action.

This week is of special significance since it was 6 years ago this week that the first American serviceman was captured by North Vietnamese forces. Since that time, over 1,500 of our military personnel have been listed as either missing in action or as prisoners of war. Approximately 150 of these men have been held prisoner or have been missing for 5 years; an additional 300 have been missing for almost 4 years.

While the North Vietnamese and Vietcong have arrogantly refused to release word on our men, their families wait for their return. Instead of cooperating, the Communists have given unofficial lists to leftist organizations who then release them with great fanfare in the United States. This only adds to the heartbreak and misery being experienced by the wives, children, and parents of those missing in action.

Mr. Speaker, our President has made two very simple proposals concerning Vietnam and our prisoners of war. He has proposed a mutual withdrawal of all foreign troops from Vietnam and a return of all prisoners of war. The Communists, however, have refused to even discuss this.

I need not remind any of my distinguished colleagues that the Paris talks have been continuing for almost 3 years. Out of those weekly meetings, the only thing that has been definitely decided is the shape of the conference table.

While our diplomats continue to make honest attempts at ending our involvement in Southeast Asia, the Communists continue to make propaganda from the talks from the POW issue.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the President's vow that as long as the prisoner of war issue is unresolved, the United States will continue to have troops in Vietnam.

I pray that God will continue to give strength to the waiting families and to those who remain in Communist prison camps. This week affords every American the opportunity to let the families know that they are not waiting alone without hope.

#### RAILPAX IN CONNECTICUT

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased with the decision of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to include the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield route in the Railpax System. Station stops on the route include Meriden and Wallingford, both cities in the Fifth Congressional District which I represent. I can personally attest to the importance of railroad passenger service in both of the cities.

Initially there was some question whether rail passenger service to Hartford, the State capitol, would be retained in the plan due to the inclusion of the New York-New Haven-Providence-Boston route and I early pointed out the need for both routes. Last November, I wrote to Secretary of Transportation Volpe and urged him to include all Connecticut rail lines in the Railpax System, and Secretary Volpe assured me that my recommendations would be considered and analyzed in the preparation of the final report.

In December, shortly after the Department of Transportation issued its Preliminary Report on Basic National Rail Passenger System I again wrote to the Secretary of Transportation and protested the exclusion of the entire western half of Connecticut, which includes a good part of my district, from the proposed basic system. In my letter to Secretary Volpe I urged the inclusion of a Bridgeport-Waterbury-Hartford-Springfield-Boston route, and a New Haven-Meriden-Wallingford-Hartford-Springfield route in any plan finally adopted. I also asked that the city of Danbury, serviced by a rail passenger line originating in Norwalk, to be included in the system.

On December 18, I also urged Mr. Chester M. Wiggin, Jr., Federal Co-Chairman of the New England Regional Commission to include my recommendations for western Connecticut and for the Hartford line in the Commission's proposals to the Secretary of Transportation. I was pleased that the January 3, 1971, New England Regional Commission report to the Secretary of Transportation included my recommendation for a Hartford-Meriden-New Haven route, and a route through Danbury, but I notified Mr. Wiggin of my disappointment with the failure of the New England Regional Commission to propose an overall rail passenger system to service the western half of Connecticut.

Prior to the National Rail Passenger Corporation's decision to designate the so-called inland route through Hartford as well as the coastal route from New York to Boston in the final system I joined with Governor Meskill, ex-Governor Dempsey, and other elected officials and concerned citizens in Connecticut in emphasizing with the Secretary of Transportation and the incorporators of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation the vital importance of having

both routes designated to serve Connecticut, and I am pleased that the Corporation has adopted our recommendation.

Despite our success in having both routes in Connecticut included in the final system, it is a matter of continuing concern for me that the final route fails to include any rail service in the entire western half of Connecticut and I intend to work with elected officials and citizens in that part of the State to secure adequate rail passenger service, since I believe that in the future we shall turn increasingly to this form of transportation as the congestion of our highways and streets increases with the rise in the number of automobiles.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS OF REVENUE SHARING

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the pros and cons of President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposals. The President has hailed his recommendation as a means of returning "power to the people." As a Member of Congress who has long been concerned with civil rights and equal opportunity for all of our citizens I find the President's choice of words ironical. For while revenue sharing on its face may appear to be a mechanism for returning power to some people, I have grave doubts about the program's ability to deliver power to those people that have never fully had it—namely the poor and members of minority groups. For these reasons I asked Dick Warden of the Washington Research Project Action Council, a well-respected organization concerned with poverty, race, and education to prepare a memorandum for me on the civil rights-equal opportunity aspects of the President's revenue-sharing proposals. I would like to share this insightful memo with my colleagues who I am sure are equally concerned about the full implications of the President's proposal. The memorandum and the article it commends to our reading follows:

#### REVENUE SHARING (By Dick Warden)

From a civil rights-equal opportunity standpoint, the concept of revenue sharing represents a retreat from national responsibility. We strongly oppose the Administration's revenue sharing proposals. In what follows, I shall attempt to set forth some (but not necessarily all) of the objections which have occurred to persons involved in civil rights, equal opportunity and programs to aid disadvantaged Americans. Most of these concerns would apply equally to the proposed program of grant consolidation as we understand it.

#### NATIONAL PRIORITIES

As one who has had some experience in the administration of federal programs, I find it difficult to understand how the federal government could assign priorities under a program of no strings revenue sharing. Let us assume for the sake of discussion that the "modest" program recommended by the President represents a "foot in the door" from which a more comprehensive revenue sharing program would probably

evolve. It is unrealistic, I think, to expect that the federal government will retain many of its categorical aid programs in the face of revenue sharing if that concept should ever be written into law.

Under a program of revenue sharing, how would the Congress and an administration declare a national goal to do anything and then be confident that the goal would be pursued effectively. It has been difficult enough (to wit, the "war against poverty") even under categorical grants where Uncle Sam holds the strings. Take the improvement of education opportunities for disadvantaged children, for example. How, under a system of revenue sharing (or block grants, the revenue sharing twin) could the Congress legislate to meet those needs?

I'm afraid—and this is a fear shared by the many of my associates—that with respect to equal opportunity, meeting the needs of disadvantaged people or in trying to direct a greater share of the nation's resources to meet any national problem, we would be placed in a position of having to rely upon the "good faith" of the states. This, of course, means that the national objective would not be achieved. Instead, we would have a potential of 50 different situations in 50 different states. The track records of many of the states does not inspire much confidence. Without singling out any particular states, it doesn't take much imagination to understand why minority groups, the poor and other disadvantaged Americans might prefer to cast their lot with the federal government rather than the states.

The states and municipalities—in spite of Nixon's "power to the people" and closeness to the people arguments—have not exactly shown themselves to be paragons of virtue or administrative efficiency. While recognizing the federal government has problems in trying to administer its far-flung programs, I suspect most black people in Alabama for example, would still prefer to take their chances with the federal government than to be forced to rely on a fair shake from a state government headed by George Wallace. It is difficult enough for disadvantaged Americans and minorities under our federal categorical aid programs—even though a number of them are aimed specifically at alleviating problems of poor, minorities and the disadvantaged. Things would be even more difficult under no strings revenue sharing or—perhaps to a lesser extent—block grant approaches to extending federal aid.

I have singled out the federal aid to disadvantaged children program as one which would be particularly vulnerable to either revenue sharing or block grants. You may have noticed articles recently about a study conducted at Syracuse and funded by the Ford Foundation. The title is "The Pattern of Allocation of Federal Aid to Education: A Preliminary Summary of Findings", and it concludes with respect to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (the aid to disadvantaged kids section) that this program is the only one administered by the Federal government which does a half-way decent job of getting money to the kids who need it most. Other less categorical federal programs have not proven to be good vehicles for getting assistance to those who need it most, or even to be equitably distributed on the basis of population.

The experience under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 might be worth citing at this point as an example of what can happen to an innovative, promising federal program when it is, in effect, turned over to the states. This is the section of the Act authorizing development of supplementary services and centers. When ESEA was adopted in 1965, many members of Congress and others outside of Congress saw Title III as the most promising part of the Act. One hears very little about Title III any more, a fact undoubtedly related to

the reality of subsequent amendments turning the program over to the states.

You may have read the recent article in *The Post* by Doug Carter about categorical aid programs. I think he has done an excellent job of summarizing the "national priorities" argument on revenue sharing. I am enclosing a copy of the article.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

My principal concern here can be summarized in one sentence: How do we carry out a Title VI or other equal opportunity program under revenue sharing or block grants? It isn't enough to say, as the President has, that equal opportunity requirements and the protections of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act will apply. The question is *how*—and this is a question bothering most of the people I know who have worked in the area of civil rights and equal opportunity. In his message on revenue sharing, the President reiterated his earlier State of the Union statement about nondiscrimination safeguards and then went on to say:

"The legislation I am recommending provides these safeguards. It stipulates that: 'No person in the United States shall on the ground of race, color or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with general revenue sharing funds.'

"The Secretary of the Treasury would be empowered to enforce this provision. If he found a violation and was unable to gain voluntary compliance, he could then call on the Attorney General to seek appropriate relief in the Federal Courts, or he could institute administrative proceedings under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—leading to a cutoff of Federal funds . . ."

(Emphasis added.)

This is all well and good, but . . . In the first place, the Treasury Department has never, to the best of my knowledge, been known for vigorous enforcement of equal opportunity. The language used by the President in his message is almost identical to Title VI, and the federal government—except in education programs and a couple of other activities—has never been particularly zealous about enforcement of Title VI. Giving the Secretary of the Treasury the option of going either to the courts or Title VI means, in practice, the courts—if indeed, any compliance action were ever undertaken. The Nixon Administration has for all practical purposes abandoned the use of the Title VI sanction (the cutoff of funding). Even if these facts of life under the Nixon Administration were not facts, and even if we could assume absolute good faith, I still would ask how Title VI could be implemented.

What would be the mechanics of an effective compliance program? Is the Administration thinking of a huge division of compliance officers as part of the Treasury Department to fan out over the country to determine how these federal shared revenues are spent after they are comingled with state and local money? Or is the government planning to delegate its responsibility for the protection of federal constitutional rights to state and/or local governments? Or is the idea to require simply an "assurance of compliance" from states that they are distributing the shared revenues on a nondiscriminatory basis? How is it to be done? It isn't enough simply to say it and have it happen. If we haven't learned that by now, we haven't learned anything. The *Brown* decision was 17 years ago, and segregated schools still exist in the South.

On a related subject, how is the Executive Order on Equal Employment Opportunity (E.O. 11246) to be applied under revenue sharing or block grants. This is the executive order which requires equal employment opportunity under federal contracts or fed-

erally-assisted contracts. It has been the basis for the Philadelphia Plan and other similar efforts to increase employment opportunities for minority workers in federally-assisted construction.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION, PUBLIC DISCLOSURE, OTHER ISSUES

In several existing federal programs, the Congress has required community participation, public disclosure and such other practices as maintenance of state and local effort as a condition to receiving federal assistance, prohibition against supplanting federal money for state and/or local funds and accountability by local and state officials. I don't see how such requirements could be implemented under revenue sharing. How, for example would the Freedom of Information Act be implemented to assure that local citizens or others interested be given access to information about the way in which shared revenues are being spent.

I have not exhausted the list of concerns expressed just in the areas of civil rights and equal opportunity by persons who have been involved in these types of programs in recent years. The above recitation, however, should give you some idea about the types of apprehensions being widely expressed.

With all their imperfections, the categorical aid programs are much preferable, in my judgment, to any of the proposals yet advanced for revenue sharing or block grants. If the categorical programs need amendment—and I think they do, then Congress should amend them to meet changing conditions and new needs. But let's not throw the baby out with the bath water. Let's not deprive those Americans who need help most of the concern of their federal government—particularly when the federal government is the only instrument through which their special needs are likely to be met.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1971]  
A KIND WORD FOR CATEGORICAL AID PROGRAMS  
(By Douglass Carter)

During the struggle to pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, one close friend of mine, a member of the Cleveland, Ohio, School Board, visited me in the White House to voice grave reservations. He was fearful that Title I of that Act, earmarking federal funds for disadvantaged children, would make the job of hard pressed school officials more difficult. A year or so later, he reported that he had reversed his position. Title I funds, he said, had made it possible to tackle critical and expensive needs which could not be justified if paid from locally raised revenues.

Recently, he enumerated for me two political facts of life. The first: local governments tend to deal well with needs that are general in the community; they tend to deal less well with needs which are special, or which serve interests going beyond the community. A second political fact of life: the lion's share of any general aid for education will be claimed for higher salaries in a community where there is strong teacher organization. At best, only a small fraction can be preserved for innovative programs.

Both these facts of life need to be kept in mind as we consider President Nixon's proposal for revenue sharing. It is tempting to succumb to the cry of "more power to the people" uttered by the apostles of the New Revolution. Why not join Joe Alsop in berating the federal bureaucracy for the red tapery of categorical aid programs? Why not join Vice President Agnew in making a whipping boy of Wilbur Mills for demanding federal responsibility for federal spending? (At last Mr. Agnew has found himself a nattering nabob of nepotism!)

But a little perspective is in order: categorical aid programs did not emerge out of fiendish mistrust of the people by their

elected leaders in Washington. On the contrary, those programs have been adopted by Congress in order to serve public needs not being met by state and local government. They have represented national priorities to be paid for by tax revenues raised by the federal government.

Admittedly, some of these priorities are markedly different from those of state and local governments. For example, Congress passed, on President Eisenhower's urging, an act to create a national highway system. Local officials might have preferred to spend the money on more farm-to-market roads.

Similarly, with President Johnson's urging, Congress established a wide range of categorical programs to meet desperate needs of the disadvantaged. Congress set new priorities for the nation.

No impartial observer could claim that these priorities have been met. Most of the categorical programs have been funded at only a fraction of their authorizations. Lacking adequate dollars to make a measurable impact, they have spawned too much bureaucratic foot shuffling at federal, state and local levels. It is easy to curse the bureaucrats for the shortfall of great expectations.

But the more relevant task is to decide where we go from here. I am persuaded that it will be a cop out for the federal government to remove itself from the business of setting national priorities. And it will be a grand illusion to believe that those priorities can be attained by passing out funds with no strings attached. Given their present strained financial situation, even the best intentioned governors and mayors will be forced to bail out their most pressing debts and their most persistent creditors. New and hard won social programs, lacking a powerful constituency, will be the first to suffer.

It is a beguiling notion that the people share great intimacy with their state and local governments. We no longer live in a nation of New England town meetings. Most people learn about government from their press and they influence government through their organizations. I wonder how many believe that state capitol or city hall is better reported than the U.S. Congress? Or that Washington is less responsive to public interest lobbies?

Our problems today—health, education, environment, urban crisis—cut across the traditional boundaries of state and municipal government. They even cut across the traditional federal departments, hence Mr. Nixon's efforts at reorganization. We will not meet our problems by pouring new funds into old containers. Probably the most difficult challenge we face is to create new institutions adequate to cope with our problems.

This does not mean blind commitment to the categorical programs launched in the past decade. There must be continual efforts at consolidation, especially of the programs which are too small to justify separate existence. Congress needs to study the proper balance between "earmarked" funds and "general support" funds. The matching fund formula has provided a highly effective device for asserting a federal priority while allowing discretion to state and local government.

But it will be bad policy and bad politics for Congress to cast aside the experience of the past decade in a rush to espouse the creed of revenue sharing. The slogan "more power to the people" could lead to abdication of the vital role which the people elected Congress to serve.

THE RAILPAX MESS

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include two resolutions.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the

storm of protest stirred up by announcement of Railpax routes yesterday is rising to a veritable gale. I cannot enter my office without being aware of it, by letter, by telephone call, or by personal visit. I have no doubt that many Members of this body have a similar experience.

A particularly forceful example is a message from the city of Cumberland, Md. It consists of two letters and a resolution setting forth the impossible situation produced by the Railpax decision. People in many walks of life are affected. They will be deprived not only of rail service, but will have no other form of public transportation available.

Heavens knows rail service has been poor enough. But it has sufficed to take people back and forth to their necessary places of work or study.

Surely it was not the intention of Congress in establishing Railpax to abolish rail service. What we had in mind was to improve it. Improve it, not in a few places, but everywhere. We must take a careful look at what has been done to our project.

Cumberland is not in my own district, but it is just across the river from my home. I know that what Cumberland says is true, because it is just as true of my side of the river as of the Maryland side.

I submit the Cumberland protest for consideration of the House and also a resolution passed by the Oklahoma Legislature, pertaining to the same subject:

CITY OF CUMBERLAND, MD.,  
March 10, 1971.

DAVID W. KENDALL,  
Railpax Chairman, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENDALL: I am enclosing for your consideration of Resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Council of Cumberland with respect to the implications of the adoption of the Railpax System.

As the Resolution indicates, City Officials are quite disturbed by the prospect of a loss of direct rail passenger service and adequate connecting service as a result of the new system.

Very truly yours,  
J. FREDERICK SHARER,  
City Solicitor.

CITY OF CUMBERLAND, MD.,  
March 17, 1971.

Re Rail Service Through Cumberland.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,  
Committee on Interstate Commerce,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STAGGERS: It is pleasing to report that the City Council unanimously adopted the enclosed Resolution dealing with the need for Rail Service through Cumberland under the Rail-Pax contract. I believe you and other members of the Committee who are familiar with the problems of transportation in Appalachia will agree that our Attorney, Mr. J. Frederick Sharer, has effectively portrayed the problem and the urgency of a solution for it.

The Council feels strongly about this matter and called upon Mr. Sharer to frame their objections to the removal of Cumberland from the Rail passenger network, and his words speak eloquently for all of us. As you know, my business is the transportation of passengers, by motor coach tours, air, and when possible, by rail.

Reservations personnel in my Travel Agency constantly remind me that young

people attending college, and many, many Vietnamese veterans depend upon our Rail service to get to the Pittsburgh Airport and the Washington National Airport, since we have no commuter service as yet which connects them conveniently to these points.

Senior citizens, many of whom hold railroad passes as a result of long and faithful service to the B. & O. Railroad and the Western Maryland Railway Systems, would receive a double blow if something cannot be done soon for Cumberland and its rail passenger service. These older folks who cannot drive their cars on the modern dual highways would be deprived of visiting their children and grandchildren in Montgomery County and Prince Georges County where many of these families have emigrated in the search for work.

It is my earnest hope that you will convey to your committee members the concern that I have for the City officials who must some day face the stranded elderly taxpayers and tell them that rail service will be no more through Allegany County.

I know that you are concerned, but I am sending extra copies of this excellent Resolution for distribution to key members of your committee and staff. If there is any way in which hearings can be brought about to counteract the misinformation which Rail-Pax officials seem to have about the B. & O. Railroad trackage and mileage, it is my feeling that they should be held soon.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS F. CONLON, Mayor.

CITY OF CUMBERLAND, MARYLAND  
RESOLUTION

Whereas, the histories of the City of Cumberland and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company are nearly parallel in that the City of Cumberland virtually grew around the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company when said company extended its services Westward; and

Whereas, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company has been an integral phase of the life and times of the City of Cumberland; and

Whereas, as a result of the development of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company in and near the City of Cumberland, the residents of the City of Cumberland and its surrounding area have enjoyed the benefits and services of said Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company; and

Whereas, the City of Cumberland has been linked directly with the cities to the East and to the West by railroad passenger service, as a result of the growth of said Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company; and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of Transportation, through the implementation of its "Railpax" System, now seeks to remove railroad passenger service from the City of Cumberland and its residents; and

Whereas, implementation of the "Railpax" System will result in a loss of railroad passenger service to the residents of the City of Cumberland and the residents of the surrounding area and will eliminate connection, by rail, with the cities to the East and to the West; and

Whereas, loss of passenger service to the residents of the City of Cumberland and the surrounding area will have serious personal and economic effects. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Mayor and City Council of Cumberland:

1. That the Mayor and City Council of Cumberland hereby voices strong objection to the elimination of direct rail passenger service to the City of Cumberland and the resulting detriment to its residents and the residents of the surrounding areas; and the Mayor and City Council of Cumberland strongly urges the U.S. Department of Transportation to reconsider the implementation of the "Railpax" System in its present form, and suggest an amendment to said system

to permit the continuance of the rail passenger service to the City of Cumberland.

2. That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, to the Chairman of the Railpax System and to those members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives who represent the citizens of the City of Cumberland and its surrounding area.

Given under our hands and seals at City Hall, Cumberland, Maryland, with the Corporate Seal of the city attached, duly attested by the City Clerk, this 16th day of March, 1971.

THOMAS F. CONLON,  
Mayor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 15 RELATING TO PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE BY THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE CORPORATION UNDER THE RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE ACT OF 1970

Whereas, the Congress of the United States has enacted the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, popularly referred to as "Railpax," establishing the National Railroad Passenger Service Corporation to provide intercity rail passenger service, assuming the public responsibility to carry passengers previously vested in individual rail carriers; and

Whereas, the Secretary of Transportation has been authorized and directed by said act to devise a basic rail passenger system and to submit a report to the Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Railroad Passenger Service Corporation including the principal cities between which intercity passenger trains shall be operated and all routes over which such service may be provided and the trains presently operated over such routes; and

Whereas, the Secretary of Transportation in the Basic National Rail Passenger System designated Chicago-Houston as city-pair end points and indicated the route "Chicago via St. Louis-Houston," over which passenger service may be provided, though no through service is currently available, thus bypassing Oklahoma City and the entire State of Oklahoma; and

Whereas, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe passenger trains Nos. 15 and 16 routed Chicago-Kansas City-Oklahoma City-Dallas/Ft. Worth-Houston currently provide through service and connecting service from Kansas City to Tulsa, Oklahoma; and

Whereas, through passenger train service from Chicago via Kansas City-Oklahoma City-Dallas/Ft. Worth-Houston and connecting service from Kansas City to Tulsa, Oklahoma, is urgently needed in the public interest as indicated by a request of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, dated December 23, 1970, directed to the Secretary of Transportation. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 1st Session of the 33rd Oklahoma Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

SECTION 1. The Secretary of Transportation is hereby respectfully requested and petitioned to include Chicago via Kansas City-Oklahoma City-Dallas/Ft. Worth-Houston as an alternate route in the Basic Rail Passenger System for the reasons outlined in the preamble to this Resolution.

SECTION 2. Copies of this Resolution, after consideration and adoption, shall be distributed to the Secretary of Transportation, Washington, D.C., the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation, Washington, D.C. and each Director of the National Railroad Passenger Service Corporation.

Adopted by the Senate the 9th day of March, 1971.

TOM PAYNE,  
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 10th day of March, 1971.

REX PRIVETT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

HIGHER EDUCATION EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PACKAGE

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, in a special message to Congress on February 12, President Nixon proposed comprehensive reforms and innovations for our system of higher education. With several exceptions these proposals are the same as those which received no congressional action last year.

As the President pointed out last month, existing legislation for the basic Federal higher education programs expires at the end of the current fiscal year. Based on past experience, it is at least possible that final action on new legislation will not be completed by that time. Because of the depth and scope of the proposed reforms, all Members of Congress will need to give them careful consideration before any votes are taken.

At the same time, we are faced with a situation wherein two-thirds of all American colleges and universities are either in or headed for grave financial difficulties. To help meet these difficulties, most institutions have found it necessary to raise their tuition and other charges, and most face the need to do so again in the near future. Thus, the financial squeeze will inevitably be shared with the consumer—the students and their families.

Mr. Speaker, these institutions fully realize that fundamental reforms are needed in our system of higher education, but they are simply too busy surviving to initiate such changes on their own. In addition, changes of a complex nature in the field of student assistance programs such as those which have been proposed would surely require extensive reorganization of administration procedures on each campus, thus further delay. The delay inherent in these basic changes cannot be tolerated.

For that reason, I am today introducing a higher education emergency assistance package of three bills to provide immediate relief to these institutions and students. It is my hope that the relatively uncomplicated nature of these bills will facilitate early action by Congress. They are designed to assist all low- and moderate-income students while attending all postsecondary institutions—large and small, public and private, educational, and vocational—with the least amount of governmental interference.

The first bill would allow a tax credit for certain higher education expenses of up to \$325 on the first \$1,500 paid by the student or for the student by any other individual. These expenses include tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment required by the institutions involved. In order to allow students a wide choice in the kind of education they want, the bill specifically includes the traditional institutions and business, trade, technical, and vocational schools which offer postsecondary education for useful employment.

Since costs of higher education are expected to continue their upward climb,

the second bill in this package is designed to provide a backup for a more effective guaranteed student loan program. This bill would establish the Student Loan Marketing Association, or Sally Mae, as it would be called. Sally Mae establishes a student loan program which would operate in much the same fashion as Fanny Mae, the Federal National Mortgage Association does in the home mortgage field. This means that Federal tax dollars would not be needed to maintain its operations. Operating funds would be generated through the sale of stock and later through the sale of Government-guaranteed bonds.

The guaranteed student loan program, which was established as part of the Higher Education Act of 1965, has been important to the education of thousands of our young people, but it has suffered during these times of high interest rates. By buying up the loans already held by private lending institutions, Sally Mae would free additional private funds for more student loans. Private lenders would also be encouraged by the resulting lighter load of paperwork needed for such loans.

The first two bills in this package deal primarily with the economic needs of students, although they would have secondary favorable effects on institutions. The third bill of the package is aimed at financially pressed institutions themselves, so that the students assisted by the other bills will have some place to go to school.

Mr. Speaker, if we provide additional financial assistance to potential students, and this additional money is viewed as a green light for increased tuition, we will be frustrating our purpose. My third bill, the Higher Education Gift Incentive Act, is designed to alleviate the need for such tuition increases through the stimulation of charitable contributions to institutions from individuals and corporations. Private contributors have always played an important role in our higher education system, but tax laws and the economic slowdown have hampered these efforts at the same time larger gifts are needed.

Under this bill, an individual would be allowed a tax credit equal up to the amount of his contribution up to 20 percent of his tax liability, or \$100, whichever is less. A corporation would be allowed a tax credit equal to its contribution up to 10 percent of its tax liability, or \$5,000, whichever is less.

All three of the bills I have introduced today are designed to motivate and mobilize our private economy toward greater support for higher education. As I have said, I am quite aware that more extensive legislation is needed and will be passed by this Congress with my support. However, the need is urgent; these bills are relatively noncontroversial; and all three would be complementary to additional legislative reform in this area. I strongly urge serious and prompt consideration of this emergency higher education package.

#### GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY— 150TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today is Greek Independence Day. It is also the 150th anniversary of the Greek Revolution which overthrew four centuries of Ottoman rule.

We welcome this opportunity to demonstrate our respect for the great contributions Hellenism has made to world civilization, to reaffirm our affection for the Greek people, and to emphasize that there are voices in Congress who strongly favor the return of democracy to that ancient land.

The Greek revolt of 1821 was a daring decision to either perish or be delivered. It was the culmination of centuries of oppression, and humiliations, and uprisings begun and crushed. Just as the situation in Greece today attracts a concern far beyond Greece's borders, the Greek revolution of 1821 was considered an event of great interest not only to Europe but much of the world.

While the conservative atmosphere of the Holy Alliance in post-Napoleonic Europe argued for not offending the Ottoman Turkish Empire, individuals in Western Europe dared to state the moral issues of freedom and individual liberties. And in the end, the views of these individuals were adopted by their hitherto reluctant governments.

As Prof. George Arnakis, of Texas University, state in his "Americans in the Greek Revolution."

The intellectuals and the youths of Germany, France, Italy and England and other countries took a sympathetic interest in the struggle for Greek Independence, largely because their education had stressed the cultural achievements of classical Greece. Philhellenism, a product of classicism as well as an aspect of political liberalism, was rapidly winning ground and an increasing number of people in Europe and in America shared the hope that Greece, the cradle of Western civilization, would again be free, after four centuries of Ottoman rule.

The cause of emergent Greece captured the interest of many Americans, too. Our American Republic of the 1820's was very young, we must remember. It numbered but a few million, and the journey by ship to Greece took 60 days. Yet the mood here was idealistic, and President Monroe, Daniel Webster, and Edward Everett were effective in arousing pro-Greek sentiment.

In time, perhaps a dozen Americans actually reached Greece and fought against the Turks in a war that stretched out over 7 years. The most interesting of these Americans was the remarkable Samuel Gridley Howe. Howe went to Greece immediately after completion of his medical studies at Harvard in 1824. His "Greek phase" was indeed extraordinary as he not only joined the Greeks in battle, but treated casualties, wrote appeals, and later, wrote a book of his experiences. In his later life he worked to abolish slavery in the United States, was involved in the expansion of the American frontier—the Kansas Free Territory—participated in projects to establish institutes for the blind, deaf and dumb, married Julia Ward Howe, the poetess of Battle Hymn of the Republic, was imprisoned in 1832 in Berlin

for helping the Poles in their struggle for freedom—in this he collaborated with General Lafayette, the great liberal of the American and French revolutions—and as late as 1867 was helping the Greek Cretans in their unsuccessful attempt to shake the Turkish yoke.

A reading of this history reveals American ties to Greece which are rooted in the "rebirth" of that ancient land. Americans as well as Europeans breathed the heady breeze of Philhellenism. And the efforts and writings of Lord Byron annotated the cause with practical as well as romantic support.

When the Byzantine Empire came to an end in 1453 the Greeks passed from the catalog of nations. It is no wonder that the stirrings of those virtually forgotten people four centuries later engaged the hearts and minds of the West. The word "Greece" called up visions of the great classical age. It also reminded some that the language of the New Testament was Greek, and that Christian faith was spread by Greek-speaking missionaries, notably St. Paul, in Hellenized Asia Minor and Old Greece.

Constantine, the first Christian emperor, chose Byzantium as his capital in 321 A.D., when it was renamed Constantinople. For over 1,000 years the Byzantine Empire, which was Greek in language, culture, religion, maintained a relatively high level of civilization in an age when Western Europe lay in barbarism. It ended when Constantinople fell to the Turks in 1453.

The Turks first appeared, out of what is today the Turkestan area of the Soviet Union, in the 11th Century. In 1071, near modern Armenia, the Byzantine army was defeated. The Hellenic world of Asia Minor was steadily occupied by the Turks, whose advance was slowed by the four crusades, 1100-1204, arising from the appeal of the Byzantine emperor to Western mercenaries. These adventurers, Franks, Genoans, Venetians, were frequently diverted into establishing themselves on the Greek mainland and simply stayed. Meanwhile, the Ottoman Empire moved into Europe in the 15th Century. The Turkish tide was finally turned back under the walls of Vienna in 1520.

The Ottoman Empire was somewhat less vigorous but still war-minded by 1821. The "terrible Turk" still frightened the Christian West, and Turkish authority ruled the Balkans and much of the Middle East.

The Greeks of mainland Greece, in 1821, were scarcely 3 million. Others were scattered along the Black Sea, in modern Rumania, in the Aegean Islands, and in Asia Minor. Yet they dared to rise against a huge empire, despite having been slaughtered in a previous revolt inspired, then abandoned, by Catherine II of Russia in 1770. Their situation was intolerable. Except for those Greeks who moved to the inaccessible mountains, Greek families had to submit to the shameful tribute of the first male child to the Turks, to be educated by and serve the Turks. Levies and taxes further humiliated them and beauty in their children was a danger, lest the Turks force them into harems.

Nevertheless, Howe and others found a continuity of Hellenism from ancient

times. These Greeks spoke the same language, employed the same characters in writing, retained many of the same prejudices, manners, and customs recorded of the old Greeks. Many Greeks, especially the "Klephts," had never laid down their arms but chose to retire to the fastnesses of the mountains, where they lived in open hostility to all around, sang and passed down songs in the Homeric tradition, and became the backbone of the revolution.

It is remarkable that a people who had been under foreign rule for four centuries and who labored under the fact of no money, no standing army, no medical facilities, no arms depots, and no central government to command the land's scattered resources, could yet prevail. They did so thanks to the heroic bands of mountain warriors and the exploits of the merchant fleets of island Greeks which were converted into makeshift warships. They did so despite brutal reprisals, such as the slaughter of the 40,000 Greek inhabitants of the island of Hios. And they did so, in the end, when the Russian, French, and British fleets intervened and inflicted a critical defeat on the Turkish Fleet in 1828. But it was the Greeks themselves who broke the chains of bondage on the head of the oppressors.

In the West, it was Lord Byron, above all others who had stirred the minds of civilized man about the fate of Greece. In his youth, he had made a pilgrimage to the venerable land, gazed with admiration on her wild and beautiful scenery, trod with awe on the graves of her heroes, and wrote with pleasing melancholy:

Cold is the heart, fair Greece! that looks on  
thee,  
Nor feels as lovers o'er the dust they loved;  
Dull is the eye that will not weep to see  
Thy walls defaced, thy mouldering shrines  
removed.

And he prophesied their regeneration  
with the words,

And many dream withal the hour is nigh,  
That gives them back their father's heritage.

As we know, Byron himself returned to help the Greeks in revolt and gave his life at Messolonghi before the final liberation was at hand. A young American, George Jarvis, who organized American relief supplies in 1827, was also to die before the war was won. Howe survived, to write about his experiences and to insure the beginning of Greek-American friendship which has now stretched to a century and a half.

One hundred and fifty years ago today, Greece and America were two countries together in spirit and in substance. Committed to the revolutionary ideals of independence, freedom, democracy, and individual dignity, the Greeks looked to the young and distant nation of President Monroe as a shining example for emulation.

Today, unfortunately, the largest portion of the Greeks and their political spokesmen are accusing the United States of supporting a tyrannical, oppressive, regressive, and unimaginative regime in the interest of dubious and at best narrowly defined "strategic objectives."

What has happened to account for this dramatic reversal in the relations of two traditional friends and allies?

Twenty-five years ago the United States aided the Greeks massively in their resistance against a Communist attempt to take power by force of arms. Twenty years ago, all but a handful of Greece's parliamentarians voted overwhelmingly for NATO accession and considered Greece's participation in the Western alliance the crowning success of Greece's foreign policy.

The record of Greek-American friendship and cooperation throughout the 1950's and 1960's has been tremendous. The Greeks have participated actively with the U.N. forces in Korea and have adopted strong and vigilant NATO stances in the U.N. and other international organizations.

Greece, since 1952, has been steadily marching toward rapid economic development and modernization. Good relations between the United States and Greece had been further cemented by about 2 million Greek Americans.

Following a severe political crisis, from 1965 to 1967, which could have been solved easily by the legitimate electoral process, a small group of Greek colonels staged a coup d'etat—April 21, 1967—and has suspended democratic structures and freedoms ever since.

Although promises for an early return to democracy have been abounding since that time, little of substance has been accomplished on this score. The Greeks still remain under the shadow of martial law in a tightly policed and controlled state approaching Orwellian proportions.

The U.S. policy has been stated from the outset as one of dilemma; that is, disappointment on the political sphere but need to continue cooperation in the vital strategic dimension of NATO. The equivocal verbal protestations of the U.S. administration, have failed totally to move the colonels in the direction of democracy. On the contrary, the military and diplomatic cooperation, through substantive military assistance and cordial politico-strategic relations, have been interpreted by all but the most obtuse and obstinate observers as tangible political support for the Greek regime, if not outright approval.

It is, therefore, no surprise that recent resistance announcements in Greece are demanding American withdrawal "or else," while the military government itself is making signs of greater and greater impatience with American suggestions urging democratization.

The dilemma of the United States will eventually be transformed into a paradox where in support of a progressively uncooperative and unpopular Greek regime, the United States will lose the traditional affinity and affection of the Greek people. The paradox, in turn, may soon degenerate into a tragedy.

It is in America's interest, and in Greece's interest, that we as individuals and public officials challenge the official line of governments, that we raise the moral issue as the Philhellenes of the 1820's raised it.

Four years of dictatorship have done

untold damage to a nation which was undergoing economic, educational, and creative revitalization in the 1950's and early 1960's. A genuinely free Greece, with a government enjoying mass support, will be an ally we will be able to rely on and also be proud of it. Beyond that, there is the question of individual liberty and man's concern for his fellow man, which, in this day of "strategic interests," and "blocs," and "bases" is too often lost in the shuffle.

Next year, when we observe the 151st anniversary of Greek Independence Day, let us hope that genuine democracy has returned to Greece and that our own Nation has hastened that return by acting with honor and wisdom.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago, Alexandros Ypsilantis led the first of a series of revolts against the Turks. This bloody struggle for national independence lasted 7 tumultuous years, before the Greek people finally managed to extricate themselves from Turkish rule.

Greece's turbulent political history has extended into the 20th century. In the past 30 years, there have been over 40 changes of government, involving coups, attempted coups, dictatorships, democracies with a king, democracies without a king, and a civil war. Finally, in April 1967, a group of military officers seized power, and constituted themselves as the "Revolutionary Council."

Prime Minister Papadopoulos, presently in command, has continually emphasized the transitional nature of his Government, and his desire to return to parliamentary democracy. Yet, this transitional government has been in power now for almost 4 years with little hope of elections in the foreseeable future.

Over the past year and a half, the government has issued several statements promising full implementation of the constitution, only to withdraw these promises in subsequent statements or actions. At the present time, eight of the most crucial constitutional articles have been suspended, and according to the Prime Minister, will remain suspended through 1971.

These articles include: 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 declaring a state of siege; 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. These significant aspects of the Constitution dealing with human rights and liberties are presently frozen, and appear likely to remain so in the future.

It is extremely difficult to measure the popular support extended to the present regime, as it has never put its popularity to a free vote. It may be safe to conclude that more people oppose the regime than favor it. As stated in the Senate Foreign Relations Staff Report on Greece:

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.

In light of this repressive political atmosphere, it is quite difficult to comprehend many recent official statements issued by the U.S. Government. On September 22, 1970, the U.S. Department of State announced the lifting of the selective embargo on the delivery of heavy military equipment to Greece, imposed immediately after the coup in April 1967. According to the announcement, the decision to lift the embargo was entirely related to the strategic advantages to the NATO alliance such a move would create. But the statement also said:

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 . . .

In lifting the embargo on heavy arms, the United States may well have preserved Greek military cooperation with the NATO alliance, but simultaneously managed to disillusion many opposition leaders with the accompanying statement. It now appears that most Greeks sincerely believe that the United States supports the military junta—and this support is tragically considered to be the junta's greatest asset.

Only 5 days from now, Gen. Odysseus Anghelis, commander in chief of the Greek Armed Forces, is meeting with Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. This exchange of high-level visits can only serve as further evidence of U.S. support for the present regime.

I censure the United States for this tacit approval of the Greek military junta and implore our Government to restrain from encouraging such close relations with this regime. We should restrict the exchange of high-level visits, and demand that the Greek Government fulfill its empty promises to the people.

We must not allow ourselves to forget that the democratic principles and beliefs we hold so dearly in this country, were derived from ancient Greece. I am sure I speak for all concerned Americans in extending to Greece and her people our hope for lasting freedom and peace.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, in 1821, after nearly four centuries of foreign occupation, the Greeks rose up against their oppressors and began a struggle which seemed all but hopeless. Not alone was the power of the great Turkish Empire still unbroken and dreaded, but the governments of Europe, fearing complications in their relations with the Turks, were opposed to the timing of the Greek rebellion.

The official date of the beginning of the Greek War of Independence was March 25, 1821, 150 years ago today, when the flag of resistance was first raised at Kalavryta, a village in the Peloponnese. The struggle, which lasted 7 years, was fought among the islands

of the Aegean Sea and primarily in the Peloponnese, the southern peninsula of Greece. At the hardcore of the resistance were the "Klephts," the term used to designate the free mountaineers who had long carried on a small-scale open warfare against the Turkish occupiers, and who, by their unadorned state in their mountain fastnesses, justified the assertion that Greece was at no time wholly conquered. The Klepht typified the ideals of individuality, austerity of morals, endurance against every hardship, and skill in guerrilla warfare. His was a hard, dangerous life but one very appealing when compared with the humiliation which followed submission to the occupier.

It was the Klephtic bands who were at the heart of the makeshift Greek Army. It was they who surprised the hesitant West by trapping, harassing, and eventually besting the Turkish legions in the mountain defiles. It was they, whose every previous rising had been crushed by barbarous means, succeeded in the 1820's in achieving their own deliverance.

The historian George Periovoles is fond of quoting the leading Klepht warrior, the Odysseus of the Greek Revolution, Theodore Kolokotronis, a man much given to colorful idiom. "Tame fowl cannot chase away wild ones," Kolokotronis would say. "We must help ourselves and not rely on strangers to save us. God has autographed our freedom. He will not withdraw his signature."

The Greek rebels had no munitions depots, no centralized food supply, no central government to command the land's scant resources. Communications were primitive and most of the rebels knew of no place beyond a few miles of their own localities. Yet, the spirit of liberty united them sufficiently until the Turks, bled by incessant skirmishes on land and on sea and finally pressured by Russia, England, and France, agreed to peace. A new Greece, consisting of a modest portion of the ancient Hellenic world, was born.

America was, in the 1820's, herself a new young nation, a modest portion of her present size in land and in population. Yet, the struggle of an ancient people, symbol of classical learning, stirred President James Monroe to issue a statement of support. Daniel Webster and Edward Everett organized popular support and a handful of Americans, such as Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, actually made the 2-month ocean crossing to enlist in the Greek cause.

Greek-American ties were sketchy until the 1860's, when Ambassadors were exchanged. Greek emigration to America really did not begin until the 1890's although a little-known expedition of Greeks, led by Dr. Andrew Turnbull, an English adventurer, settled in Florida in the 1760's but was decimated by illness.

The great wave of Greek immigration reached America in the first two decades of the 20th century. We have known them and their families as good citizens, close-knit family people, industrious, and ambitious for the education of their children.

In metropolitan Detroit, the Greek-American community numbers approxi-

mately 30,000 to 40,000. It has five churches in Detroit, plus churches in Allan Park, Southfield, Pontiac, and Ann Arbor. There are hundreds of Greek-American lawyers, teachers, doctors, businessmen, and the entire Greek-American community is infused with vitality, public-spirit, and aspiration. I have personally enjoyed and valued my association with this community.

One cannot observe the significance of this anniversary in its entirety without also noting the tragic fact that today's Greece has been under martial law for 4 years, political parties have been abolished, and fundamental civil liberties denied. This has been the case since a military junta seized power illegally in April 1967.

In the short run, and in the long run, Greece's interests and America's interests will be best served by a freely elected Greek Government enjoying mass support. It is morally wrong and politically and strategically short-sighted that this truth has not been sufficiently recognized. Let us hope that when the 151st anniversary of Greek Independence Day arrives that Greece will have once again become a genuine democracy.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the Greek struggle for independence from Ottoman rule. While we celebrate with special significance this day, the heritage and principles of democracy which have their roots in Greek tradition, we must also recognize with sadness the suffering of tyranny presently afflicting the staunch people of Greece.

The spirit of the Greek people has long been a dominant factor in their determined search for freedom. Historically, Greeks would rather fight against insurmountable odds than succumb to conquerors; and even when subjected to foreign rule, their nationalistic spirit could not be crushed. Today, in Greece, a military junta which assumed power in April of 1967 has tragically destroyed almost all personal freedom in the country. Martial law continues to reign; and fundamental civil liberties, the growth of political parties, and free elections are denied to the people. Such events cloud a happy celebration of this traditional event.

Traditionally, March 25 is regarded as the day when Alexander Ypsilantis and the archbishop of Patrias unfurled the flag that sparked the revolt leading to the Greek War of Independence, and the eventual overthrow of Ottoman Empire rule. For 8 years the Greeks, aided by the French, English, and Russians, fought against their Turkish and Egyptian oppressors in order to gain the freedom they valued so highly. Their long and valiant struggle was rewarded finally with success by the treaty of Adrianople in 1829, followed by the London protocol of 1830.

From the day the Archbishop and his group of patriots raised the standard of freedom in 1821, we, in the United States, have followed the course of dramatic events in Greece with deep interest. Having fought a war of independence less than 50 years prior to the Greek strug-

gle, American sympathies, prayers, and aid were gladly offered. When Greek independence became a reality, we were overjoyed.

This same feeling of friendship and mutual aid has been continued and expanded during and after the two world wars; since long before the Greek struggle for independence, Americans were fully aware of the debt owed to Greece as the cradle of democracy, and as our cultural forebearer.

The concept of government and the principles of democracy, which were the basis of the government of ancient Athens, are also the principles of government which we now hold. The city-state methods have been altered to fit the needs of modern society, but the basic precept of dignity for the individual and respect for the spirit of the law remains unchanged.

Over three-quarters of a million Greeks now reside in the United States. These Greek Americans have contributed significantly to the development and strengthening of our democratic institutions and all of us are, indeed, fortunate for the impact Greeks have had on our way of life.

We, in the United States, can only hope that the spirit which has so long guided these people will continue to be a source of inspiration to them during these dark days of military rule in Greece. There exists between the Greek and American people a bond of friendship that shall outlive the current political presence in their homeland, as we look forward to a rebirth of freedom and human dignity in that land.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the Greek insurrection against the Ottoman Empire, a movement which eventually led to the establishment of an independent Greece.

Today, however, the Greek people do not enjoy the basic civil liberties of a free people. It has been almost 4 years since the military junta seized power and crushed self government. The periodic pledges to restore democratic government have been broken as regularly as they have been made by the ruling clique of colonels. A police state now reigns in Greece, the birthplace of democracy. Government by terror and torture rules in the land which first conceived of government by the consent of the governed.

For Americans, the grimmest part of the tragedy of Greece is our Government's support of this brutal military junta. Using the excuse that Greek military cooperation is essential in order to cope with the tensions in the Mideast and the Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean, the administration has given significant military assistance to the Greek dictatorship, notwithstanding our other military allies in the area. This action not only carries with it the official blessings and moral approval of our Government for this cruel military regime where political prisoners are tortured and where many have died, but also, this military aid strengthens the junta's grip on the Greek people.

Our State Department maintains that the junta has made substantial progress

toward the restoration of political freedom in Greece. There is, however, no sound evidence to support this claim made by the apologists in the State Department. The Greek situation is yet another instance of our espousal of high sounding principles about democracy on the one hand, while dealing with a dictatorship for military purposes on the other.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time for this hypocrisy to end. It has been the traditional policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting the subjugation of their liberties by totalitarian forces. Rather than giving legitimacy to the dictatorship of the colonels, the United States should loudly proclaim our solidarity with the Greek people who cry for liberty, and stop immediately the shipment of all military supplies to the Greek regime and withdraw all support to the oppressors of Greek freedom.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the observance of Greek Independence Day and the 150th anniversary of the start of the Greek revolution which overthrew four centuries of Ottoman tyranny.

We owe much to the people of Greece and their ancestors. In two world wars, Greek soldiers fought side by side with Americans in the cause of democracy.

The ancient Greeks helped lay the foundations on which modern civilization was built. Their contributions to world culture stand out brilliantly on the pages of history.

The people of Greece have for years exemplified the true meaning of democracy. I join with all advocates of true democracy in the hope that soon Greece will again enjoy the fruits of individual liberty and freedom which Greece has cultivated throughout the years.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, it is an almost unspeakable irony that Greece, "the cradle of democracy," today suffers under a regime that holds more to the philosophy of Adolf Hitler than that of Pericles. It is an even greater irony that America, which pictures itself as the world's greatest contemporary defender of democracy, is that regime's "greatest asset." How could this remarkable situation come to be?

In April 1969 Greece fell under the rule of a military junta which claimed the necessity to restore political order to Greece despite the fact that from 1952 to 1965 only three persons served as head of government to that country, not counting transitional, caretaker governments. This junta also claims that it, too, is just a transitional caretaker government. For all that, we find that today, 4 years later, the constitution has not been implemented. Martial law remains in effect for political offenses. There is no suggestion that elections will take place in the foreseeable future. Arrests continue with prisoners frequently held incommunicado and tortured. The press is intimidated and in danger of being shut down for even the vaguest hint of criticism against the government.

All this makes American support for the junta incomprehensible. Yet, on September 22, 1970, the selective embargo

on heavy military equipment delivery to Greece was lifted. This action was greeted with great dismay by many Greeks, foreign observers, and even some officials in the executive branch. While Greeks have been generally pro-American, there is now growing anti-Americanism in that country. Many Greeks feel betrayed.

Whether this lifting of the embargo in fact suggests that our Government approves to the junta is beside the point. Most Greeks believe that it does. It is this belief that constitutes a great asset to the junta. The Greeks place a great deal of value on American support and this in turn creates a curious situation. Greeks believe the regime has American support and therefore opposition is futile. Since there is no sign of opposition, the Americans believe the regime has popular support and that they might as well support it too.

The junta is aware of the importance of American support. That fact does give us some amount of leverage if we are wise enough to use it. To date the regime has resisted our efforts at persuasion while accepting our aid. Yet, we have not shown an inclination to use threats of withdrawal of aid or condemnation of the junta to encourage the needed political reforms. We have accepted the broad generalities handed down by the junta as firm commitments despite the lack of action.

It is time that we use our influence to achieve reform rather than to further cement the control of another military dictatorship. Do we still really believe that the best way to fight communistic totalitarianism is to support totalitarianism on the right? It is time that we we commit ourselves to the support of democracy.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very important celebration today. This is the 150th anniversary of Greek independence from the Turks. On March 25, 1821, after 400 years of Turkish rule, Greece once again gained her independence and freedom as a nation.

What a joyful occasion this must have been for the Greek people, who had known the benefits of a democratic system so early in their history. Our own Nation has much to be thankful for what has come out of the Greek heritage. It is the Greek philosophy which forms the foundation of our Republic. We are a nation of free people today, because the Greeks long ago felt that man could govern himself. As Thierry Maulnier, a member of the French Academy, said in his work, "Tribute to Greece":

We have all been shaped on that anvil of civilization that was the Greece of yesterday. We owe what we are today to her, and our debt is infinite, since Greece is closely bound with our existence. Therefore, the future of Greece is our future, too.

The ancient Greeks were great philosophers, teachers, and statesmen. The magnificent heritage left by the ancient Greeks helped make modern Greek Americans the fine citizens they are today. Again and again, they have fought for freedom with real tenacity and distinction. Modern Greek Americans have made major contributions to strengthen-

ing the United States with their remarkable character, diligence, and leadership. They are great people.

All this week in my congressional district hundreds of Greek American families have been celebrating this 150th anniversary. In fact, New Brunswick and Piscataway have been selected as sites for area Greek Americans to gather to celebrate. This past Monday, Piscataway Mayor Orville Bennett signed a proclamation to commemorate March 25 as the official feast day. Today the Greek community will present Mayor Bennett with a Greek flag to be flown over the Municipal Building. The Greek flag will also be flying over the city hall in New Brunswick after it has been brought, in relay fashion by the Sons of Pericles, a Greek American boy's fraternity, from services at the St. George Greek Orthodox Church. At city hall in New Brunswick Mayor Patricia Q. Sheehan will read a proclamation in honor of the day's activities. Additional religious and musical programs will be presented throughout the day, and tonight a banquet with a Greek consul official from New York as guest of honor will close out the activities.

Mr. Speaker, like most free nations today, Greece is facing problems which cause many of us concern. Let us hope that in the present struggle America can serve as an inspiring example of democracy to Greece, in the way that small, but brave nation has so nobly served the cause of freedom.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1971, marks the 150th anniversary of the war of independence in Greece. In 1821 the Greek people struck the initial blow in their struggle to break free of 400 years of rule by the Ottoman Empire.

The fact that the date is the Greek equivalent of our own July 4 must be considered painfully ironic to the United States today. This Nation, historically dedicated to the belief in global democracy and one whose most fundamental institutions stem from ancient Athens itself, is pursuing a policy of "benign neglect" toward the oppressed peoples of Greece on the very day of celebrating the start of the country's struggle for freedom.

The United States continues to bestow foreign aid upon a military government that seized power in 1967 and has since refused to hold elections. The Parliament has been dissolved and the leaders of the nation's political parties are in exile or have gone to jail. Articles in a new constitution remain suspended while the military junta pursues a domestic policy of "purification," evening out what it considers any leftist or immoral trends with steamroller effectiveness. As one of the junta members said, they want to make sure the candidates for public office are "reliable" before elections are held.

The plight of an imprisoned Greece has been described before. Greeks have spoken to us about the problems firsthand. American citizens have organized special groups in some instances to address themselves more forcefully to the problem. A first-rate film dramatically recreated the events that preceded military control. Some Members of this

Chamber have spoken out with regularity on the need to recognize the injustice of the situation.

The message, however, is going unheard. In 1970 military aid to Greece is expected to exceed \$45 million. The United States is providing \$45 million to a military government which maintains strict controls on freedom of speech, on the right to organize and join political parties, and on a free press. In recent years, the Congress has approved even the sending of heavy military equipment to the junta.

The cry is not for the United States to intervene or to involve American dollars or lives; it is simply to curtail the sending of military aid to a government dictatorship.

We have provided Greece with more than \$4 billion in foreign aid since 1946. Twenty-five years and \$4 billion later, Greece stands without a representative government. Internal strife racks the nation's urban centers, and political prisoners remain confined throughout the country. The only hope for impartial justice has been suspended by an autocratic rule, fed and supported by benevolent providers like the United States.

Admittedly, Greece is strategically located in the volatile Middle East and friendly relations may be important to our interests in that area. However, it does appear inconsistent for a nation which has dedicated itself to liberating South Vietnam at virtually any price, not even to be willing to speak out against the lack of basic freedoms in Greece. Through our actions and our official silence, the United States has both acknowledged and accepted the military junta.

Two letters, written 150 years apart, speak eloquently on the plight of the oppressed who call to those who are free. In 1821, Petros Mavromichalis, Director General of the Messenian Senate at Kalamata, addressed an open letter to the American people during the revolutionary war against the Turks:

Though separated from you by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us. . . It is by your example that Europe has abolished the shameful and cruel trade in human flesh, from you that she receives lessons of justice, and learns to renounce her absurd and sanguinary customs. This glory, Americans, is yours alone, and raises you above all the nations which have gained a name for liberty and laws.

It is surely worthy of you to repay the obligations of the civilized nations, and to banish ignorance and barbarism from the country of freedom and arts. You will not assuredly imitate the culpable indifference or rather the long ingratitude of some of the Europeans. No, the fellow-citizen of Penn., of Washington, and of Franklin, will not refuse their aid to the descendants of Phocion and Thrasylbulus, of Aratus and of Philopoemen. You have already shown them esteem and confidence in sending your children to their schools.

The letter of a Greek student printed this month in the New York Times presents a contemporary version of the message of the Messenian Senate updated in tone as well as in time.

These people fought against the Turks in 1821, against the Italians in 1940, against the Nazis from 1941 to 1944, against the

Greek Communists from 1944 to 1949 and in Korea in 1950. They fought and were killed not only for their own freedom, but for the freedom of the Western world. It is time that the Western world, and mainly the United States, did something about the freedom that these people and their sons have now lost.

Perhaps we have pursued such a deranged policy in Southeast Asia for so long that we no longer can sensibly comprehend where our duties lie. Perhaps reasons can be found for being completely apathetic toward the recent problems of the Greek people. Perhaps forces beyond our control dictate our support of a government which represents everything that is abhorrent to the American system. Nevertheless, on this, Greek Independence Day, let us salute the people of Greece and their dedication to freedom, and pledge ourselves to ending American support of the military dictatorship which oppresses that spirit. Let us turn from a policy which caused a young Greek to almost wistfully remark to me: "I have a high regard for your democracy; it is too bad you believe in it only for yourselves."

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted for the opportunity to join with my colleagues in the observance of Greek Independence Day.

The occasion also marks the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the Greek revolution which overthrew four centuries of Ottoman rule.

I have had many wonderful associations with peoples of Greek descent particularly since we have an active community of Greek descendants in my home area of Buffalo, N.Y.

Over the years, Hellenism has made great contributions to world civilization, and it is most appropriate that we take this opportunity to voice our affection for the people of Greece and those of Greek descent.

Unfortunately, there is very little personal liberty left in Greece today as a result of the tragedy in April 1967, when a military junta grabbed control of the Nation.

Despite repeated promises to the contrary by the junta, and despite assurances from our own State Department, the fact remains that martial law continues in effect.

There are no elections; political parties are not allowed; fundamental civil liberties are denied the people.

A recent staff report to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations points out that there is the widespread impression in Greece that the junta has the approval of the U.S. Government. Indeed, this mistaken impression is considered to be the junta's greatest asset.

My heart goes out to the people of Greece in their present restricted life under martial law, and I join my colleagues in the hope that the people of Greece soon will have the independence which they so richly deserve.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, Greeks are among the oldest and boldest fighters for independence in human history. Throughout their long and glorious history they have championed innumerable noble human causes; they have fought

for them and have died for them; but among these none has been so appealing and attractive to them as the cause of national political independence.

For many centuries they were without their independence, and their country, once the glorious fountainhead of freedom and the cradle of the West's heritage, had become a province of the Ottoman Turks. Under these Asiatic invaders and conquerors, Greeks lived and suffered as subjects of the sultans. Whenever they tried to free themselves from the tyrannical oppression of the Turks they were not powerful enough to fight alone, and they paid heavily for their abortive efforts. But the attempt made in 1821 proved successful, partly through the aid received from abroad. On March 25, 1821, a band of intrepid Greeks rose in rebellion against their alien masters, and unfurled the flag of revolt. At once their efforts were greeted by all friends of freedom in many lands. All Europe and America followed the events in Greece with the keenest interest. Material aid was sent from many lands, and volunteers even came from as far away as in Scandinavia. For more than 6 years the war raged, and at times it looked as though the Greek cause would lose out against the overwhelming forces of the Turks. But the events toward the end favored the Greeks, and finally they regained their independence.

Today on the 150th anniversary of Greek Independence Day I join with all Americans of Greek descent—indeed, with all Americans, since it is our common spiritual heritage to oppose external oppression—in the celebration of the memorable day.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no nation in the Western World has contributed more to the development of freedom and democracy than the small, but heroic, nation of Greece. Therefore, I believe it appropriate to point out that today is the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the Greek War of Independence, which led to the overthrow of nearly 400 years of Ottoman rule. This War of Independence, in which the Greeks—battling against tremendous odds—regained their freedom, is a glorious chapter not only in Greek history, but in the human struggle for dignity and democratic self-determination.

All of us are aware of the ancient traditions of Greek democracy. Greek philosophers, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle first asserted the dignity of the individual; Greek statesmen, Solon, Cleisthenes and Pericles first spelled out the rights of a citizen; and Greek patriots set a stirring example for the ages when they died resisting tyranny at Thermopylae and Marathon.

The ancient Greeks were, indeed, a noble and freedom-loving people; but it should be emphasized that the Hellenic contribution to freedom and democracy spans virtually every age of recorded Western history. Greek political thought played a major role in the progress of the Roman Empire, which extended the rule of law and the concept of free, individual citizenship throughout much of the ancient world. During the Dark Ages it was Greek Byzantium which kept alive the

tradition of freedom and learning. Historians now point out that it was Byzantine Greek scholars who carried these ideas with them to the universities of southern Europe, thereby laying the intellectual groundwork for the Renaissance.

Again, in modern times, Greeks have demonstrated, repeatedly, their firm determination to resist the forces of tyranny and political extremism. In World War II, little Hellas became the first Nation to successfully turn back the Axis armies. Refusing with one voice to bow to demands for immediate surrender, the Greeks stood their ground and drove the fascist forces into the sea. This Greek victory forced Hitler to withdraw troops from the eastern front thus postponing a major offensive and granting the allies badly needed time to bolster their defense. Greek tenacity and bravery against overwhelming Nazi forces prompted one American reporter to comment that Greece was truly a land where ". . . Freedom was life, and death merely an episode."

After nearly 5 years of harsh Axis occupation, a liberated Greek Nation was confronted by the threat of totalitarian communism. Once again, the Greek people met the challenge and, with American help, defeated the forces of Communist extremism, thus alining Greece with the free world.

On this important anniversary we can be proud not only of the Greek contribution to freedom but also of the historic friendship between the Greek and American peoples. When Greek Bishop Germanos lit the torch of liberty in 1821, proclaiming the independence movement with the immortal words, "Freedom or Death," it was the young American Republic which rallied to Greece's side with moral and material support. Meetings were held throughout this country and governmental bodies, at all levels, passed resolutions of support or raised funds to send to the valiant Greeks. This friendship grew closer over the years. It was further solidified by the thousands of Greek immigrants who came to the United States and enriched America's pluralistic culture as she, in turn, gave them the opportunity to live a better life.

This alliance between the ancient, small Greek democracy and the young, giant American Republic has served as an inspiring model for all those seeking equality and integrity among nations. It was, therefore, natural that the United States should play the crucial role in the rebuilding of post-World War II Greece. This involvement added a new and important dimension to already friendly Greek-American relations. Based on the moral and political commitments contained in the historic Truman Doctrine, America undertook to protect and assist a stable, free, and—most importantly—democratic Greece.

Today as we mark this 150th anniversary of Greek Independence, all those who love Greece and liberty cannot but feel deep concern, and dismay at the political situation in that land. For Greece, today is not the democratic and free country for which Americans in the past worked so hard. She is ruled by a small

group of military officers who overthrew the constitutionally designated government and imposed a regime which has violated fundamental individual liberties. For nearly 4 years, the Greek people have been deprived of the basic rights of free speech, free movement, and free assembly. Many persons have lost their jobs and countless others have been jailed, harassed, or forced into exile because they asserted these basic rights. This is not the Greece which America envisioned nor the Greece which the Greek people would desire could they freely choose their government.

During the last 25 years the American people have sent millions of dollars in assistance to Greece. These resources were committed in support of a free and democratic nation. The present regime has violated this commitment. It is, I submit, time for the United States, as a close and longstanding friend of the Greek people, to make every effort to achieve a prompt and peaceful return of democratic government to Greece.

Today, as we honor Greek Independence Day we pay tribute to Greeks who made great sacrifices so that the delicate, tenuous, human condition we know as freedom might prevail and be enjoyed by all men. It is that message we should stress today, for Greece, like America, is much more than a nation; it is the idea of freedom . . . it is the sanctity of the individual from the oppression of either tyrannical government or mindless anarchy . . . it is the belief that the individual can, given the chance, decide his own destiny, respect his fellow man, and work together for the common good. On this important occasion let us therefore reassure the Greek people that we stand rededicated to these democratic precepts and the restoration of their freedom.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today is an historic date for Greece.

It is a date which will be marked with pride by the people of Greece and the sons and daughters of Greece who now live in other lands—including more than 400,000 American citizens of Greek descent.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1971, is an important date for everyone who loves freedom and democracy, because today is the 150th anniversary of Greek independence.

It was on March 25, 1821, that Greek patriots triggered a revolt against the Ottoman Empire, which for four centuries had dominated Greece with a cruel and tyrannical rule. Inspired by the prospect of independence and supported by freedom-loving allies in Europe and America, the people of Greece succeeded in routing their oppressor and reestablishing liberty in the birthplace of democracy.

Sympathy for the Greek cause was easily aroused in the United States, where independence was still newly won and freshly defended. Many American leaders rallied behind the Greek patriots, forging an alliance between the two countries which has endured for a century and a half.

It is a natural alliance, because Greece's contribution to the civilization

of the Western World is almost incalculable.

For, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, democracy was conceived in Greece.

The philosophy of Socrates, Aristotle and Plato and the highest ideals in learning flowed from Greece.

The arts and culture of Sophocles, Euripides and Aeschylus flourished in Greece.

A deeply religious spirit is an indispensable part of the life of the Greek people.

And through the centuries, the heritage of liberty and learning which we have come to identify as characteristic of the Hellenic ideal has served as a model for America.

Mr. Speaker, as some of my colleagues are aware, I have a highly personal link with Greece. My father is a Greek immigrant; he was born in Greece and came to the United States some 55 years ago.

As my colleagues also know, I am deeply proud to be the first native-born American of Greek descent elected to the Congress of the United States.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to say that there are now four other Members of Congress with Greek ancestry, and of course I refer to my warm friends and distinguished colleagues, Congressmen PETER KYROS, of Maine; NICK GALIFIANAKIS, of North Carolina; GUS YATRON, of Pennsylvania; and PAUL SARBANES, of Maryland. They are among the ablest Members of the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have always felt a strong affinity with the land of my father, and I have naturally followed the course of events in Greece with very great interest.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I reflect on the 150th anniversary of Greek independence, I find myself with very ambivalent feelings.

It is written in Ecclesiastes that "to every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven . . . a time to weep and a time to laugh; a time to mourn and a time to dance."

For me, this 150th anniversary of Greek independence seems to be a time both to rejoice and to mourn.

We can rejoice over the great legacy that Greece has given mankind. We can hail the concepts of democracy and independence.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to be honest with ourselves, we must also mourn the loss of constitutional democracy and political freedom in that Nation today.

Indeed, it is truly a modern Greek tragedy that many liberties are missing there today—liberties that we now enjoy in our own country which were in large measure spawned in Greece.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled, as I know many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate are, by the political situation in Greece today.

The military junta which seized power in Greece in 1967 retains ostensibly good relations with the U.S. Government but rules the country in a manner which does not live up to the ideals of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; namely,

the provisions in the agreement relating to the strengthening of free institutions.

The policies instituted and administered by the colonels for nearly 4 years now are clearly incompatible with the democracy and self-government and political freedom which it is the principal purpose of NATO to defend.

There have been no free elections in Greece. The parliament, such as it is, is chosen by the controlling regime.

Basic civil liberties have been suspended. Key tenets of the Constitution assuring political freedom have not been implemented.

There have been widespread political arrests and verified reports of torture. Martial law, instead of due process, is in effect for political offenses.

Freedom of the press is a phrase instead of a reality. The Greek press has been severely restrained and intimidated by the possibility of stern punishment for the publication of material unfavorable to the junta.

Meanwhile, the military continues in the ascendancy with government expenditures for defense and security purposes expected to double this year the funds spent for the same purpose in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, that this state of affairs should exist in Greece on the 150th anniversary of its independence is sad, indeed.

I am, of course, aware that political problems are not new for Greece; that in recent years the nation has been unsettled by a succession of governments including dictatorships, democracies with and without monarchs, coups and counter-coups; that political freedom has existed on a tenuous basis in a period of instability which has seen more than 40 changes of government in Greece in the past 30 years.

As C. L. Sulzberger noted in an article in "Foreign Affairs" in January 1970:

The current fashion is to decry the military coup as a rape of democracy. Indeed it was; but democracy in Greece is no virgin.

So, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that Greece has a turbulent political background. Yet Prime Minister Constantine Karamanlis headed a parliamentary democracy in Greece over a recent, continuous span of 8 years. Clearly a stable, democratic government in modern times is possible in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, I am also aware that Greece is an important ally for the United States in the explosive Mediterranean area; that Greece is a valuable member of NATO; that its government is fiercely anti-Communist.

Mr. Speaker, no one recognizes more than I the importance of maintaining cordial relations between the United States and Greece. But I am disturbed, as I know many Americans are, that U.S. policies may be, albeit unintentionally, nurturing political repression there.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, first as a U.S. Congressman, and second as an American of Greek origin, I find America's posture today vis-a-vis Greece most ironic.

It is ironic because our Nation's early history carried a firm commitment on behalf of liberty in Greece, while our

present policy toward Greece is filled with contradiction.

Let me cite several examples.

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Roger Davies said in June 1970 that:

We are informed that the entire constitution will be implemented by the end of the year.

But today eight key constitutional articles dealing with elections, political parties, trial of civilians in civil courts, and freedom of the press are still suspended.

During virtually the entire period that the junta has controlled the country, the U.S. Government has imposed a heavy arms embargo on Greece.

But a recent report by investigators from the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee points out—

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.

In announcing the lifting of the embargo on September 22, 1970, the United States noted that "the trend toward a constitutional order has been established."

That, however, was followed by a December 19, 1970, declaration by the Greek Government that there would be no change in the coming year in the constitutional field.

On February 14, 1971, Assistant Secretary of State Joseph J. Sisco said:

I think one must bear in mind that Greece is a loyal NATO ally. The Greek people have a tremendous affection for America and the American people. Greece is important to the U.S. as part of the southern flank of NATO, and we have really tried to pursue a two-pronged policy, namely to support the present leadership insofar as its responsibilities are concerned within the NATO framework, and we would hope that more progress in the future can be made toward the establishment of democratic institutions.

But this hope for progress in restoring democracy in Greece—a hope, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I share with most Americans—is not at all being effectively implemented by our Government. Indeed, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee report concludes that America's "policy of friendly persuasion has clearly failed. The regime has accepted the friendship, and the military assistance, but has ignored the persuasion."

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the action of the U.S. Department of State seems in many instances to encourage the Greek Government to continue its present course.

Officials of our Government issue approving statements, hold out false promises, and offer little criticism of the subversion of democracy there. In fact, American officials continue to add to the aura of U.S. approval of the junta through repeated public appearances with members of the Greek Government, thereby leading the Greek people to believe that the United States condones the conduct of the regime in suppressing democratic institutions.

What should be the role of the United States regarding Greece?

Mr. Speaker, let me here state that I

do not suggest that the United States should attempt to dictate policy for Greece. I nonetheless believe the time has come for the U.S. Government to make it unmistakably clear to the Government of Greece that the policy of repression of constitutional democracy and self-government is neither in keeping with the longstanding friendship between our countries nor with the very purpose of the NATO alliance.

Furthermore, the failure of the Government of Greece to initiate elections and to provide constitutional guarantees for personal and political freedom stands in sharp contrast with the stated objectives of reform which the junta pledged when it seized power 4 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the U.S. Government should make emphatic its disapproval of current political conditions in Greece. We should urge the present Greek Government to restore to the people of Greece constitutional democracy and political freedom in that great country.

The United States is in a position to be strongly persuasive: Because of the long friendship between our countries, because of our military support, and because of our impact on the economy of Greece through trade and tourism.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that at long last the United States Government will begin to use its influence to work for the early restoration of constitutional democracy and political freedom in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, having expressed the hope that there will be continued friendship between our countries and an early return to democracy in Greece, I would like to close with the words of a great American President, James Monroe, who nearly a century and a half ago—in 1822—spoke for Greek independence in words which must haunt us today:

The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments, and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. That such a country should have been overwhelmed, and so long hidden as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism, has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds for ages past . . . A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence, and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, if one American President could speak so eloquently in support of the independence of Greece from despotism, 150 years ago, is it too much to ask that another American President—and we in Congress—speak today in that same cause?

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to introduce on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Maine, Mr. KYROS; the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. YATRON; and the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, the following resolution:

Whereas, the date of March 25, 1821, is the date on which the people of Greece began their War of Independence against Turkish rule; and

Whereas, on March 25, 1971, the people of Greece will celebrate the 150th Anniversary of the 1821 Greek War of Independence; and

Whereas, the people of Greece and the people of the United States have always maintained the closest international friendship, and were allies in two World Wars;

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the House of Representatives of the United States does hereby extend all good wishes to the people of Greece on this, their 150th Anniversary of Independence from foreign rule, and expresses its hope for a speedy resumption of constitutional democracy and political liberty for all the people of Greece.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today is Greek Independence Day. I take this opportunity to express my respect for the great contributions the Greeks have made to world civilization, and to reaffirm my affection for the Greek people.

It is also the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the Greek revolution which overthrew four centuries of Ottoman rule. How long will it be before the Greek people regain their liberty stolen from them by the Greek military junta now ruling that land?

It is not our role, as Americans, to depose the Greek junta. The people of Greece must do that. But, we must not aid the military junta which we are doing, by providing them with arms and economic aid used to oppress their own people.

We should not require every country to be made over in our own image, and of course, we should note that, in the case of Greece, it is the reverse situation for we are modeled on its original democratic principles. But, we should never provide support to a government that oppresses its own people.

Despite junta promises to end it, martial law remains in effect. There are no elections, political parties are banned, fundamental civil liberties are denied, and our country bears some responsibility for this state of affairs. As the recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff report points out, the widespread impression in Greece that the junta has American approval is the junta's greatest asset.

Mr. Speaker, our continued support of that Greek junta shames us before every country maintaining its democratic form of government. When will it end?

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of Greek independence. March 25 is the date of the renewal of the struggle of the Greek nation to be free of the bonds imposed by another nation. The successful conclusion of that struggle returned Greece to the family of sovereign states.

The contribution of Greece and her sons to our civilization is incalculable. The ideals and wisdom that ancient Hellas gave the world have provided the substance, the firm foundation, upon which not only our own country, but our civilization as a whole is based. The influence of Greece has prevailed in the arts, sciences, and humanities.

The epic legends of Homer present to the world one of its most enduring sagas of man's struggle against himself, his fellow man, the gods, and the forces of nature. Greek myths and legends have provided a great part of the body of Western literature and music. The vitality of Greek architecture, poetry, literature, and thought attest to its greatness. No one can escape being struck by the

influence of Greek architecture when they first enter our Nation's Capitol.

This influence extends not only to the Government's buildings but to the roots of our democracy. Our Founding Fathers were well educated in the classics, both in literature and theory of government. When they set out to build a nation from 13 colonies they drew heavily from the democratic traditions of Greece.

Unfortunately, progress and democracy in Greece were not able to withstand the invasions and tyranny of other peoples. At times the peoples of Greece united to withstand the armies of Persia—but were later conquered by the Macedonians under Phillip and Alexander. The successive invasions and occupations by Rome, and later by the barbarians from the north, infused many diverse and foreign influences into Greece. Finally, the Turkish invasion ended Greek independence for over 3½ centuries.

After several years of struggle a modern, independent Greece was established in the mid-19th century. A monarchy was established with Prince Otto of Bavaria chosen to rule Greece as king. Political instability was the mark of his reign, and the national assembly and constitution was the result of a bloodless coup with the Bavarians being removed.

After a year of anarchy Prince William of Denmark was placed on the throne. He led the nation through a period of economic stability, social progress, and political calm that lasted until the 20th century.

The Young Turk revolt of 1909 and increased tensions in the Balkans involved Greece in the Balkan wars of 1912-13, in which Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia defeated the Turks. As one of the Allied powers allied against the Germans and Turks in World War I, the Greeks were offered support for the establishment of an enclave on the Asia Minor coast, a revival of the Ionian Greek presence of centuries past. Unfortunately, they were driven off and, later, a population exchange with Turkey brought 1,500,000 Asian Greeks to the peninsula.

The period that followed was one of political instability. Finally the country was solidified enough to bravely resist the Fascist ultimatum for capitulation on October 28, 1940, a date remembered in the Okhi Day holiday which celebrates Greek determination to remain free. Under the leadership of Gen. Alexandros Papagos, the Greek Army stopped the Italian advance and drove the Italians from Greek soil, only to be met by a new invasion by the Germans in 1941. This forced King George II into exile.

The Greeks courageously resisted the German occupation through noncooperation, which soon became guerrilla warfare. When the Germans withdrew in 1944 the fight began against the Communists. Elections reestablished the monarchy and returned George II from exile. President Truman assisted the fight against the foreign supported Communists with the result that on October 16, 1949, the hostilities ended with the democratic forces victorious.

Greece became more international in outlook during these years, joining NATO in 1951, fighting in the Korean conflict of 1950-53, and signing in 1959 an agree-

ment with Turkey for the independence of Cyprus. During this period Greece was also enjoying both economic prosperity and political freedom.

But tragically, on the night of April 21, 1967, a group of conservative army officers seized control of the Government because they maintained the leftists were planning to use the upcoming elections to stage their own coup. Since that coup the loss of democratic freedoms in Greece is too familiar and too disturbing to be recounted again here.

Mr. Speaker, that devotion to freedom and democracy by both Americans of Greek origin and by Greek citizens themselves has not diminished at all since the 1967 coup. We all hope and believe that the disappearance of democratic freedoms from Greece will be both temporary and brief.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today, the 150th anniversary of Greek independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### IN MEMORY OF PRINCE KALANIANA'OLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 26, 1971, is a day which holds special significance for the people of Hawaii. It is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, one of the most appealing figures in the saga of Hawaii. Born to the purple in 1871, the Prince was to prove, in his mature years, to be an inspiring champion of American democracy.

Born on the island of Kauai, only a short distance from my own birthplace, Prince Kalaniana'ole was a direct descendant of the last independent ruler of that island. He was a son of High Chief David Kahalepouli Piikoi and the Princess Kinoiki Kekaulike. While still in his teens, the youth was made a prince of the realm by King Kalakaua, his uncle.

After attending both public and private schools in Honolulu, the prince became a student at St. Matthew's College in San Mateo, Calif. He concluded his formal education by taking a business course at the Royal Agricultural College in England.

Compelled by ill health to return to Hawaii, Prince Kalaniana'ole served, under the Hawaiian monarchy, as a minor official in the office of the Minister of the Interior and in the Customs Service. When the non-native element forced revolution on the islands in 1893, Kuhio sided with his cousin, Queen Liliuokalani. Shortly after the Republic of Hawaii was established, the unreconstructed prince was arrested, convicted, and imprisoned

for conspiring to effect a royalist uprising. Following his release in 1896, he was married to Elizabeth Kahanu Kaauwai, daughter of a chief on Kauai. Three years later, the couple left Hawaii for an extended tour abroad, despairing of a future in their own land. It was initially the purpose of the prince to remain in exile for the rest of his life, but after 2 years he was persuaded to accept the new order in Hawaii, and he thereupon returned.

At home again, he entered into politics, becoming for a time a member of the home rule party before declaring in favor of the Republicans. This switch in party affiliation occurred in 1902, in which year the prince received the Republican nomination for Territorial Delegate to Congress. Victorious in his first campaign, Kuhio established a record of political invincibility from then on. He served as a nonvoting delegate to Congress from 1903 until his death in 1922.

Affectionately known to his colleagues and constituents alike as "Prince Kuhio" or "Prince Cupid," the affable, untiring delegate captured the respect of everyone with whom he came in contact. Assigned to four House committees, Agriculture, Coinage, Weights and Measures, Military Affairs, and Territories, Kuhio was able to render significant service to his people. In 1919, he introduced the first of a long series of bills to accord Statehood to Hawaii. The crowning legislative achievement of his career was the successful sponsoring of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, looking to the salvation of the Hawaiian people from second-class status in their own land.

As in every country taken over by Western influence, so it was in Hawaii, where the people migrated to the cities in search of work, creating slums and wreaking economic havoc among themselves. Under the terms of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, Prince Kuhio proposed to modify the public land section of the Organic Act, providing land for homesteaders in the interior regions as an inducement for mass migration from the city slums. The system had been employed successfully in the United States, Prince Kuhio noted, so why not Hawaii?

Approximately 200,000 acres of Government land, comprising specified undeveloped areas, excluding sugarcane lands, were made available. The act prevented homesteaders from either speculating with their land or conveying it to others. If the implementation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act has not measured up to the original expectations of Prince Kuhio, the act has nonetheless produced tangible benefits.

On January 7, 1922, the prime mover of Hawaiian rehabilitation departed to join his forefathers. Despite his express desire to have his death marked by a simple ceremony, the grief-stricken people of Hawaii refused to have it so. The pomp and pageantry incident to his funeral has never been surpassed in the history of the Islands. He was revered not only as a man of pure motives, but also as the last titular prince of his line. The Hawaiian people today acknowledge that he, through example and influence,

played a major part in committing the Islanders to an acceptance of America, and converting them to passionate Americanism. That Americanism promises to extend, undiminished, into perpetuity under Hawaiian statehood—a dream that Prince Kuhio did not live to see fulfilled.

Truly, Kuhio was "Ke Alii Makaai-nana"—"A Prince of the People."

#### THE SEVENTH VIETNAM ROLL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago on March 26, 1969, I first inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of American men killed in hostile action in Vietnam. Since then, the whole course of the war has changed and America's involvement in it has been significantly curtailed. Secretary of Defense Laird has pledged to have all Americans out of ground combat activity by this summer, and President Nixon has vowed to maintain withdrawal rates at least at present levels—12,500 per month—and is hopeful that withdrawals can be increased. The President has also said he will announce another reduction in American troop strength in May, at which time the number of Americans in Vietnam will be 284,000, about half what it was when he came to office.

One thing seems clear. Regardless of the circumstances, the U.S. combat role in Vietnam will be terminated on the ground in a few months, and the bulk of our combat support activity in the air will be phased out over a period of time only slightly longer. America's role in the Indochina war is unquestionably nearing an end.

Comforting as this must be for most Americans, it, nevertheless, provides little solace to the families of loved ones who have been killed during this period when the war is being wound down.

Today I am listing with these remarks the names of 1,352 men killed in hostile action in Vietnam during the last 6 months of 1970. This brings the total number of dead listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to 44,778, and demonstrates vividly the grim momentum of the war. The previous listings were:

March 25, 1969, 31,379 men, through January 1969;

April 3, 1969, 2,148 men, February and March, 1969;

July 22, 1969, 2,866 men, April and May, 1969;

December 2, 1969, 2,999 men, June through September, 1969;

March 26, 1970, 1,159 men, October through December, 1969;

October 14, 1970, 2,875 men, January through June, 1970;

March 26, 1971, 1,352 men, July through December, 1970;

Total of 44,778 men.

For many men, the incursion into Cambodia and the subsequent activities over Laos proved to be the hardest and bleakest days of the war. American casualties once again rose from previous

lows. Fighting is unquestionably heavier, and setbacks to Allied forces once again occupy the front pages of newspapers.

For those caught up in the process of winding down the war, these are surely their darkest hours. The difficulty of understanding the need for Americans to die in a far off corner of the world is intensified as it becomes clearer that America's role in this war is almost over. For many, the last days of the war are the hardest.

Progress in ending the war in Vietnam seems to be moving so slowly in the eyes of some as to be imperceptible. On another front, in the legislative halls of Congress, I am glad to report that very definite, if slow, progress has been made in shaping legislation aimed at preventing the recurrence of Vietnam-type entanglements in the future.

One year ago, when I listed the names of over 1,000 men who died in the last 3 months of 1969, I called for the Congress to build a proper legislative memorial to our Vietnam war dead in the form of a new law which would seek to prevent the improper use of Presidential powers to initiate military hostilities. In my view, it was this improper use of power by previous administrations, together with congressional inaction, which step by step took us into the quagmire of Vietnam.

On March 26, 1970, I introduced a joint resolution outlining the three circumstances in which I believed the President was authorized to commit U.S. military personnel to foreign territory without prior congressional approval. A second section of the resolution required the President to report promptly to Congress anytime he sent our troops to a foreign country without first securing the approval of the Congress, such report to state the circumstances necessitating the commitment of troops and the justification for not first seeking congressional approval.

In the intervening year, much progress has been made. The three circumstances in which I suggested the President need not first come to Congress—that is, to repel attack, protect American lives and property, and fulfill treaty and legislative obligations—have been embodied in a proposal which is presently the focus of hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Today I testified before that committee to express my support for measures which would restore the war powers to the Congress.

Substantially more progress has been made in the House of Representatives. After exhaustive hearings, the House Foreign Affairs Committee last year passed a joint resolution containing the language of a Presidential reporting requirement which I had drafted. The measure, which was reintroduced as House Joint Resolution 1 this year, would require the President to report to Congress promptly in any case where, without specific prior congressional authorization, he:

(1) commits United States military forces to armed conflict;

(2) commits military forces equipped for combat to the territory, airspace, or waters of a foreign nation, except for deployments which relate solely to supply, repair, or train-

ing of United States forces, or for humanitarian or other peaceful purposes; or

(3) substantially enlarges military forces already located in a foreign nation.

The President's report would include:

(A) the circumstances necessitating his action;

(B) the constitutional, legislative, and treaty provisions under the authority of which he took such action, together with his reasons for not seeking specific prior congressional authorization;

(C) the estimated scope of activities; and  
(D) such other information as the President may deem useful to the Congress in the fulfillment of its constitutional responsibilities with respect to committing the Nation to war and to the use of United States Armed Forces abroad.

I am hopeful that this Congress will finish construction of the legislative monument to Vietnam war dead begun 1 year ago. I believe that Congress will pass a bill which will impose new meaningful limitations on Presidential ability to commit U.S. troops to war without first seeking congressional approval. Such limitations need not infringe upon his responsibilities as Commander in Chief, but they will impose upon him the responsibility to take the Congress into his councils when decisions are made which might make the difference between war and peace for our Nation, and life and death for many of its citizens.

Had this reporting requirement been in effect in 1962 when the number of U.S. advisers in Vietnam was raised from 700 without combat gear to 16,000 equipped for combat, President Kennedy would have been required to explain promptly and in writing to Congress the circumstances necessitating his decision, the constitutional, legislative, and treaty provisions under which he took such action, and his reasons for not seeking specific prior congressional authorization.

This reporting requirement of itself might have caused sober second thoughts by the President. It might have caused him to reconsider. If he went ahead, the report on the action would have provided Congress with a formal document on which to hold hearings.

Certainly the consideration of the report in 1962 would have been in circumstances more favorable to objectivity than existed when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was passed in 1964.

We cannot turn back the clock and erase Vietnam from the pages of history. Nor can we afford to erase from our minds the memory of Vietnam. We must build upon our experience so that there will be no Vietnams in the future. The legislation which is being considered by the House and the Senate is aimed at just that. When enacted, it will be as fitting a monument to our Vietnam war dead as any memorial carved in granite or engraved in bronze.

List of war dead follows:

#### DEATHS RESULTING FROM HOSTILE ACTION IN VIETNAM FROM JULY-DECEMBER 1970

The names appearing in this list are of those U.S. military personnel who incurred fatal casualties in connection with the conflict in Vietnam, arranged by home state of record as indicated by the servicemen at their last entry into active duty. For officers, this would generally be at the time of commissioning or call to active duty in the re-

serve or national guard. For enlisted personnel, it would be at the time of induction, first enlistment, or reenlistment.

This is volume IV of the name list and includes the deaths reported from 1 January through 31 December 1970.

Volume III (deaths reported during 1969), volume II (deaths reported during 1968), and the list which includes deaths reported from 1 January 1961 through 31 December 1967, should be retained, as it is not planned that they will be re-published or incorporated in a subsequent list.

#### ALABAMA

##### Army

Allen, Johnny, Jr., Birmingham.  
Baldwin, Larry Glenn, Montgomery County.

Billings, Will Danny, Helena.  
Campbell, Thomas Allen, York.  
Craig, Clayton Jerome, Lester.  
Crenshaw, Joe Edward, Mobile.  
Crow, Rodger Pinkney, Decatur.  
Duckworth, James Edward, Cullman.  
Durall, Robert Michael, Daleville.  
Ellis, William Richard, Brewton.  
Gantt, Samuel Lee, Montgomery.  
Mitchell, Perry Adkins, Athens.  
Moss, Jack, Jr., Talladega.  
Murrell, Ervin Jerome, Birmingham.  
Parker, Carter, Jr., Monroeville.  
Perkins, James Earney, Birmingham.  
Raiford, Mark Phillip, Huntsville.  
Robinson, Jimmie Lee, Mobile.  
Tindall, Bruce Carland, Pittsview.  
Todd, Carlos Franklin, Talladega.  
Wade, Steven Michael, Birmingham.  
White, Michael Eugene, Prattville.

##### Air Force

Brunson, Robert Wade, Birmingham.  
Stallings, John Larry, Tuscaloosa.

##### Marine Corps

Barber, Ernest McDonald, Talladega.  
Bennett, Daniel Murphy, Mobile.  
Berryman, William Ernest, Leighton.  
Elland, Grady Louis, Foley.  
Lassiter, John Irving, Sumnerdale.  
Shelton, Joseph Henry, III, Montgomery.  
Touart, John Elliott, Mobile.

#### ALASKA

Banta, Michael Dean, Cordova.  
Plett, Larry Joe, Anchorage.

#### ARIZONA

##### Army

Blanchette, Michael R., Phoenix.  
Brenner, Larry Ray, Phoenix.  
Carlberg, Alan George, Scottsdale.  
Clifford, William Henry, Tucson.  
Coffin, Jeffrey Alan, Flagstaff.  
Davis, Wesley Wayne, Queen Creek.  
Felts, Dan Owen, Flagstaff.  
Fenton, James Willard, Prescott.  
Gray, Dale Alan, Mesa.  
Hankins, Bruce Lynn, Tempe.  
Pahissa, William Anthony, Tucson.  
Pickett, Darrel Monroe, Buckeye.  
Shevlin, Hugh John, Tucson.  
Staddon, Peter Bruce, Phoenix.  
Toschik, Mark Joseph, Phoenix.

##### Marine Corps

Tsosie, Albert, Chinle.

##### Navy

Daniels, Russell Glen, Phoenix.  
Ortiz, Antonio Clivarez, Pirtleville.  
Riter, James Lee, Phoenix.

#### ARKANSAS

##### Army

Barnett, Stuart Lee, Bull Shoals.  
Cody, Wesley Oteria, Wynne.  
Hamm, Franklin Alvin, Little Rock.  
Hedges, Daniel Macom, Malvern.  
Huffine, Dennis Willard, Paragould.  
Johnson, David Earl, Humnoke.  
Lindler, Jessie Ray, Lockesburg.  
Price, Arthur Houston, Fort Smith.

Smith, Jimmy Don, Mountainburg.  
Upshaw, Olen Lee, Holly Grove.  
White, Donald Nisler, Plumerville.

*Marine Corps*

Kimbrough, Harold Bruce, Batesville.

CALIFORNIA

*Army*

Apellido, Raymond Hugh, Bakersfield.  
Arias, William Cip, Jr., National City.  
Arnall, Robert C., Bell.  
Bainter, Neal Vincent, Orange.  
Barrera, Jose Gilbert, Corcoran.  
Baxley, Dennis Wayne, Orange.  
Baxter, Ivery Lee, Los Angeles.  
Bedra, Theodore Frank, Buena Park.  
Beltran, Robert Joseph, Los Angeles.  
Bennett, Brian John, Stockton.  
Brown, Clemmie Jr., Dublin.  
Brown, Laurence Gordon, Fullerton.  
Burns, Ken Dwight, Norwalk.  
Campbell, James Lee, Northridge.  
Carr, Roger James, Fullerton.  
Chamberlain, Dale Stewart, Pasadena.  
Coe, Paul Thomas, Concord.  
Denna, David Ramiro, Los Angeles.  
Dick, Manuel Levi, Coleville.  
Dodge, Gregory Alexis, Stockton.  
Emerine, Jerry Owen, Benicia.  
Filippi, Gerald Francis, San Jose.  
Fitzsimmons, Patrick G., Ventura.  
Ford, Earl Eugene, Susanville.  
Frazier, Rex Leonard, Sonora.  
Gage, Michael Arthur, Gerber.  
Gleim, Arthur Frederick, Jr., Aptos.  
Griggs, Steven Thomas, Atwater.  
Guenther, Bert Marrion, Jr., West Covina.  
Gurnias, Nicholas Perez, Hollister.  
Hargraves, Murvyn Eugene, Santa Maria.  
Hernandez, Ramon Antonio, McFarland.  
Holt, Raymond Clyde, Antioch.  
Hooper, John Joseph, Ventura.  
Hunt, John Stuart, Santa Ana.  
Jensen, Michael Charles, San Francisco.  
Jernigan, Mark Thomas, Imperial.  
Kappmeyer, Theodore C., San Jose.  
Kloss, Thomas Donald, Los Angeles.  
Koonce, Robert Edmund, San Diego.  
Kotarski, Vincent R., Jr., Paramount.  
Kuersten, Jeffery David, San Jose.  
Lawrence, Tory Drake, Murphys.  
Lopez, George Leonard, Banning.  
Lopez, John Edward Jr., San Jose.  
Lucas, Andre Cavaro, San Diego.  
Luna, Joe, Jr., Azusa.  
Mathern, Edward Gerard, Corona.  
Meador, Larry Joe, Carmichael.  
Morgans, Christopher W., Redlands.  
Nelson, Benjamin Roy, Jr., Los Angeles.  
Nunez Jesus Carlos, Los Angeles.  
Padilla, Eddie Jack, Stevinson.  
Perry, Casey Clayton, Los Angeles.  
Petandvich, Nicholas C., Lompoc.  
Prater, Donald Harold, El Cerrito.  
Premenko, John Al, Pacifica.  
Pritchard, Clarence R., Jr., Lompoc.  
Ramirez, Eduardo Cruz, Canoga Park.  
Rasey, Larry Wayne, Taft.  
Remelts, William Henry II, Wilmington.  
Reyes, Edward Thomas, San Leandro.  
Rocha, Robert Silas, Los Angeles.  
Rollason, William David, Riverside.  
Runge, Robert Carl, Mountain View.  
Sayers, David William, Simi.  
Scanlon, William Manuel, Los Banos.  
Schoepke, Anton John, Goleta.  
Sears, Gordon Bert, Los Molinos.  
Settle, William Foy, Richmond.  
Silver, Gareth MacKenzie, Palo Alto.  
Singleton, Gerald Blaine, Indio.  
Stephens, Boyd Adam, Jr., Mendota.  
Sullivan, Thomas Howard, Los Angeles.  
Swarbrick, Lawrence Gordon, Pismo Beach.  
Taylor, Larry Gene, El Cajon.  
Vandiver, Fred Gerald, Riverside.  
Velasquez, Robert, Los Angeles.  
Vesey, Jerrold Louis, Palo Alto.  
Villalobos, Paul Rubio, Los Angeles.  
Vullo, Michael Phillip, Alhambra.  
Wadsworth, John Lanier, San Diego.

Wagner, John Lawrence, Dale City.  
Wagner, Marvin Leroy, Elverta.  
Waldron, Duane Everett, Inglewood.  
Walker, Larry Allen, Denair.  
Ward, Robert William, Concord.  
Watson, J. V., Los Angeles.  
Webster, Frank Anthony, Los Angeles.  
Wheeler, Nicholas, San Diego.  
Young, Ronald Lee, Morongo Valley.  
Zacharuk, Michael Patrick, San Diego.  
Zerba, Douglas Paul, Napa.

*Air Force*

Lundy, Albro Lynn, Jr., Sherman Oaks.  
McGerty, Michael John, Fullerton.  
Vrablick, Michael Stephen, Marysville.

*Marine Corps*

Barnett, John Frank, Port Hueneme.  
Buttry, Richard Russell, Anaheim.  
Davis, William Stanley, Alhambra.  
Duemling, Ralph Nelson, South Pasadena.  
Keller, Greg, Whittier.  
Ketchum, William Arnold, Jr., Littlerock.  
Kindrick, Bryce Leroy, Torrance.  
La Rosa, Marion Dominic, San Jose.  
Munoz, Jose, Jr., Rowland Heights.  
Parsons, Henry Bennett, III, Fairfield.  
Russell, Donnie Howard, Tracy.  
Standring, Lauren Walter, Reseda.

*Navy*

Drake, John De Witt, Stockton.  
Pedersen, William A., La Canada.

COLORADO

*Army*

Carter, James William, Denver.  
Casler, Joseph Duane, Colorado Springs.  
Haining, Paul Linn, Placerville.  
Helms, John Ray, Littleton.  
Marchesi, Jimmy Eugene, Littleton.  
Parmentier, Roger David, Littleton.  
Sanchez, Nick Enrique, Chama.  
Smith, Dennis Michael, Aurora.  
Sullivan, William Lee, Denver.  
Thaden, Gary Dennis, Brighton.  
Vestal, Steve Alan, Denver.

*Air Force*

Helwig, Roger Danny, Colorado Springs.  
Stearns, Roger Horace, Boulder.

*Marine Corps*

Pappenheim, Thomas Henry, Eaton.  
Sievers, John Robert, Gunnison.

CONNECTICUT

*Army*

Harris, Roy Edward, Bridgeport.  
Malcolm, John Daniel, Middlefield.  
Parsons, Clifford E., Jr., Milford.  
Repole, Richard Glenn, Danbury.  
Silverman, Sheldon, Waterford.  
Stoddard, Norman R., Jr., Kent.

DELAWARE

*Army*

Aikin, George Lee, Wilmington.  
Jones, William Edward, Millsboro.  
Moses, Jesse Lee, Wilmington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

*Army*

Austin, Paul Jasper, Jr., Washington.  
Williams, Raymond Leon, Washington.

FLORIDA

*Army*

Aaron, Eugene Allen, Tampa.  
Batcher, Larry Gene, Naples.  
Bean, John Robert, Parker.  
Bregler, John Ramsey, Lake City.  
Bryant, John Darrall, Miami.  
Chamblee, William Donald, Leisure City.  
Diehl, Stanley Gene, Treasure Island.  
Durden, Troy, Orlando.  
Freda, Robert, Miami.  
Hadden, Herbert Michael, Bradenton.  
Harp, William, Pompano Beach.  
Helle, Henry Nicholas II, West Palm Beach.  
Herring, John Willie, Sanford.  
Johnson, Gordon Michael, Oviedo.

Maseda, Gerald Lee, Miami.  
McGuckin, Joseph, Apopka.  
McNutt, Frank Elliott, Tampa.  
Minear, Mark Wendell, Merritt Island.  
Moore, Johnny Lee, Madison.  
Parker, Otis, Green Cove Springs.  
Porter, Sandy Hilly, Tampa.  
Pratt, David Alvin, Miami Lakes.  
Ravelo-Toribio, Elpidio J., Hialeah.  
Redding, Walter Lee, Lake Wales.  
Roller, William Eugene, Sebastian.  
Sawyer, William Lelon, Jr., Hollywood.  
Schofield, Robert Louis, Miami.  
Sooville, Howard James, Hollywood.  
Shaw, Roy Edward, Jr., Bowling Green.  
Sizemore, Robert Ralph, Jr., Lynn Haven.  
Szponder, Robert Allan, Miami Beach.  
Tanner, Kenneth Paul, Orlando.  
Thigpen, Willie Junior, Ocala.  
Walker, William Wayman, Jacksonville.  
Washenik, Gary Lee, Miami.  
Williams, Pondextuer E., Ft. Pierce.  
Wooten, David Daryl, Coral Gables.  
York, Joel Craig, Fort Walton Beach.

*Air Force*

Carter, Joseph Jr., Miami.

*Marine Corps*

Amick, Timothy David, St. Petersburg.  
Gray, Bobby Elmer, Tampa.  
Leffer, Richard John, Miami.  
Maninger, Raymond Marcine, Jacksonville.  
Vacenovsky, Dennis Edward, Brooksville.  
Watts, Richard Joe, West Hollywood.

*Navy*

Bomar, Frank Willis, Miami.  
Young, Robert Earl, Orlando.

GEORGIA

*Army*

Allen, Gus, Atlanta.  
Fouche, Paul Jerry, Macon.  
Gentry, Dennis Wayne, Athens.  
Lightsey, John Henry, Odum.  
Mears, Guy Lamar, Jr., Rockmart.  
Vavrin, Frank Neal, Augusta.  
Walner, Walter Lewis, Stapleton.

*Marine Corps*

Manac, Don, Fargo.  
Norcin, John Emory, Ft. Ogelthorpe.  
Pierce, Robert James, Ft. Gains.  
Scott, Johnny Fred, Americus.

HAWAII

*Army*

Johnson, Steve Freddie, Kailua Kona.  
Riveira, Robert Charles, Honolulu.

IDAHO

*Army*

Blenkinsop, William Darwin, Coeur D' Alene.

Mapes, Eddie D., Kootenai.  
Mitchell, John E. S., Jr., American Falls.  
Nelson, Robert William, Rigby.  
Shiefer, John Frederick, Boise.

ILLINOIS

*Army*

Avery, Don Wayne, Chicago.  
Babich, John Michael, Franklin Grove.  
Baum, Michael Edward, Decatur.  
Benofst, William F., III, Winnetka.  
Bohan, Patrick John, Peoria.  
Bollman, Robert Norman, Springfield.  
Boyer, James Alan, Kansas.  
Brass, Paul Robert, St. Charles.  
Busch, Eric Peter, Chicago.  
Clymer, Dennis Lee, Eureka.  
Colford, Darrell Lee, West Chicago.  
Connor, Patrick James, Glenview.  
Edgren, Thomas Gordon, Libertyville.  
Ervin, John Lee, Springfield.  
Feezell, Dan Guinn, Wilmington.  
Felkamp, Ronald Allen, Chicago.  
Frossard, William John, Chicago.  
Glassford, Gary Bruce, Flora.  
Guimond, Paul Gerald, Chicago.  
Hart, Robert William, Chicago.  
Herington, John Donovan, Washburn.

Herring, Thomas Forest, Lombard.  
Housman, Robert Charles, Bradley.  
Jeters, Darold, Chicago.  
Johnson, Michael Kirk, Alton.  
Juarez, Mateo, Joliet.

Karsznia, Leszek Stanley, Chicago.  
Kelton, Richard Lane, Chicago.  
Knox, Leonard Wayne, Sterling.  
Lakwa, Edward John, Chicago.  
Lyons, William Perry, Lombard.  
Mackey, Larry Allen, Polo.  
Magnuson, David Jack, Chicago.  
Mindock, Richard William, Ottawa.  
Mucci, John Rocco, Chicago.

Olson, Mark Allen, Plano.  
Paleowski, Richard Wayne, Chicago.  
Quick, Michael Edward, Wauconda.  
Rajcevic, Hans Anthony, Chicago.  
Ramm, Ferenc John, Danville.  
Rankins, Samuel Kaye, Chicago.  
Reed, Richard Leon, Rock City.  
Sandoval, Hector Montalvo, Chicago.  
Scarborough, Roger Allen, Dixon.  
Simmons, Elroy, East St. Louis.  
Soto, Joseph Martinez, Chicago.  
Springer, Timothy Michael, Chicago.  
Stearns, Frank Edwin, Carbondale.  
Trotanella, Clement Joseph, Chicago.  
Trygg, Stanley Herbert, Jr., Joliet.  
Utecht, Robert Stephen, Des Plaines.  
Wehrhelm, Charles George, Chicago.  
Widdows, John William, Chicago.  
Williams, Gary Robert, Cuba.  
Wolters, Theodore Anthony, New Baden.  
Wright, Clifford Ivan, East Peoria.  
Zagata, John Joseph, Chicago.

*Air Force*

Bunker, Park George, Homewood.  
Pennington, Richard W., Adair.  
Wood, James Watson, Galesburg.

*Marine Corps*

Ashenfelter, Alan Wayne, Decatur.  
Berger, Nicholas Allen, Savanna.  
Blake, Wayne Valgeen, Rockford.  
Dodd, Richard William, Oglesby.  
Flester, Glen Alan, Park Ridge.  
Gilbert, Jack Richardo, Chicago Ridge.  
Guldan, John Anthony, Chicago.  
Hilliard, Donald Ray, Chicago.  
Iwasko, Edward Bernard, Bellwood.  
Novak, Edward James, Tinley Park.  
Schroeder, William Ray, Bloomington.  
Williams, Earnest, Chicago.

*Navy*

Boor, Alan Scott, Woodridge.  
Buroff, Lanny Howard, Chicago.

## INDIANA

Adams, Robert James, Indianapolis.  
Barnett, Thomas Martin, Sellersburg.  
Beyl, David Robert, Sellersburg.  
Birkholz, Robert Earl, Michigan City.  
Chaney, Roy Lee, Indianapolis.  
Cisar, Thomas Charles, Highland.  
Cleveland, Ronald Louis, Gaston.  
Conover, Charles Raymond, Logansport.  
Craig, William Anderson, Indianapolis.  
Dickus, Michael John, Hammond.  
Draper, Mark Gregory, Finly.  
Engelhardt, Gary Wayne, Muncie.  
Fields, Garrison David, Lafayette.  
Gibbs, Ira Eugene, Hammond.  
Harkins, Edison Amos III, Beverly Shores.  
Harter, Francis William, La Porte.  
Heavrin, Mark Thomas, Evansville.  
Henthorn, Harry Thomas, Richmond.  
Hickman, Thomas Steven, Logansport.  
Hughes, Furman David, Hammond.  
Jordan, Roy Douglas, Logansport.  
Kahre, Donald Lee, Evansville.  
Lee, Milan Lavoy, Muncie.  
McDowell, Larry James, Terre Haute.  
O'Boyle, Terrence Patrick, Gary.  
O'Connor, Timothy John, Logansport.  
Pettitt, John Thomas Sr., Indianapolis.  
Phillips, Kerry Wayne, Evansville.  
Pratt, Carey Jay, Kokomo.  
Raymer, Carroll Edward Jr., Otisco.  
Scott, Rickey Leroy, Columbia City.  
Smith, Stephen Thomas, Indianapolis.

Stone, Forest Michael, Oaklandon.  
Tharp, Paul Arnold, Kirklint.  
Tunny, Nicholas Randle, Osgood.  
Valentine, Donald Lynn, Lafayette.  
Warner, Wilfred Wesley Jr., Mishawaka.  
Waymire, Michael Karl, Macy.  
Webb, Mark James, Hobart.  
Willis, Steven Craig, Hammond.

*Air Force*

Bancroft, William W. Jr., Indianapolis.

*Marine Corps*

Daulton, William Manson, Medora.  
Frakes, William Douglas, Boonville.  
Musselman, James Kevin, Fort Wayne.

*Navy*

Gish, Calvin Robert, Highland.  
Hunt, James Robert, Columbus.  
Prchlik, William Charles, Knox.

*Army*

Ahart, William Junior, Crown Point.  
Alexander, James Hines, Lizton.  
Barnett, Carl Taylor, Bluffton.  
Baum, David Michale, Crown Point.  
Brittain, Joseph Bruce, Bloomington.  
Buchanan, John Gary, Evansville.  
Cook, Donald Warren, Avilla.  
Craig, Dickey, Madison.  
Creamer, Charles F. III, South Bend.  
Dulin, Zettie J. C., Brazil.

## IOWA

*Army*

Abrahamson, Gary Lee, Albia.  
Bartmess, Gary Wawne, Nevada.  
Bixby, Virgil Martin, Iowa City.  
Briese, Stephen Craig, Correctionville.  
Bull, Billy Bruce, Lake City.  
Fell, Daniel Boone, West Des Moines.  
Freeman, Randall Gaylord, Sac City.  
Fries, Danny Joe, Council Bluffs.  
Halbach, Bruce Charles, Stacyville.  
Huk, Peter Paul, Cedar Rapids.  
Larson, Mark Allan, Council Bluffs.  
Levis, Dennis Richard, Chariton.  
Martin, Dennis Keith, Cedar Rapids.  
McClurg, John Lloyd, Earlham.  
McNett, Joe Billy, West Burlington.  
Miller, Melvin Dale, Newell.  
Newell, Tim Edwin, Des Moines.  
Riley, James Francis, Waukon.  
Rushing, Stephen Abram, Ames.  
Scott, Steven Clayton, Elkhart.  
Scully, Russell Craig, Ottumwa.  
Shonka, Daryl David, Ft. Dodge.  
Struble, Stanley Dean, Castana.  
Thorpe, William David, Jesup.  
Waterman, Craig Thomas, Rockwell City.  
Werner, John Fredrick, Williamsburg.  
Wilson, John Joseph, Davenport.  
Wolf, Kent Carter, Boone.  
Wright, Bruce William, West Des Moines.  
Wright, Vernon Arthur, Indianola.  
Zittergruen, Louis Lloyd, Monona.

## KANSAS

Amann, Albert Frank, Argonia.  
Carter, Otis, Independence.  
Conrardy, Richard John, Wright.  
Coombs, Dan L. F., III, Overland Park.  
Dickey, Derral Keith, Arcadia.  
Forrest, Monte Wayne, Argonia.  
Hewitt, Thomas Theodore, Topeka.  
Huttie, Frederick E., III, Prairie Village.  
Mizer, Lenton Eugene, El Dorado.  
Munger, Ronald William, Beattie.  
Richardson, Gary Wayne, Wichita.  
Seglem, Richard Noyce, Wichita.  
Stelmel, Gregg Francis, Wright.  
Tucker, Robert Eugene, Abbyville.  
Wallace, Lanny John, Shawnee Mission.

## KENTUCKY

*Army*

Bridgers, Douglas Stephen, Louisville.  
Carson, Omer Price, Campton.  
Chaney, David Glenn, Bloss.  
Estridge, Curtiss, Hoskinson.  
Fawbush, Steven Lee, Jeffersonton.  
Fields, Bobby George, Blackey.  
Frale, Ezekiel, Jr., Jackson.

Geer, Robert Sampson, Elizabethtown.  
Hockensmith, David Baker, Frankfort.  
Inmann, Harry Charles, III, Louisville.  
Johnson, Nicholas G., Sr., New Haven.  
Johnson, Paul Allen, New Haven.  
Jones, Marshall Keene, Campbellsville.  
Kavich, Robert Dale, Jeffersonton.  
Marcum, Walter Vernon, Louisville.  
Nolen, Kenneth Joe, Manchester.  
Norrenbrock, William A., Louisville.  
Ratliff, Billy Harrison, Pomeroyton.  
Ray, William Clayton, De Mossville.  
Risinger, Gerald Lee, Jeffersonton.  
Schneider, Gary Lee, Newport.  
Sharp, Stephen Allen, Sebree.  
Taylor, Harry Eugene, Louisville.  
Toler, David Bruce, Ashland.  
Williamson, Pete Ellis, Ashland.  
Wright, Phillip Gerald, Ashland.

*Marine Corps*

Cox, Charles William, Louisville.  
Crisp, Thomas Mikell, Hopkinsville.  
Justice, Don McClelland, Pikeville.  
Seymore, Richard Morris, Princeton.

## LOUISIANA

*Army*

Brown, James, Jr., Port Allen.  
Converser, Tyrone, New Orleans.  
Duplechain, Andrus Floyd, Eunice.  
Emanuel, William Frederick, Shreveport.  
Garnett, Isiah Calvin, New Orleans.  
Johnston, Billy Neal, Jr., Ruston.  
Lombas, Dexter Joseph, Morgan City.  
Medine, Bertrand C., Jr., New Orleans.  
Mistretta, Eric Paul, Metairie.  
Perrodin, Curtis Joseph, St. Martinville.  
Romagosa, Layne Joseph, New Orleans.  
Singleton, Charlie, Jr., Winnboro.  
Smith, Marcus, West Monroe.  
Thibodeaux, Michael L., Crowley.  
Walton, Jimmy Ronald, Harrisonburg.  
Wheless, Douglass Terrell, Shreveport.

*Marine Corps*

McNeil, Bruce Alan, Metairie.  
Tarver, Edward, Winnboro.

*Navy*

Griffith, Eric Lawrence, Destrehan.

## MAINE

*Army*

Daigle, Bennett Joseph, Stockholm.  
Manchester, Gary Oral C., Farmington.

*Marine Corps*

Buxton, Dale Ryan, Rangeley.

*Navy*

Withee, Edward William, Madison.

## MARYLAND

*Army*

Bates, Melvin Carroll Jr., Baltimore.  
Bolan, Robert Louis, Pasadena.  
Bridgett, Paul Edward, Riverdale.  
Burrows, Roberts Paton, Denton.  
Dale, Dennis Humphrey, Baltimore.  
Curtis, Joseph Paul, Hollywood.  
Deibel, Edward Paul III, Baltimore.  
Keeney, Joseph Frank, Baltimore.  
Kessing, Thomas Edward Jr., Silver Spring.  
King, Robert Lee, Prince Frederick.  
Kozlowski, James Michael, Baltimore.  
McDermott, Joseph F. III, College Park.  
Osborne, David William, Baltimore.  
Rowe, Russell Allen, Lexington Park.  
Stroud, Allen Ralph, Silver Spring.

*Air Force*

Wright, David Irvin, Annapolis.

*Marine Corps*

Casner, Lewis Edgar, Jr., Potomac.  
Gaffigan, Robert Michael, Silver Spring.  
Killmon, Frederick Russell, Delmar.  
Steger, David Naylor, Hampstead.

## MASSACHUSETTS

*Army*

Cahill, William Joseph, Haverhill.  
Collina, George William, Springfield.

Davis, Wayne Robert, Leominster.  
Gambino, Michael James, Haverhill.  
Hepler, James Howard, Needham.  
Kacsock, Walter Joseph, Jr., Bridgewater.  
Larraga, Angelo Gentry, Boston.  
Lovett, Bernard James, Jr., Springfield.  
McEwing, Harry, Ayer.  
Powers, Francis Edward, Jr., Charlestown.  
Seaman, Joseph Andrew, Framingham.

*Air Force*

Landry, Peter Joseph, Quincy.  
Ramsay, David Leroy, Boston.

*Marine Corps*

Cunningham, Robert James, Dorchester.  
Lawson, John David, Topsfield.  
Reardon, Dennis Joseph, Cohasset.

*Navy*

Buzzell, Richard Howard, Arlington.  
Palma, Luco William, Tewksbury.

MICHIGAN

*Army*

Atkins, Douglas Paul, Ann Arbor.  
Baer, Randall Thomas, Detroit.  
Bain, Bruce Arnold, Taylor.  
Barkley, Kirk Owen, East Leroy.  
Blaskowski, Richard L., Cheboygan.  
Bouchard, Roger Harold, Flint.  
Boyer, Thomas Michael, Livonia.  
Brooks, Larry Eugene, Detroit.  
Bryan, Robert Lamarr, Colon.  
Busick, Larry Russell, Fraser.  
Caffey, Michael Alexander, Saginaw.  
Carver, Randall Allen, Three Oaks.  
Cleverley, William Bert, Detroit.  
De Wulf, Patrick Thomas, Bloomfield Hills.  
Derrick, Robert Allen, Marquette.  
Faculak, Gary J., Boyne City.  
Fries, Daniel Leslie, Greenville.  
Gerten, Ronald Eugene, Tecumseh.  
Gomez, Evello Alfred, Kalamazoo.  
Greene, Frederick David, Detroit.  
Griffin, William Donald II, Pontiac.  
Gydesen, Gregory Allen, Big Rapids.  
Harper, Harold Owen, Grand Rapids.  
Hawley, Peter Sheldon, Jackson.  
Hearsch, John Patrick Jr., Flint.  
Herndon, Thomas Hayden, Saint Joseph.  
Hilderbrant, Phillip Jay, Edmore.  
Howe, John Allan, Mt. Pleasant.  
Huxtable, Ronald Lester, Madison Heights.  
Lafferty, Thomas Lee, Adrian.  
Lane, Albert Leroy, Jr., Ferndale.  
Lavery, Steve L. J., Farwell.  
Law, Brent Robin, St. Johns.  
Linville, Michael Thomas, Madison Heights.  
MacDonald, Harold Lee, Clarkston.  
Mathews, Charles Donald, Grand Haven.  
Merz, James R. Jr., Royal Oak.  
Metz, Gary Raymond, Adrain.  
Miller, David Bruce, Lansing.  
Musich, John Paul, Calumet.  
Nabozniak, Myron Richard, Warren.  
Natalie, Ronald John, Monroe.  
Nowaczynski, Natalie, Roseville.  
Olinger, James Edward, Jr., Grand Rapids.  
Osier, Robert Dale, Jr., Garden City.  
Overweg, Roger Dale, Zeeland.  
Persyn, Ronald Frank, Detroit.  
Pinkney, Robertis, Detroit.  
Reska, Craig Thomas, Novi.  
Rose, David Earl, Flint.  
Sanders, Terry Lee, Wayne.  
Simmons, Kenneth Jerome, Muskegon.  
Smith, Thomas Paul, Alpena.  
Stanich, Nade Michael, Lexington.  
Van Ochten, Terry Joseph, Bay City.  
Vanderhaag, Albert Jacob, Grant.  
Von Der Hoff, Ralph Henry, Traverse City.  
Weaver, Jerry Michael, Niles.  
Wheeler, William Eugene, Detroit.  
Wilson, Phillip Allen, Plainwell.

*Air Force*

Kelsey, Ronald Keith, Troy.

*Marine Corps*

Asbury, Donnie DeWayne, Flint.  
Beach, Leo Albert, Jr., Detroit.  
Carr, James Otis, Flint.

Delaphiano Joe B., Shelbyville.  
Franklin, William Johnson, Southgate.  
Jones, James Dale, Pontiac.  
Lafler, John James, Wyandotte.  
Lazar, Daniel Stephen, Flushing.  
More, Gary Keith, Sterling Heights.  
Welch, Robert Leroy, Yale.

*Navy*

Conley, Larry Ray, Detroit.  
Nieboer, Douglas Alan, Holland.

MINNESOTA

*Army*

Anderson, Roger Wilbur, Jr., Montevideo.  
Barrett, Andrew Ryan, Minnetonka.  
Cooreman, Raymond Robert, Tracy.  
Gunderson, Thomas La Von, Milan.  
Hayes, Lyle Dennis, Pierz.  
Hennessy, Stephen Thomas, Duluth.  
Kaster, Stephen Joseph, Coon Rapids.  
Knott, John Charles, Pine River.  
Kraemer, Fred Chris, Hopkins.  
Krull, James Lee, Herman.  
Nehl, Joseph Robert, Hoyt Lakes.  
Nieken, Larry Lee, Hillman.  
Nordquist, Jon Harris, St. Paul.  
Ordner, John Albert, Rush City.  
Sampson, Michael John, Forest Lake.  
Sikich, Michael Matthew, Bloomington.  
Stefanich, Nicholas C., Tower.  
Waldron, James Taylor, Minneapolis.  
Wise, Gordon Scott, Minneapolis.  
Zager, John Carl, Virginia.

MISSISSIPPI

*Army*

Bailey, Bobby Lee, Biloxi.  
Barritt, William Emmett, Meridian.  
Bennett, Robert Horace, Starkville.  
Drane, Wilbert Ray, Charleston.  
Expose, Henry Ray, Columbia.  
Franklin, Jerold, Greenville.  
Frazier, Gary Lee, Jackson.  
Fulgham, Joe Hugh, Mathiston.  
Gillaspy, Thomas David, Monticello.  
Golden, Donald Lewis, Meridian.  
Hester, Guy Wilson, Jr., Winona.  
Howard, Chester Theo, Jr., Winona.  
Hudson, James William, Biloxi.  
Malette, Avon Norris, Lucedale.  
McGuire, John Eddie, Walls.  
McLaurin, Willie James, Picayune.  
Porter, Thomas Lamar, Vicksburg.  
Ray, Willie James, Centreville.  
Roberts, Joe Raymond, Jr., New Albany.  
Robinson, Charles Wayne, Vicksburg.  
Salters, Lee Earnest, Belden.  
Sanford, Hollis Coleman, Jr., Clarksdale.  
Santee, Henry Edward, Hattiesburg.  
Stodard, William Terry, Meridian.  
Sumrall, Roger Dale, Hattiesburg.

*Marine Corps*

Clark, Dennis Eugene, Tupelo.

MISSOURI

*Army*

Batesel, Dennis Gordon, Hocomo.  
Burnett, Curters Joseph, Sikeston.  
Cady, Stephen Michael, St. Louis.  
Candrl, Bruce Charles, St. Louis.  
Collins, Donald Clifton, West Plains.  
Crawford, John Nelson, Jr., Kansas City.  
Crosby, Louis John, St. Louis.  
Dean, Terry Lee, Columbia.  
Dickson, Ronald George, St. Louis.  
Fisher, Dennis Fay, Walker.  
Frasch, Robert Louis, Belton.  
Freeman, David Franklin, Farmington.  
Gallina, Anthony Joseph, Maplewood.  
Gladu, Robert Joseph, St. Louis.  
Grove, Steven Eugene, Kansas City.  
Gutierrez, Christopher, St. Louis.  
Hicks, Larry David, St. Ann.  
Hodges, William Jesse, Sr., Kansas City.  
Hood, Derald Joe, Polk.  
Kraus, Jean Mason, Gorin.  
Layne, Howard Wilson, Jr., Lamar.  
Long, Thomas Arnold, Brookfield.  
Maune, Francis Edward, Washington.  
McCray, Pleasant, Jr., St. Louis.

McMillin, Gary Don, Osceola.  
Miller, Burke Holbrook, Springfield.  
Moore, Paul Vincent, Independence.  
Morris, Tommy Gene, Lucerne.  
Myers, Tony Howard, Kansas City.  
Neu, William Allen, Overland.  
Petty, Ernest De Forest, St. Louis.  
Reynolds, Edward Lee, Macon.  
Rother, Robert Cawson, Jr., St. Louis.  
Sathoff, Dale Ervin, St. Louis.  
Schmitz, Craig Alan, Kirkwood.  
Shea, Thomas Welch, Ballwin.  
Spiers, Randolph, Maysville.  
Unzicker, Gregory Dean, St. Joseph.  
Wilson, Robert Henerson, Jr., St. Louis.  
Workman, Donald Renay, Kirkwood.

*Marine Corps*

Goszewski, Thomas Walter, Dellwood.  
Hancock, Jerry Edward, Quinlan.  
Hudson, Gary Duane, Joplin.  
James, Robert Lee, Clinton.  
Mitchell, Daniel Lee, Ballwin.  
Paule, Phillip Arthur, St. Louis.  
Perry, Jack Armond, St. Louis.  
Pope, Charles Alfred, Jr., Independence.  
Waterfield, Richard F., Kansas City.

MONTANA

*Army*

Hensley, Mark Alan, Great Falls.  
McDougall, Hima Duncan, Jr., Thompson Falls.  
Mehls, Leland McGee, Flaxville.  
Naasz, Emil John, Wolf Point.  
Nichols, Phillip Arthur, Kalispell.  
Stube, Richard Furrell, Helena.  
Utter, Keith Edward, Eureka.  
Ziebarth, Dennis Leroy, Missoula.

*Air Force*

Melnick, Steven Bernard, Billings.

NEBRASKA

*Army*

Anderson, Warren Charles, Omaha.  
Barnhill, Robert Eugene, North Platte.  
Kaminski, Raymond Donald, Loup City.  
Larson, David Wayne, Funk.  
Moreno, Dennis Ralph, Hay Springs.  
Walker, Michael Allen, Scottsbluff.

*Marine Corps*

Samuelson, Ronald Earl, Wymore.

NEVADA

*Army*

Muncey, Jay Allan, Battle Mountain.

NEW JERSEY

*Army*

Asmuth, Robert Labudde, Jr., Montclair.  
Diani, Franco, Passaic.  
Formica, Gary Peter, Bloomfield.  
Graham, Barry Francis, Jersey City.  
Grau, Antonio Ambrosio, Lodi.  
Grisard, John Robert, Long Branch.  
Hutton, Walter Wesley, Newark.  
Jacobson, Jon Christopher, Bayonne.  
Koch, Kenneth John, Jersey City.  
Lively, Warren II, Trenton.  
Luttgens, James, Keyport.  
Mickens, Carl Lawrence, Belleville.  
Nudenberg, David Alan, Caldwell.  
Rogers, Thomas Samuel, Penns Grove.  
Schless, Thomas Charles, Edgewater.  
Schoenberg, Richard C., Palmyra.  
Spruill, Ovell, Jersey City.

*Marine Corps*

Elliott, Robert William, Woodbury.  
Humphrey, Kevin Richard, Park Ridge.  
Ortiz, Robert Wilson, Paterson.

NEW MEXICO

*Army*

Chavez, Glen Alex, Glencoe.  
Hern, William Burch, Albuquerque.  
Robertson, Kenneth Lee, Albuquerque.  
Smith, Jol Nebane, Santa Fe.

*Air Force*

Milbrath, Robert Keith, Okabena.

*Marine Corps*

Charlie, Peter, Farmington.  
Kozal, Kenneth Bruce K., Albuquerque.  
Montoya, Joe Herman, Santa Fe.

## NEW YORK

*Army*

Aiken, William Leslie, Whitehall.  
Allen, Leonard Peter, Fort Ann.  
Alsever, Michael Hadwin, Pennellville.  
Armato, Salvatore, Joseph, West Babylon.  
Asep, Michael, New York.  
Auletta, Peter Paul, New York.  
Bailey, Rae Arvid, Clemons.  
Baiz, Lee Thomas, Elmira.  
Barrett, Stanley Howard, Waterford.  
Bedient, Ross Edward, Valois.  
Beebe, Richard William, Liverpool.  
Bohnwagner, Peter Paul, Slate Hill.  
Bojanek, Robert Arthur, Kenmore.  
Bozler, Willie, Jr., New York.  
Brown, Robert Joseph, Jr., Buffalo.  
Bunk, Francis Xavier, East Islip.  
Caines, Frederick Alfred, New York.  
Cannan, Dennis Charles, Rochester.  
Coffino, Thomas Paul, New York.  
Crowley, John Edward, Williamson.  
De Angelis, Dominic John, New York.  
Di Finizio, Louis Carl, New York.  
Dorsey, William Timothy, Peekskill.  
Dragone, James Vincent, Middletown.  
Fako, John Stephen, New York.  
Fratellenico, Frank Rocco, Chatham.  
Glenn, Edward Francis, Jr., Levittown.  
Gross, Mark Irwin, New York.  
Harrison, Charles E., Jr., Kill Buck.  
Hatcher, David Lee, New York.  
Huey, Donald Raymond, Farmingdale.  
Kingston, George Henry, Jr., Waterloo.  
Livingston, John Dewey, Red Creek.  
Lynch, Bernard, New York.  
Macedonio, Carmine Angelo, Williston Park.

Marcantonio, Joseph Frank, New York.  
Martinez, Anthony Vincent, Medford Station.  
Meehan, James Michael, Flushing.  
Muniz-Garcia, Luis Ernesto, New York.  
Olgyay, Roy Christopher, New York.  
Ottman, Todd Whitney, Victor.  
Oyola, Hector David, New York.  
Pardo, Thomas Anthony, Flushing.  
Petraschune, Michael James, Lyon Mountain.

Pippins, Gus, New York.  
Quinn, Richard Floyd, Woodstock.  
Salazar, Ernesto Victor, New York.  
Shine, Jonathan Cameron, Pleasantville.  
Silvernail, Douglas Harold, Bloomfield.  
Smith, Michael, Richmond Hill.  
Sorci, Mark Timothy, Niagara Falls.  
Tamburri, John Richard Jr., New York.  
Van Gelder, William H., Jr., Waterloo.  
Vetrano, Gerald Michael, Elmont.  
Wicks, William Arthur, North Bellmore.  
Woodhouse, Robert F., Jr., Ellenville.

*Air Force*

Justice, William Paul, Niagra Falls.

*Marine Corps*

Bajin, Enver, College Point.  
Boyd, Stephen Leslie, Rochester.  
Cruz, Luis Antonio, New York.  
Donnell, Robert A., II, Clymer.  
Fisher, Arthur, North Tonawanda.  
Gillies, James Francis, Bardonia.  
Hines, John Charles, Cohoes.  
Miller, Jeffery Allen, Akron.  
Montano, William Andrew, Deer Park.  
Montero, Ignacio, New York.  
Murphy, William, New York.  
Oliver, Kenneth Earliston, Rensselaer.  
Puderbaugh, Charles Kay, Dryden.  
Smith, Gregg Allison, Great Valley.  
Stolz, James Edward, Jr., Hicksville.  
Valle, Guillermo, New York.  
Vega, Francisco, New York.

*Navy*

Beck, Edgar Peter, Jr., Gowanda.  
Hyler, Nelson Michael, Scarsdale.

Koberlein, Charles Ernest, Swan Lake.  
McNulty, William Francis, Green Island.  
Neubauer, John Frank, Mount Vernon.  
Raymond, Carl Roger, Elmira.  
Rochez, Esteban Valeriano, New York.

*Army*

Alexander, Woodrow, New York.  
Andrews, Walter Eugene, Jr., Garnerville.  
Bailey, Dennis Michael, New York.  
Barbaria, Louis Joseph, New York.  
Bauer, Robert Ernest, Pearl River.  
Bennett, John Jay, Beacon.

## NORTH CAROLINA

*Army*

Adams, Merritt, Fayetteville.  
Arbeit, Martin Irving, Fayetteville.  
Austin, William Eugene, Lenoir.  
Auten, Donald Eugene, Cramerton.  
Black, Perry Gray, Winston-Salem.  
Boone, William Edward, Durham.  
Bradley, Thomas Euben, Tarboro.  
Brown, Joseph Martin Leroy, Fayetteville.  
Campbell, Wilson, Laurinburg.  
Carroll, Max Edward, Gastonia.  
Carroll, Samuel T., Jr., Drexel.  
Clayton, Curvin, Durham.  
Daves, Dennis Lee, Lincolnton.  
Davis, Sherman Ponderexter, Fayetteville.  
Dennis, Jerry Allen, Erwin.  
Dew, Robert Earl, Raeford.  
Elkins, Bruce Clinton, Swannanoa.  
Ford, Jerry Stevenson, Jonesville.  
Fore, James Larry, Sanford.  
Fox, Lorenzo, Battleboro.  
Gaddie, David, Jr., Hope Mills.  
Graham, Michael Allan, Kings Mountain.  
Gray, Charles Howard, Jr., Fayetteville.  
Grimm, Michael Joseph, Carthage.  
Halley, Mark Steven, High Point.  
Harrison, Robert Allen, Asheville.  
Heaggans, Thurston Conrad, Troutman.  
Hodges, Bernard, Parkton.  
Holder, James Edward, Fayetteville.  
Hollifield, Harold Dean, Marion.  
Howell, Ralph, Eureka.  
Hyatt, Jack Edward, Sylva.  
Johnson, Albert Lee, Angier.  
Jones, Wilbert Earl, Mt. Olive.  
Manring, Curtis Johnson, Pinnacle.  
McDaniel, Cary Elzlevan, McLeansville.  
Moody, John Ernest, Jr., Norlina.  
Ogib, Johnny Wayne, Burnsville.  
Owens, Carl Eugene, Lincolnton.  
Parris, Bobby James, Sylva.  
Proffitt, John Bernard, Todd.  
Raymond, Fredrick Carol, Jr., Beaufort.  
Ritchie, Glenn Carland, Jr., Mount Pleasant.

Slaughter, Kenneth Wesley, Murfreesboro.  
Sturm, Herman Victor, Jr., Monroe.  
Taylor, James Erwin, Laurinburg.  
Taylor, Rodney Eugene, McGrady.  
Taylor, Wendell, Enfield.  
Walker, Gary Wayne, Winston-Salem.  
Winborne, John Hutchings, Edenton.

*Air Force*

Morgan, Otis Cleveland, Candler.  
Wellons, Phillip Rogerson, Raleigh.

## NORTH DAKOTA

*Army*

Jacobson, Larry Bruce, Norma.  
Sveen, Brent William, Fargo.

## OHIO

*Army*

Amhelsler, David James, Lodi.  
Asher, Frank Louis, Hamilton.  
Brown, Richard Allen, Rayland.  
Bryan, David Andrew, North Canton.  
Callan, Robert Thomas, Youngstown.  
Climer, David Leroy, Columbus.  
Conrad, John William, Fremont.  
Dadisman, Gordon Alan, Dayton.  
Dasen, Gerald Randal, III, Toledo.  
Denig, Joseph Henry, Mansfield.  
Devers, David Ronald, Sr., Paulding.  
Du Pont, James Camil, Westerville.  
Dunn, Carl Edward, Chillicothe.

Flynn, Raymond Joseph, Jr., Toledo.  
Foster, Alfonza, East Liverpool.  
Frilling, Jerome Raymond, Sidney.  
Hannah, Byron Mark, Cygnet.  
Hively, Daniel Richard, Danville.  
Jasso, John, Rudolph.  
Keister, John Loy, New Lexington.  
Kelley, George Robert, Bellaire.  
Koly, Robert James, Parma.  
Lloyd, Randall Lynn, Sterling.  
Marshall, Dennis Craig, Wooster.  
McFarland, Richard Wesley, Lucas.  
Mikolajczyk, Dennis Lee, Toledo.  
Miller, Frank Harold, Jr., Athens.  
Noel, Michael David, Lucasville.  
Paley, Norman Fred, Mentor.  
Peterson, Michael Harrel, Toledo.  
Poland, Ronald Lee, Canton.  
Radcliff, Robert Paul, Jr., Akron.  
Reed, William Clemon, Hamilton.  
Rice, Finley Austin, Athens.  
Rice, Robert Thomas, Jr., Springfield.  
Russell, John Joseph, Ironton.  
Schaff, Ronald Joseph, Kettering.  
Shaw, Jeffrey Michael, Lima.  
Swiger, Bernard Leroy, Madison.  
Thompson, Douglas, Cleveland.  
Thompson, Timothy Joseph, Norwalk.  
Walker, William Gregory, II, Euclid.  
Ward, Paul, Rarden.  
Wilhelm, William Lester, Covington.  
Winter, Gary Glen, Grand Rapids.  
Wirks, Robert Blane, East Palestine.  
Zoller, Robert William, II, Mantua.

*Air Force*

Justice, William Allen, Columbus.  
Pearl, Richard Max, Lorain.  
Powell, John Parker, Dayton.

*Marine Corps*

Arnett, Ray, Jr., Dayton.  
Chandler, Ronald Eugene, Cincinnati.  
Courtney, Michael Joseph, Youngstown.  
Jenkins, Donald Ray, Cleveland.  
Jenks, Gary Lee, Xenia.  
Mattingly, John Eugene, Dresden.  
Predovic, William Mark, Cleveland.  
Rowley, Theodore Texas, Chillicothe.  
Savio, Richard Hugh, Fostoria.  
Trotta, Francisco Jeffrey, Cincinnati.  
Ward, Craig Nelson, Dayton.

*Navy*

Kempel, Michael Richard, Cuyahoga Falls.  
Nutter, Frederick Leroy, Zanesville.  
Ratliff, Johnny, Washington Court House.  
Rushton, Wayne Sterling, Eastlake.

## OKLAHOMA

*Army*

Armstrong, Sherman Felton, Poteau.  
Bogle, Dennis Dean, Oklahoma City.  
Bookout, Charles Franklin, Oklahoma City.  
Bradley, Alfred Lee, Stilwell.  
Callison, Jimmy Ray, Nowata.  
Cruse, Stanley Joe, Clayton.  
Dodd, Richard Eugene, Wister.  
Domine, Manuel De Leon, Ft. Sill.  
Hartness, Roger Dale, Hulbert.  
Hodges, Raymond Leon, Jr., Lawton.  
Hutton, Charles Phillip, Tulsa.  
Kalsu, James Robert, Oklahoma City.  
Kusch, William Howard, Fairview.  
Love, Don Wayne, Konawa.  
McDonald, Albert, Jr., Tulsa.  
Niman, Robert O'Neal, Tulsa.  
Reese, Chester Roy, Jr., Sand Springs.  
Starrett, John Delbert, Bartlesville.  
Tefft, George Edward, Oklahoma City.  
Wellman, Cecil Albert, Purcell.  
Wells, Eroy Frederick, Ponca City.  
Williams, Bobby Ray, Lawton.  
York, Daniel Webster, Tulsa.

*Marine Corps*

Evans, Danny Leo, Atoka.  
Porter, Robert Lee, Enid.  
Prince, Eugene, Jr., Grant.  
Teffs, James Richard, Tulsa.

*Navy*

Asher, Harold E., Tulsa.  
Morrison, Randy Stanton, Oklahoma City.

OREGON

Army

Anderson, Dale Arthur, Portland.  
 Carper, John William, Jr., Sweet Home.  
 Davis, Kelly Ray, Arock.  
 Fleger, Harold Norman, Tigard.  
 Friend, Gary Ralph, Harper.  
 Gatliff, Larry Allen, Lebanon.  
 Johnson, Clifford Thomas, Portland.  
 Johnston, Edward Charles, Hines.  
 Milberger, Russell Dale, Portland.  
 Murphy, John William, Pendleton.  
 Ownbey, Timothy Robert, Springfield.  
 Popp, David Fred, Milwaukie.  
 Rogers, Dean Francis, Portland.  
 Smith, Gary Wayne, Toledo.  
 Taylor, Robert Wayne, Klamath Falls.  
 Whitmore, William Lee, Sherwood.  
 Whitton, Edward James, Gaston.  
 Williams, Robert A., Jr., Rockaway.  
 Winter, Gary James, Portland.

Marine Corps

Manela, Randall Paul, Eugene.

PENNSYLVANIA

Army

Belarski, Ronald Dale, Charleroi.  
 Blickenstaff, Joseph W., Jr., Littlestown.  
 Bowdren, James Ignatius, Jr., Philadelphia.  
 Cassin, Frank Andrew, Jr., Newell.  
 Corl, Franklin Matthew, Jr., Lebanon.  
 Di Bartolomeo, Ronald J., Volant.  
 English, Glenn Harry, Jr., Cornwells Heights.  
 Farnsworth, John Joseph, Jr., Frackville.  
 Findlay, William Thomas, Philadelphia.  
 Finn, Albert Maurice, Lansdale.  
 Fritsch, Andrew Joseph III, Rochester.  
 Geiger, Lawrence, Irwin.  
 Gilpin, Terry Lee, Marianna.  
 Glatfelter, Larry Eugene, Glen Rock.  
 Hamilton, Walter Wade, Eighty Four.  
 Hiteshue, Frank Richard, Penn.  
 Horner, Larry Mark, Walnutport.  
 Hughes, Frederick Joseph, Pittsburgh.  
 Hupp, James Earl, Darlington.  
 Johnson, Asa Thomas, Covington.  
 Johnson, George Russell, Amity.  
 Kelso, James Michael, Clifton Heights.  
 Kiscaden, Michael Edward, Lancaster.  
 Kubelus, Anthony George, Jr., Scranton.  
 Lishchynsky, George, Philadelphia.  
 Maratta, Craig, Allegheny.  
 Marlatt, Roy Wayne, Pittsburgh.  
 Martin, Lawrence Samuel, Philadelphia.  
 McCann, Jack William, Pittsburgh.  
 Meadows, Lee David, Johnstown.  
 Napier, Robert Wayne, Pittsburgh.  
 Parada, Edward John, Arcadia.  
 Piersol, John Laurence, Jr., Downingtown.  
 Quinn, James Anthony, King of Prussia.  
 Reed, Albert Marshall, Philadelphia.  
 Schelb, Lawrence Elwood, Jr., Tower City.  
 Scholl, Clifford Paul, Jr., Macungie.  
 Schultz, Thomas Russell, Pittsburgh.  
 Shipe, Thomas Allebach, Venetia.  
 Shultz, Dale Edward, Freeport.  
 Spence, John Andrew, III, Modena.  
 Thomas, Henry Benny, Philadelphia.  
 Upright, Brian Dale, Starrucca.  
 Walko, Daniel Steven, Wilkes-Barre.  
 Walsh, Wayne Emerick, Jr., Fairbank.  
 Walter, Clyde Elmer, Jr., Claysburg.  
 Watson, Tyrone Calvin, Philadelphia.  
 Weidle, Robert James, Cornwells Heights.  
 Weigner, David Ralph, North Wales.  
 Wells, Roger Orrie, Pleasantville.  
 Wiegand, Dean Michael, Philadelphia.  
 Zerggen, Francis Albert, Philadelphia.

Marine Corps

Craige, Amos Mark, Selingsgrove.  
 Delozier, David Vincent, Altoona.  
 Hanlon, Martin Joseph, Gallitzin.  
 Klaiber, Francis Earl, Kane.  
 Miller, James Edward, Lancaster.  
 Morrow, Edward Cy, Bangor.  
 Smith, David Leland, Clairton.  
 Smith, Frederick Joseph, Pittsburgh.  
 Stockman, John Frank, Marcus Hook.  
 Thomas, John Henry, Jr., Pittsburgh.

Navy

Bullock, Dennis John, Montoursville.

RHODE ISLAND

Army

Lancaster, Robert West, Lincoln.  
 MacNaught, Robert William, Warwick.  
 O'Neill, John Joseph, Jr., Providence.  
 Webster, Dennis Wade, Narragansett.

Marine Corps

Argenti, Robert Lee, Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Army

Baker, Clarence Eugene, Lancaster.  
 Blackwell, Robert Lawrence, Gaffney.  
 Brooks, David Lee, Greenwood.  
 Burdette, Hilburn M. Jr., Simpsonville.  
 Fields, Ronald Elwood, Anderson.  
 King, Robert Louis, Anderson.  
 McGee, Joseph O'Neil, Clinton.  
 Miles, Galen Spinks, Dillon.  
 Miller, Paul, Roebuck.  
 Norris, Grady Lee, Walhalla.  
 Shaw, William Frederick Jr., Columbia.  
 Smith, Richard Lee, West Columbia.  
 Still, Jerry Melton, Bamberg.

Marine Corps

Herring, Alfred Jimmy, Jr., Mullins.

Navy

Tapscott, Kenneth Walker, Charleston.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Army

Hallstrom, Charles Maury, Webster.

Air Force

Callies, Tommy Leon, Howard.

Marine Corps

Flying Horse, Conrad Lee, McIntosh.

TENNESSEE

Army

Bills, Kenneth Dale, Greenfield.  
 Brady, David Harvey, Leoma.  
 Bramwell, Raymond Sanders, Nashville.  
 Coddington, James Patrick, Dyersburg.  
 Dickson, Kenneth Odell, Ethridge.  
 Ferguson, Richard Lee, Nashville.  
 Guinn, Joseph Wade, Bradford.  
 Knight, James William, Rockwood.  
 Markland, James Harry, Elizabethton.  
 Morgan, Michael Lynn, Hollow Rock.  
 Palk, Bobby Lee, Bloomington Spring.  
 Strong, James Larry, Celina.  
 Sullivan, Lawrence Michael, Memphis.  
 Weaver, Garry Lynn, Lake City.  
 Young, Thomas Dudley, McMinnville.  
 Yount, William Henry, Jr., Millington.

Marine Corps

Leftwich, William Groom, Jr., German-  
 town.

Rippetoe, Rae Kelland, Greeneville.  
 West John Edward, Jr., Johnson City.

Navy

Edmonds, Jerry Baxter, Jr., Crossville.  
 Ingle, Nathan Lamar, Chattanooga.  
 McGarry, Thomas Stewart, Springville.

TEXAS

Army

Avila, Juan, Jr., Brackettville.  
 Baker, Robert Benton, Jr., Pasadena.  
 Barnes, Stephen Westley, Duncanville.  
 Barrett, John Daniel, Wichita Falls.  
 Becker, James Christof, Palestine.  
 Bell, Harrison, Bon Weir.  
 Black, Victor Lee, De Kalb.  
 Bothwell, William David, Tyler.  
 Bowens, Tommy, Houston.  
 Broach, Earl David, Dallas.  
 Burgess, John Harlie, Jr., San Antonio.  
 Cain, James Calvin, Hampshire.  
 Christie, Zane, Eureka.  
 Connel, David Arnold, Wichita Falls.  
 Dacus, Freddie Louis, Beaumont.  
 De Foor, Victor Lee, Abilene.

Dotson, William Thomas, III, Dallas.  
 Dunaway, Robert Leon, Jr., Ft. Worth.  
 Elder, Howard Lee, Texarkana.  
 Epps, Titus Lee, Paris.  
 Fabacher, Sazin Dale, Copperas Cove.  
 Flores, Florentino, Welch.  
 Flores, Roberto C., Brownsville.  
 Fracione, Frederick R., Alvin.  
 Guerrero, Andrew Castro, Midland.  
 Harper, Robert Edward, Houston.  
 Harris, Ned Henry, Houston.  
 Hays, Robert Bradford, Weslaco.  
 Hayton, Brent Allan, San Antonio.  
 Herd, Ronald Ward, Dallas.  
 Isaacs, Milo Clinton, Temple.  
 Jesko, Stephen Edward, Hereford.  
 Johnson, Ben Odell, Brenham.  
 Kestler, Jesse Lynn, Dallas.  
 Knetsar, George Arthur, Ft. Worth.  
 Laurence, William H., Jr., San Antonio.  
 Luna, Julian, Forreton.  
 Lynch, Samuel Roy, Nacogdoches.  
 Martin, Donnie Richard, Lubbock.  
 Montoya, David, Crystal City.  
 Moreno, Angel Jose, Roma.  
 Moreno, Jesus, Jr., Corpus Christi.  
 Nelson, Franklin King, Arlington.  
 Oldham, Robert Lee, Caldwell.  
 Orsini, John Joseph, Jr., Dénver City.  
 Pannell, Phillip Randall, Plainview.  
 Patino, Roberto Lerra, Corpus Christi.  
 Percy, Donald Lee, Devers.  
 Perez, Jose Manuel, Brownsville.  
 Phillips, Roger Lee, La Porte.  
 Reyna, Joe, Jr., Cherokee.  
 Richardson, Robert Wayne, Alta Loma.  
 Rios, Fidencio Garza, Jr., San Antonio.  
 Roberts, Thurston Craig, Baytown.  
 Robertson, Tommy Wayne, Big Sandy.  
 Rodriguez, Margarito, Jr., Dallas.  
 Rodriguez, Sammy Pina, San Antonio.  
 Rosen, Patrick Dean, Austin.  
 Salazar, Alfred, Victoria.  
 Schultz, David Paul, Harlingen.  
 Sells, Terry Stephen, Fort Worth.  
 Sides, Harold Edwin, Dallas.  
 Sims, Kirk Wayne, Corpus Christi.  
 Smith, Donald Richard, Universal City.  
 Smith, Rayburn Lester, III, Shamrock.  
 Spencer, Robert Dale, Texas City.  
 Suniga, Ruben Bosquez, San Antonio.  
 Tomas, David Ray, Gonzales.  
 Tristan, Albert Flores, Dallas.  
 Tuttle, Nelson Payne, Abilene.  
 Valle, Eloy Ruben, Rio Grande City.

Air Force

Vaughan, Carver Joe, San Antonio.  
 Williamson, Benton Claude, Fort Worth.  
 Zamudio, Benigno, Jr., Houston.

Marine Corps

Aston, Blake Edward, Dallas.  
 Hendry, David Eugene, Lake Dallas.  
 Jones, Gary William, Houston.  
 Maseda, Robert, Port Lavaca.  
 Rodgers, Johnny Michael, Fort Worth.  
 Rogers, Orville Curtis, Jr., Dallas.  
 Sanchez, Michael, Dallas.  
 Torres, Joe D., San Antonio.  
 Vaden, William Kenneth, Jr., Hurst.  
 Villasana, Fernando, El Paso.

Navy

Ramos, Jose Parlo, McAllen.  
 Williams, Lawrence C., Jr., Port Arthur.  
 Worth, Robert Earl, Big Lake.

UTAH

Army

Hardman, Dean William, Murray.  
 Petersen, Harry Thomas, Salt Lake City.  
 Rhead, Jim Marble, Ogden.  
 Sorensen, Kenneth Jay, Lehi.  
 Stitt, Gregory Carlisle, Salt Lake City.  
 Wilks, Gregory Alan, Ogden.

VERMONT

Army

Carr, Stephen Douglas, Barre.

## VIRGINIA

## Army

Bass, John Cabney, Lynchburg.  
 Bly, Percy Eugene, Jr., Norfolk.  
 Brown, Eugene Onfil, Richmond.  
 Cox, Henry Thomas, Christiansburg.  
 Crouse, Edgar Franklin, Jr., Glen Allen.  
 Dickey, James Wheeler, Alexandria.  
 Edenton, Hiram Eurias, Jr., Spotsylvania.  
 Ellinger, Victor Lee, Staunton.  
 Felton, Garland Paris, Norfolk.  
 Ginn, James Michael, Arlington.  
 Jones, Wilbert Jasper, Jr., Keysville.  
 Journell, Robert Mason, III, Salem.  
 Knisley, Randall C., Roanoke.  
 Lancaster, Herman, Jr., Newport News.  
 McCauley, Wayland F., Jr., Manassas.  
 McElhannon, Kevin C., Jr., Alexandria.  
 Mealer, Ferrell Eugene, Jr., Virginia Beach.  
 Messer, Thomas Hubert, Springfield.  
 Myers, John Samuels, Moneta.  
 Neal, Harvey Ray, South Boston.  
 Newman, Stanley Victor, Oak Grove.  
 Palm, Terry Alan, Williamsburg.  
 Powers, Monroe Alan, Newport News.  
 Ramsey, Calvin Wetzel, Bassett.  
 Rohlinger, Joseph Earl, Fairfax.  
 Rucker, John William, Roanoke.  
 Spence, Joseph C., Jr., Franklin.  
 St. Clair, Elisha Reeves, Newport News.  
 Vaughan, Council Delano, Chesapeake.

## Air Force

Burd, Douglas Glenn, Hampton.

## Marine Corps

Akers, E. G., Jr., Galex.  
 Cardwell, Ernest Daniel, Concord.  
 Harvey, Cleveland Ray, Alexandria.  
 Ross, Walter, Jr., Brems Bluff.  
 Steward, Jerry Waime, Springfield.  
 Wilborn, Charley Andrew, Richmond.

## WASHINGTON

## Army

Campbell, Donald Duane, Tacoma.  
 Cokley, Gary Wayne, Pasco.  
 Cordner, Duane Gordon, Tumwater.  
 Crosier, Steven Sebastian, Toppenish.  
 Engebretson, Larry Douglas, Snohomish.  
 Frank, Harold Leroy, Seattle.  
 Heindselman, Michael James, Olympia.  
 Lenz, Lee Newlun, Kennewick.  
 Linnell, Dennis Richard, Mount Vernon.  
 Malatesta, Larry Joe, Enumclaw.  
 Matter, Mark Allen, Puyallup.  
 Morton, Charles Tienerey, Seattle.  
 Noble, Dennis Ray, Spokane.  
 Pomerinke, Richard Allen, Toppenish.  
 Quinn, James Joseph, III, Bellingham.  
 Reese, David Phillip, Tacoma.  
 Rouska, Dennis Leon, Cosmopolis.  
 Schmidt, James Crew, Mount Vernon.  
 Scoby, Richard William, Hoquiam.  
 Secor, William Cale, Kelso.  
 Swinson, Lonnie Melroe, Yelm.  
 Weber, Wiltse Lee, Tacoma.  
 Widmer, Kim William, Spokane.  
 Worthington, Richard C., Jr., Bothell.  
 Zornes, Vernon Glen, Chelan.

## Air Force

Eddy, Garrett Edward, Seattle.

## Marine Corps

Baker, David Wallace, Ridgefield.

## Navy

Gerth, Peter Hudson, Yakima.

## WEST VIRGINIA

## Army

Cole, Roger Dale, Martinsburg.  
 Ellis, Randall Lee, Justice.  
 Fisher, Carroll Dean, Dunbar.  
 Gumm, Robert Hugh, Jr., Cowen.  
 Halstead, Benny Ray, Glen Morgan.  
 Hatcher, James Lewis, Sundial.  
 Hoffman, Charles David, Nitro.  
 Miller, James Calvin, Martinsburg.  
 Moles, Lewis Dayton, Elkview.  
 O'Brien, Dwight Preston, Ronceverte.  
 Pierce, Andrew Starrett, Jr., Alderson.  
 Salerno, Paul Louis, Weirton.

## Air Force

Adkins, Kenneth Dale, Huntington.

## Marine Corps

Burdette, Clifford Gerald, Hurricane.  
 Conner, David Leland, Wheeling.  
 Doty, James Marshall, Parkersburg.

## WISCONSIN

## Army

Anderson, William, Jr., Milwaukee.  
 Bahrke, Russell Leroy, Jr., Suring.  
 Benicek, James Milton, Racine.  
 Damm, Thomas William, Fond Du Lac.  
 De Long, Jerald Steven, De Soto.  
 Drapp, Robert George, Milwaukee.  
 Grebby, Robert William, Walworth.  
 Kreckel, John William, Milwaukee.  
 Kurz, Sidney Allen, Milwaukee.  
 Linton, Lee Roy Edward, Reeseville.  
 Maddux, David Thornton, Racine.  
 Martinez, William Joseph, Milwaukee.  
 Mc Master, Robert Paul, Green Bay.  
 Muellenbach, Robert Joseph, Malone.  
 Mulder, Russell Wesley, Adell.  
 Paulich, Patrick James, Racine.  
 Payne, Terry John, La Crosse.  
 Reed, Jon Edward, Somerset.  
 Richardson, Edmond William, Potosi.  
 Ritschard, Roger Lee, Monticello.  
 Roberts, Thomas John, Burlington.  
 Roe, John Marshall, Milwaukee.  
 Rouse, Jerome Michael, Coleman.  
 Schmidt, Peter Alden, Milwaukee.  
 Sengstock, Gary David, Marinette.  
 Severson, Donald Jon, Superior.  
 Stecker, Dennis Eugene, Manitowoc.  
 Strachota, John Gregory, Milwaukee.  
 Thelen, Le Roy Edmund, Glenbeulah.  
 Vanderweg, Peter Michael, Oak Creek.  
 Warden, Richard John, Sheboygan.

## Air Force

McLeish, Charles Edward, Monona.

## WYOMING

## Army

Chipp, Donald Warren, Jr., Rock Springs.  
 Crichton, Robert Gary, Burlington.  
 Scott, Roger Lee, Powell.

## GUAM

## Army

Diaz, Edward Reyes, Piti.  
 Moreham, Vincent Pinaula, Sinajana.

## PUERTO RICO

## Army

Gavilan-Torres, Wilfredo, Ponce.  
 Hernandez-Carras, Quillo J., Juncos.  
 Hernandez-Rodriguez R., Isabela.  
 Lozada-Wichy, Anibal P., Bayamon.  
 Martinez-Zayas, Ruben, Salinas.  
 Rivera-Montes, Edictor, Manati.  
 Rodriguez, Guillermo, Cayey.

## Marine Corps

Torres-Oyola, Orlando.

## TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. In 1969 there were 1,278 new books on religion, 1,999 new books on science, and 3,216 new books published for the first time on economics and sociology.

## FUNDS FOR THE DIXIE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Utah (Mr. McKAY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, of great importance to the development of the southwestern part of the State of Utah is the long-awaited Dixie project. The Dixie has been shown to be economically sound and has been authorized by Congress and is now awaiting funding from the U.S. Government. At this time, I would like to offer my support for, and have inserted in the pages of the RECORD, a joint resolution of the 39th Legislature of the State of Utah calling for an acceleration of funding for the Dixie project:

## HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

A joint resolution of the 39th Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress of the United States to accelerate the funding of the Dixie Project

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Whereas, the Dixie Project is important to the future economic growth of the area's irrigation, flood control, recreation, employment, municipal and industrial water, and highway improvement;

Whereas, the additional water developed under the Dixie Project would make water available for local resources and for industry which may be interested in coming into this area;

Whereas, the Dixie Project is economically sound and has been authorized by Congress;

Whereas, the Dixie Project has been planned and is now awaiting funding from the United States Government.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the 39th Legislature of the State of Utah calls upon the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress of the United States to take positive steps toward furthering and assisting the development of this potentially rich economically depressed area and toward accelerating the funding of the Dixie Project.

Be it further resolved, that the 39th Legislature of the State of Utah calls upon the Congressional delegation from the State of Utah to work avidly for the implementation of this resolution.

Be it further resolved, that the secretary of state is authorized and directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the United States Congress.

## STATEMENT BY MRS. ABZUG ON THE OCCASION OF THE ADOPTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 317

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the adoption of House Resolution 317 creating the Select Committee on the House Restaurant, I would like to take the opportunity to make some comments regarding the conditions under which employees in the House restaurant labor and the original mandate of this committee.

Let me first say that it is with some satisfaction that I note the change in jurisdiction which occurs in this measure. The previous tripartite arrangement whereby restaurant management was divided between the Capitol Architect,

managerial personnel in the restaurant, and the select committee, was certainly an arrangement which rendered reform confusing and difficult, if not impossible. However, now that the restaurant is under the jurisdiction of the committee only, I would hope that the committee will proceed to carry out its mandate. It is critically important that one of the first efforts of the committee is a concerted effort to ameliorate the disgraceful conditions under which the employees are forced to work.

Accordingly, I would urge the committee to hold public hearings on the grievances of the employees of the House restaurant pertaining to hiring and dismissal procedures, working conditions, wages, and other matters affecting the restaurant employees. It is important that the committee invite all those interested parties who may wish to present relevant testimony including a number of employees of the restaurant.

Further, I would hope that the committee will evaluate the testimony, present its report to the House and make such recommendations as it deems advisable.

At this point I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter which was sent by a former employee of the restaurant to various Members of Congress a few years ago. A few days after writing this letter, Miss Mahatha, a black woman, had her hourly wage reduced from \$1.92 to \$1.71 per hour. Last year Miss Mahatha died of a heart attack.

The letter follows:

LONGWORTH RESTAURANT,  
U.S. House of Representatives.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: I was working in the House Restaurant of the Capitol for all most four years. I was working as a salad girl, but they never gave me the title as a salad girl. They had my position stating that I was a counter girl. I was a grade 3, step 3, now I am a grade 2, step 2. All because of a misunderstanding with Jean Palmer on December 22, 1967, in which she was half drunk and plus she still had a half of bottle of whiskey left. This is what happened:

I threw out a bowl of fruit because the refrigerator had gone out, but still all the other things had to be thrown out and nothing was said to anyone else. Doing this time she (Jean) calls Mr. Cowan and he came down, and at that time she calls me a black lie and started to hit me and I told her that I wished she would and picked up a knife off the board. We went on out and he sent me home for a week and then when I came back the following Monday he sent me back for another week and he has never said anything to Jean Palmer.

Mr. Cowan said that he had talked it over with his boss and that they had decided to send me over to the Rayburn Cafeteria. As of now I am working in the Longworth Cafeteria because they were short of help. Mrs. Well sent me over here. Now I am working as a coffee girl which I don't mind but they have cut my salary.

Since this has happened, I have talked to Mr. Cowan concerning my salary, and he talked very nasty to me saying that whoever sent you over here to go right back and tell them that he wasn't ready to give my grade back. I think that something should be done about this because I am a steady worker and I always come on time and all of this should be on my record. The Negroes have always been treated like this. Furthermore, years ago, Mr. Cowan drew a knife on the chef to protect himself and nothing was done about that.

I am hoping that you can help me with this problem. I am hoping to hear from you soon.

Thank you,

(Miss) EMILY MAHATHA.

Miss Mahatha endured the injustices and degradation of a system which oppressed her because she was black and because she was a woman. Now she is dead and it is too late to give her justice. However, let us do what is right by the living and ask the forgiveness of the dead.

Perhaps this body does not yet understand the implications of the institutional arrangements which it has supported for so long that have oppressed the poor, the underprivileged, the black, and the woman, but at the very least let us pursue justice in our own house and remove the inequities which have afflicted and abridged the rights of the workers in the House restaurant for so long.

Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to report those conditions which have come to my attention.

In 1966 when the District of Columbia wage board was established the restaurant workers were placed under its jurisdiction. When in 1968 District of Columbia workers were placed under a Federal wage board, the restaurant workers were not put under its jurisdiction but instead were placed under a separate wage board established rather arbitrarily by the Office of the Capitol Architect.

Most of the lower paying jobs are held by women and most of the women are black and it is my understanding that the majority of these women make under \$5,000 a year.

Their promotions are arbitrarily decided and seniority is rarely a guarantee of a better position or higher salary.

There are no provisions which provide for their job security and thus they can be fired at any time with little recourse.

When the House is in recess most of the workers go off salary unless he or she has accumulated enough sick or vacation leave to receive salary through the recess. Those who continue to receive salary are few and the rest must join the ranks of the unemployed.

Furthermore, employees are required to take time for both breakfast and lunch and lose pay accordingly.

Finally, there is no adequate grievance procedure to insure the rights of the employed.

Mr. Speaker, many Members have been approached by workers with reports of injustices and it is my sincere hope that the committee will see fit to hold the public hearings I have recommended to permit the airing of these and other grievances and thus take a first step to alleviate this dreadful state of affairs.

#### NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in what has been a remarkable

outpouring of tribute and concern in observance of the National Week of Concern for POW's and MIA's. In doing so, I must confess I have had to overcome some initial skepticism about the value of yet another round of speechmaking and memorializing on a subject about which we in Congress seem so powerless to control and/or influence. Over the years, I have risen on a number of occasions to call attention to the continuing plight of our unsung, and in some cases unknown, heroes of the conflict in Indochina. Many of my colleagues have done the same, and to what avail? Are we closer to a solution? Have we prompted the administration to any concrete action or dramatic move?

More than my skepticism, I must confess I have had to overcome some fears—fears that we might be in danger of crossing a very thin and vague, ill-defined borderline between our statesmen-like action and politics on what is, after all, one of the most emotional issues in this Nation today. I am afraid that we may well end up being accused of simply making noises, idle gestures, playing to the galleries on an issue which is of no small concern to so many patient and long-suffering families across this land.

But I have finally overcome both my skepticism and my fears and have decided to rise today to join my colleagues once again in focusing attention on this problem, because in the end I have concluded that it might just be worth the effort one more time to register the unanimous concern of this House, together with the other House, for our separated brothers. It may just be this outpouring might finally accomplish the impossible and reach the consciences, if not the hearts, of the North Vietnamese and lead them to see the injustice in their course of action—if not the injustice, then the bad public relations of their action. If somehow we could convey to the North Vietnamese that all Americans, whatever their views on the war may be, are united on at least one aspect of this war, then we just might manage to convince them that they would be much better off without the stigma of the POW/MIA policy that they have pursued. If not the North Vietnamese, we just might be successful in registering some impression on the mentors, backers, and providers of the North Vietnamese, the Russians, or the Chinese who, in turn, just might influence their ally to mend its ways.

Closer to home, a unanimous outpouring of concern on this issue might just possibly register an impression on the administration to try one more time, make one more concession, make one last all-out effort to negotiate the release of these men. One of the depressing aspects of corresponding with the administration on this issue is that the replies a Congressman receives are stale retreads of what we have heard all along. They seem to lack even the suggestion of new thinking. They do not indicate that any real search is going on in the minds and hearts of the leaders of the administration to come up with a solution to this problem. New proposals put forth by men of good will in Congress seem to be rejected out of hand. The other side,

which is all too easily blamed, is blamed once again. Perhaps this week of heart-rending concern, this week of national admission that something is wrong when we go about our merry ways while our brothers sit tortured behind bars in a far-off land, deprived of any contact with the outside world. As I sit down once again, I am beset with misgivings. What we really need as a nation is a week of penance and sacrifice to bring home to one and all the cost of this war and the real suffering being borne by such a small number of men for a large nation such as ours. It is an appalling fact that some should be deprived of so much while others enjoy so much. We too often appear to be more a nation at play than a nation at war. If the morale of our troops is low when faced with this picture, think of what must be going on in what is left of the minds of our POW/MIA's. Until this dilemma is resolved this Nation will never really be at peace where it counts the most—at peace with itself.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. MCKAY, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mrs. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.  
Mr. HORTON.  
Mr. WYATT.  
Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.  
Mr. LENT.  
Mr. KING in five instances.  
Mr. SCHMITZ in three instances.  
Mr. STAFFORD.  
Mr. DUNCAN.  
Mr. KUYKENDALL.  
Mr. BOB WILSON.  
Mr. FINDLEY.  
Mr. WYDLER.  
Mr. KEITH.  
Mr. BAKER.  
Mr. ZION in two instances.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in 10 instances.  
Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. CARNEY.  
Mr. ROE in two instances.  
Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. BADILLO.  
Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.  
Mr. MONAGAN.  
Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.  
Mrs. GRASSO in two instances.  
Mr. CLARK.  
Mrs. MINK.  
Mr. CLAY in six instances.  
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.  
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.  
Mr. RARICK in two instances.  
Mr. HAGAN in five instances.  
Mr. FOUNTAIN.  
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.  
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.  
Mr. BOGGS in two instances.  
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.  
Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.  
Mr. HARRINGTON in four instances.  
Mr. HOWARD.  
Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.  
Mr. PATEN in two instances.  
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.  
Mr. RODINO.  
Mr. DELANEY.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 468. Joint resolution making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 29, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the

House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Resident Commissioner of the 92d Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

#### ALABAMA

1. Jack Edwards.
2. William L. Dickinson.
3. George W. Andrews.
4. Bill Nichols.
5. Walter Flowers.
6. John Buchanan.
7. Tom Beville.
8. Robert E. Jones.

#### ALASKA

At Large

Nick Begich.

#### ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Morris K. Udall.
3. Sam Steiger.

#### ARKANSAS

1. Bill Alexander.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. John Paul Hammerschmidt.
4. David Pryor.

#### CALIFORNIA

1. Don H. Clausen.
2. Harold T. Johnson.
3. John E. Moss.
4. Robert L. Leggett.
5. Phillip Burton.
6. William S. Mailliard.
7. Ronald V. Dellums.
8. George P. Miller.
9. Don Edwards.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. Paul N. McCloskey, Jr.
12. Burt L. Talcott.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. Jerome R. Waldie.
15. John J. McFall.
16. B. F. Sisk.
17. Glenn M. Anderson.
18. Robert B. (Bob) Mathias.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Augustus F. Hawkins.
22. James C. Corman.
23. Del Clawson.
24. John H. Rousselot.
25. Charles E. Wiggins.
26. Thomas M. Rees.
27. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr.
28. Alphonzo Bell.
29. George E. Danielson.
30. Edward R. Roybal.
31. Charles H. Wilson.
32. Craig Hosmer.
33. Jerry L. Pettis.
34. Richard T. Hanna.
35. John G. Schmitz.
36. Bob Wilson.
37. Lionel Van Deerlin.
38. Victor V. Veysey.

#### COLORADO

1. James D. (Mike) McKeivitt.
2. Donald G. Brozman.
3. Frank E. Evans.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

#### CONNECTICUT

1. William R. Cotten.
2. Robert H. Steele.
3. Robert N. Chaimo.
4. Stewart B. McKinney.

5. John S. Monagan.
6. Ella T. Grasso.

DELAWARE

*At Large*

Pierre S. (Pete) du Pont.

FLORIDA

1. Robert L. F. Sikes.
2. Don Fuqua.
3. Charles E. Bennett.
4. Bill Chappell, Jr.
5. Louis Frey, Jr.
6. Sam Gibbons.
7. James A. Haley.
8. C. W. Bill Young.
9. Paul G. Rogers.
10. J. Herbert Burke.
11. Claude Pepper.
12. Dante B. Fascell.

GEORGIA

1. G. Elliott Hagan.
2. Dawson Mathis.
3. Jack Brinkley.
4. Ben B. Blackburn.
5. Fletcher Thompson.
6. John J. Flynt, Jr.
7. John W. Davis.
8. W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.

HAWAII

1. Spark M. Matsunaga.
2. Patsy T. Mink.

IDAHO

1. James A. McClure.
2. Orval Hansen.

ILLINOIS

1. Ralph H. Metcalfe.
2. Abner J. Mikva.
3. Morgan F. Murphy.
4. Edward J. Derwinski.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. George W. Collins.
7. Frank Annunzio.
8. Dan Rostenkowski.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Roman C. Pucinski.
12. Robert McClory.
13. Phillip M. Crane.
14. John N. Erlenborn.
15. Charlotte T. Reid.
16. John B. Anderson.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert M. Michel.
19. Tom Railsback.
20. Paul Findley.
21. Kenneth J. Gray.
22. William L. Springer.
23. George E. Shipley.
24. Melvin Price.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Earl F. Landgrebe.
3. John Brademas.
4. J. Edward Roush.
5. Elwood Hillis.
6. William G. Bray.
7. John T. Myers.
8. Roger H. Zion.
9. Lee H. Hamilton.
10. David W. Dennis.
11. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. John C. Culver.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. John Kyl.

5. Neal Smith.
6. Wiley Mayne.
7. William J. Scherle.

KANSAS

1. Keith G. Sebelius.
2. William R. Roy.
3. Larry Winn, Jr.
4. Garner E. Shriver.
5. Joe Skubitz.

KENTUCKY

1. Frank A. Stubblefield.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. Romano L. Mazzoli.
4. M. G. (Gene) Snyder.
5. Tim Lee Carter.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Patrick T. Caffery.
4. Joe D. Waggoner, Jr.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. John R. Rarick.
7. Edwin W. Edwards.
8. Speedy O. Long.

MAINE

1. Peter N. Kyros.
2. William D. Hathaway.

MARYLAND

1. Rogers C. B. Morton.
2. Clarence D. Long.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. Paul S. Sarbanes.
5. Lawrence J. Hogan.
6. Goodloe E. Byron.
7. Parren J. Mitchell.
8. Gilbert Gude.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Robert F. Drinan.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. F. Bradford Morse.
6. Michael Harrington.
7. Torbert H. Macdonald.
8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
9. Louise Day Hicks.
10. Margaret M. Heckler.
11. James A. Burke.
12. Hastings Keith.

MICHIGAN

1. John Conyers, Jr.
2. Marvin L. Esch.
3. Garry Brown.
4. Edward Hutchinson.
5. Gerald R. Ford.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. Donald W. Riegle, Jr.
8. James Harvey.
9. Guy Vander Jagt.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Philip E. Ruppe.
12. James G. O'Hara.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Lucien N. Nedzi.
15. William D. Ford.
16. John D. Dingell.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.
19. Jack H. McDonald.

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie.
2. Ancher Nelsen.
3. Bill Frenzel.
4. Joseph E. Karth.
5. Donald M. Fraser.

6. John M. Zwach.
7. Bob Bergland.
8. John A. Blatnik.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Charles H. Griffin.
4. G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery.
5. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. William (Bill) Clay.
2. James W. Symington.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. Wm. J. Randall.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Durward G. Hall.
8. Richard H. Ichord.
9. William L. Hungate.
10. Bill D. Burlison.

MONTANA

1. Richard G. Shoup.
2. John Melcher.

NEBRASKA

1. Charles Thone.
2. John Y. McCollister.
3. Dave Martin.

NEVADA

*At Large*

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Louis C. Wyman.
2. James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

1. John E. Hunt.
2. Charles W. Sandman, Jr.
3. James J. Howard.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen.
6. Edwin B. Forsythe.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Robert A. Roe.
9. Henry Helstoski.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Joseph G. Minish.
12. Florence P. Dwyer.
13. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
14. Dominick V. Daniels.
15. Edward J. Patten.

NEW MEXICO

1. Manuel Lujan, Jr.
2. Harold Runnels.

NEW YORK

1. Otis G. Pike.
2. James R. Grover, Jr.
3. Lester L. Wolff.
4. John W. Wyder.
5. Norman F. Lent.
6. Seymour Halpern.
7. Joseph P. Addabbo.
8. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
9. James J. Delaney.
10. Emanuel Celler.
11. Frank J. Brasco.
12. Shirley Chisholm.
13. Bertram L. Podell.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. Hugh L. Carey.
16. John M. Murphy.
17. Edward I. Koch.
18. Charles B. Rangel.
19. Bella S. Abzug.
20. William F. Ryan.
21. Herman Badillo.
22. James H. Scheuer.
23. Jonathan B. Bingham.
24. Mario Biaggi.

25. Peter A. Peyser.
26. Ogden R. Reid.
27. John G. Dow.
28. Hamilton Fish, Jr.
29. Samuel S. Stratton.
30. Carleton J. King.
31. Robert C. McEwen.
32. Alexander Pirnie.
33. Howard W. Robison.
34. John H. Terry.
35. James M. Hanley.
36. Frank Horton.
37. Barber B. Conable, Jr.
38. James F. Hastings.
39. Jack F. Kemp.
40. Henry P. Smith III.
41. Thaddeus J. Dulski.

## NORTH CAROLINA

1. Walter B. Jones.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. David N. Henderson.
4. Nick Galifianakis.
5. Wilmer (Vingear Bend) Mizell.
6. Richardson Preyer.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. Earl B. Ruth.
9. Charles Raper Jonas.
10. James T. Broyhill.
11. J. William Stanton.

## NORTH DAKOTA

1. Mark Andrews.
2. Arthur A. Link.

## OHIO

1. William J. Keating.
2. Donald D. Clancy.
3. Charles W. Whalen, Jr.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Delbert L. Latta.
6. William H. Harsha.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Clarence E. Miller.
11. J. William Stanton.
12. Samuel L. Devine.
13. Charles A. Mosher.
14. John F. Seiberling.
15. Chalmers P. Wylie.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. John M. Ashbrook.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Charles J. Carney.
20. James V. Stanton.
21. Louis Stokes.
22. Charles A. Vanik.
23. William E. Minshall.
24. Walter E. Powell.

## OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. John N. Happy Camp.

## OREGON

1. Wendell Wyatt.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. John Dellenback.

## PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Robert N. C. Nix.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Joshua Eilberg.
5. William J. Green.
6. Gus Yatron.
7. Lawrence G. Williams.
8. Edward G. Biester, Jr.

9. John Ware.
10. Joseph M. McDade.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. J. Irving Whalley.
13. R. Lawrence Coughlin.
14. William S. Moorhead.
15. Fred B. Rooney.
16. Edwin D. Eshleman.
17. Herman T. Schneebeli.
18. Robert J. Corbett.
19. George A. Goodling.
20. Joseph M. Gaydos.
21. John H. Dent.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Albert W. Johnson.
24. Joseph P. Vigorito.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

## RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St Germain.
2. Robert O. Tiernan.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

1. [Vacant].
2. Floyd Spence.
3. Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn.
4. James R. Mann.
5. Tom S. Gettys.
6. John L. McMillan.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Frank E. Denholm.
2. James Abourezk.

## TENNESSEE

1. James H. (Jimmy) Quillen.
2. John J. Duncan.
3. LaMar Baker.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. Richard H. Fulton.
6. William R. Anderson.
7. Ray Blanton.
8. Ed Jones.
9. Dan Kuykendall.

## TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. John Dowdy.
3. James M. Collins.
4. Ray Roberts.
5. Earle Cabell.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. Bill Archer.
8. Bob Eckhardt.
9. Jack Brooks.
10. J. J. Pickle.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Graham Purcell.
14. John Young.
15. Eligio de la Garza.
16. Richard C. White.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Robert Price.
19. George Mahon.
20. Henry B. Gonzalez.
21. O. C. Fisher.
22. Bob Casey.
23. Abraham Kazen, Jr.

## UTAH

1. K. Gunn McKay.
2. Sherman P. Lloyd.

## VERMONT

At large

Robert T. Stafford.

## VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing.
2. G. William Whitehurst.
3. David E. Satterfield III.

4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. W. C. (Dan) Daniel.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. J. Kenneth Robinson.
8. William Lloyd Scott.
9. William C. Wampler.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

## WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Lloyd Meeds.
3. Julia Butler Hansen.
4. Mike McCormack.
5. Thomas S. Foley.
6. Floyd V. Hicks.
7. Brock Adams.

## WEST VIRGINIA

1. Robert H. Mollohan.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. John M. Slack.
4. Ken Hechler.
5. James Kee.

## WISCONSIN

1. Les Aspin.
2. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
3. Vernon W. Thomson.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William A. Steiger.
7. David R. Obey.
8. John W. Byrne.
9. Glenn R. Davis.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

## WYOMING

At large

Teno Roncalio.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

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

467. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report on Reserve Forces for fiscal year 1970, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 279; to the Committee on Armed Services.

468. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

469. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

470. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 7, 1969, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Terre Notre Creek Basin, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 8, 1964; to the Committee on Public Works.

471. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 12, 1969, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Chittenango Creek and tributaries, New York, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 24, 1961; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

472. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the evaluation of results and administration of the job opportunities in the business sector (JOBS) program in five cities. Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

473. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that more competition in emergency defense procurement by the Department of Defense is found possible; to the Committee on Government Operations.

474. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Salman M. Hilmy against the United States, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4209. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; (Rept. No. 92-87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5814. A bill to amend section 2735 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the finality of settlement effected under section 2733, 2734, 2734a, 2734b, or 2737; without amendment (Rept. No. 92-68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5981. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases, wheat domestic allotments, and upland cotton base acreage allotments for certain growers of sugarbeets; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6531. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1824. A bill for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1891. A bill for the relief of John W. Watson, a minor; (Rept. No. 92-70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2011. A bill for the relief of Philip C. Riley and Donald F. Lane; (Rept. No. 92-71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2047. A bill for the relief of Marion Owen; (Rept. No. 92-72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas; (Rept. No. 92-73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Cmdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr.; (Rept. 92-74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2400. A bill for the relief of David Z. Glassman; (Rept. No. 92-75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2816. A bill for the relief of Rose Minutillo; (Rept. No. 92-76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3475. A bill for the relief of Paul Anthony Kelly; (Rept. No. 92-77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FLOWERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4327. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Stevenson; (Rept. No. 92-78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5419. A bill for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran, Jr.; (Rept. No. 92-79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5422. A bill for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing; (Rept. No. 92-80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ABOUREZK (for himself and Mr. DENHOLM):

H.R. 6745. A bill to amend section 122 of title 28 of the United States Code to transfer certain of the Central Division of the Judicial District of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: H.R. 6746. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOW: H.R. 6747. A bill to provide private sector financing of the prototype construction of a commercial supersonic transport airplane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. REID of New York, Mrs. MINK, Mr. QUIE, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. BELL, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 6748. A bill to provide a comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARNEY: H.R. 6749. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to require intercity rail passenger service between New York, N.Y., and Chicago, Ill., via Youngstown, Ohio, and also between Washington, D.C., and Chicago, Ill., via Youngstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON):

H.R. 6750. A bill to repeal the Connally Hot Oil Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON):

H.R. 6751. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN: H.R. 6752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status of certain oil well service equipment under subchapter D of chapter 36 of such code (relating to tax on the use of certain vehicles); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN: H.R. 6753. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6754. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that periodic assistance payments made by the United States on behalf of homeowners and cooperative members under section 235 of the National Housing Act shall not be deductible as interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6757. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 10 years the length of time a divorced woman's marriage to an insured individual must have lasted in order for her to qualify for wife's or widow's benefits on his wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California: H.R. 6758. A bill to provide for the creation of an authority to be known as the Reclamation Lands Authority to carry out the congressional intent respecting the excess land provisions of the Federal Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG: H.R. 6759. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ERLÉNORN (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BELL, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. FORSYTHE, and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 6760. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD: H.R. 6761. A bill to protect the public health and welfare and the environment through improved regulation of pesticides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6762. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6763. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to make military pay more equitable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6764. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the payment of an enlistment bonus to certain persons who enlist in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps for at least 3 years; to the committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6765. A bill to amend section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships for the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6766. A bill to extend and amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8767. A bill to establish a National Foundation for Higher Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8768. A bill to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 8769. A bill to facilitate the preservation of historic monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 8770. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8771. A bill to regulate the dumping of material in the oceans, coastal and other waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 8772. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish and govern the Federal Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8773. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall not be less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8774. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 8775. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10 percent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 8776. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of packaged consumer commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DORN, Mr. ERLÉNBOERN, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 8777. A bill to provide a program for honoring industry and other private efforts to contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROUSE, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 8778. A bill to provide a program for honoring industry and other private efforts to contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 8779. A bill to provide an equitable

system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing-rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 8780. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 8781. A bill to incorporate the National Social Conditioning Camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 8782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education, to be cited as, "The Higher Education Gift Incentive Act of 1971"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8783. A bill to establish a National Student Loan Association to serve as a secondary market for student loans insured under the Higher Education Act and to provide liquidity for those making such loans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8784. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAHON, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KEE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 8785. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 8786. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 8787. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. McCLOURE, Mr. DENT, Mr. McDADE, and Mr. WYATT):

H.R. 8788. A bill to establish mining and mineral research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of mining and minerals research, to supplement the act of December 31, 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. BELL, and Mr. DENHOLM):

H.R. 8789. A bill to establish the Office of Drug Abuse Control within the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 8790. A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold and to accept gold as compensation under the terms of a contract; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 8791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8792. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a Student Loan Marketing Association; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8793. A bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education, to be cited as "The Higher Education Gift Incentive Act of 1971"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 8794. A bill to amend the Bacon-Davis Act, as amended, and the Walsh-Healey Government Contracts Act, as amended, to prevent suspension of their provisions by the President to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 8795. A bill to limit the procurement of California and Arizona lettuce by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON:

H.R. 8796. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Transportation to include a route from New York City to Chicago, Ill., via Buffalo, N.Y., to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED (for himself, Mr. EDMUNDSON, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 8797. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Kickapoo Indians of Kansas and Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 316, 316A, 317, 145, 193, and 318; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 8798. A bill to establish a registration system with respect to donors of blood, and to provide funds for research to detect serum hepatitis prior to transfusion and transmission of the disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for donations of blood to nonprofit blood banks and other nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. WINN, and Mr. COLLINS of Illinois):

H.R. 8800. A bill to provide for the procurement of voluntary military manpower; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 8801. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8802. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide increased widow's and widower's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 8803. A bill to create a National Zoological and Aquarium Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 8804. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive study of the polar bear, seal, walrus, and cetaceans for the purpose of developing adequate conservation measures; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 8805. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to authorize restraint from certain activities and to permit the refusal of Federal licenses or permits for such activities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 8806. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide for greater incentives for demonstration of resources recovery systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 8807. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden

eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ASPIN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HULLIS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 6808. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulation requiring certain modes of public transportation in interstate commerce to reserve some seating capacity for passengers who do not smoke; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 507. Joint resolution; designation of third week of April of each year as "Earth Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.J. Res. 508. Joint resolution increasing the authorizations for comprehensive planning grants and open-space-land grants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.J. Res. 509. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim April 14 of each year as "John Hanson Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 510. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 511. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period April 19 through April 24, 1971, as "School Bus Safety Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.J. Res. 512. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week be-

ginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution relative to San Juan's 450th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies concerning the rights of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. SARBANES):

H. Res. 346. Resolution relative the 150th anniversary of independence for Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. Long of Maryland, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 347. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Res. 348. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

87. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 6809. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino, Giovanna, and Antonio Giuseppe Gancitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6810. A bill for the relief of Graziano Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6811. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6812. A bill for the relief of Mani Hashem, his wife, Malhe Hashem, and their minor daughter, Ariela Hashem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6813. A bill for the relief of Mario Michele Zito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6814. A bill for the relief of Anna Anzalone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6815. A bill for the relief of Ann Atanasio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6816. A bill for the relief Democate and Giuseppina Gabaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6817. A bill for the relief of Enrique and Maria Pombal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6818. A bill for the relief of Michele Salerno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (by request):

H.R. 6819. A bill for the relief of Antonio Inzillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 6820. A bill for the relief of John W. Shafer, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 6821. A bill for the relief of Theodore Barr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 6822. A bill for the relief of Vito Vavallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, March 25, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, holy and just, who exaltest a nation that follows the way of righteousness, we pray for our leaders and our people that this Nation may become worthy of Thy gracious favor. Deliver us from pride and greed, from avarice and prejudice, from ill will and discord. Inspire in us such a love of our neighbor and concern for one another's welfare that we shall work together with one heart and will to secure a just reward and the opportunity for the good life for all.

Teach us to serve Thee as we ought, to give rather than to get, to minister and not be ministered unto, to spend our lives for others, and in everything to know and to do Thy will.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of

Wednesday, March 24, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar, and that it consider Calendar Nos. 46, 47, and 48.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAGNER-O'DAY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

The bill (S. 557) to amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend the provisions thereof to other severely handicapped

individuals who are not blind, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 557

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to create a Committee on Purchase of Blind-Made Products, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1196; 41 U.S.C. 46-48), is amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu of the matter stricken the following: "That there is hereby created a committee to be known as the Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped (hereinafter referred to as the 'Committee') to be composed of two private citizens conversant with the problems incident to the employment of blind and other severely handicapped individuals and a representative of each of the following Government departments or agencies: The Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, and the General Services Administration. The members of the Committee shall be ap-