

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, throughout my career as an elected official, I have followed and admired greatly the work of J. Edgar Hoover, the distinguished director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Time after time I have been amazed at the capacity this man has for work and his ability for getting even the most difficult task accomplished.

Of course, Mr. President, he has not achieved the outstanding record of the FBI alone—he has many dedicated men and women working with him in that organization who each contribute to the greatness of this organization. But it is, after all, Mr. Hoover who has built the FBI, and it is his principles which have insured the integrity of this, our most important force in the preservation of law and order, freedom and justice.

In the more than 45 years which Mr. Hoover has headed the FBI there have been a few who have criticized him and the FBI. Naturally, a man in his position makes enemies. Dedicated as he is to the principle of objectivity, he has not shirked his responsibilities no matter what threat there has been to his career.

Often his critics have fallen into the category of those individuals who have suffered either directly or indirectly from the expertise of the FBI and its total dedication to doing its job. The Nazis in the thirties and forties, the Communists in the forties and fifties, and extremists of all philosophies during all of these years, have leveled their most effective weapons against Mr. Hoover and the FBI. None has succeeded in the drive to unseat this man or to harness the organization he heads.

Mr. President, there is today a growing chorus of voices being raised against Mr. Hoover directly and the FBI and law enforcement indirectly. I do not question any man's right to criticize Mr. Hoover or any public official. I do, however, seriously question the wisdom of some critics of Mr. Hoover, for some of the criticism leveled against him in recent weeks has been without any basis in fact.

Mr. Hoover is held in the highest esteem by persons of all walks of life, and particularly within the law enforcement profession. His departure from the helm of law enforcement would leave an unfillable void.

Mr. President, as evidence of the great respect which Mr. Hoover enjoys among persons actively engaged in the preservation of law and order, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution adopted at the Midwinter Conference of the National District Attorneys Association on March 14, 1971, at Honolulu, Hawaii. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

NATIONAL DISTRICT ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION
1971 MIDWINTER CONFERENCE

RESOLUTION

A resolution of appreciation for personal contribution to the advancement of criminal justice and for assistance to this association

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover, with unswerving dedication, has served this Nation as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and

Whereas, his standards of ethics and his insistence on the highest level of performance in the law enforcement field have helped immeasurably to increase the stature of law enforcement as a profession of honor and respect, and

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover has offered at no cost to law enforcement agencies and prosecutors throughout the Nation the services of the FBI Identification Division, the FBI Laboratory, and has made available FBI experts to examine evidence and to testify in criminal cases, and

Whereas, under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has offered extensive training on all levels of law enforcement and has provided advance training through the FBI National Academy to selected police officers, and

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover has furnished FBI personnel to assist in the training programs for prosecutors under the sponsorship of this Association, such as his support of the first session of the National College of District Attorneys and the FBI's assistance on numerous occasions in the Association's Regional Seminars for Prosecutors, and

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover has constantly sought to educate the American public to cooperate with law enforcement in both the investigative and prosecutive phases of criminal cases which has notably upgraded over the years the entire criminal justice system.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that this Association during its 1971 Midwinter Conference does hereby gratefully express its appreciation to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and commend him for his vision, leadership, and unselfish devotion to the furtherance of justice.

Passed at the National District Attorneys Association 1971 Midwinter Conference at Honolulu, Hawaii this 14th day of March, 1971.

EUROPEAN LACK OF CONFIDENCE
IN U.S. DOLLAR**HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Post of March 31 included a column by Joseph R. Slevin, financial analyst, on the subject of the lack of confidence in the U.S. dollar which now prevails in Europe.

Mr. Slevin points out that European monetary officials blame the United States for the present situation. The charge is that the administration and the Federal Reserve Board have created a crisis by authorizing excessive amounts

of money and thus deflating the American dollar.

Mr. Slevin concludes that the United States is living on the good will of its friends, but he cautions that patience with our policies is wearing thin in other countries, the so-called expansionist policy now prevalent in the United States is making our dollar less valuable.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Slevin's article, entitled "Europeans Fault Nixon For Shaky State of Dollar," be printed in Extension of Remarks.

I include the article as follows:

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

EUROPEANS FAULT NIXON FOR SHAKY
STATE OF DOLLAR

The Free World is teetering on the edge of the gravest financial crisis since the 1968 gold panic.

The United States is at the center of the current storm as it was in the eye of the March, 1968, hurricane. The threat is to the dollar, and, if the dollar goes, there will be shattering currency changes throughout the free world.

The immediate cause is a huge gap in interest rates between the very low short-term rates in this country and the significantly higher rates overseas. Investors are shifting billions of dollars out of the United States to take advantage of the generous returns they can earn abroad.

Part of the currency shift is speculative. Bankers, corporate treasurers and financial plungers are selling dollars and are buying German deutsche marks and other strong currencies. They are gambling that there will be a general upward revaluation against the faltering dollar.

Foreign officials uniformly blame the United States for the developing crisis. They charge that the Administration and Federal Reserve have brought the free world to the brink of disaster by creating excessive amounts of money and by driving down U.S. borrowing costs in a single-minded attempt to stimulate a vigorous business recovery.

The phrase that the angry, anxious foreign officials repeatedly use to describe President Nixon's attitude is "benign neglect." The phrase has become so popular, in fact, that German central banker Otmar Emminger pointedly volunteered to an unusual Paris press conference last Thursday that European officials see no signs of "benign neglect" among their American counterparts.

"The arrangements that were designed at Bretton Woods in 1944 assumed we would have a co-operative system with a soundly-managed dollar at its center," a Washington-based foreign official says. "Nobody has been able to figure out how you run an international monetary system when the central domestic economy, the United States, runs on its own rules and doesn't give a damn for anyone else."

Secretary of the Treasury John Connally will hear a blunt lecture on U.S. shortcomings next week when he visits the International Monetary fund for an unannounced luncheon meeting with Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, the able, tough-minded managing director of the 117-nation financial institution. It will be the first Connally-Schweitzer talk, and associates predict Schweitzer will pull no punches in telling Connally what other countries think of Nixon's easy-money policies.

There is general agreement among the experts that the dollar still is afloat only because this country and its creditors are in the same boat. A lesser currency would have gone under before now but sinking the dollar would wreck the free world financial system.

Germany, Japan, Canada and a number of other countries do not want the billions of paper dollars they are reluctantly accumulating, but no major country is prepared to demand that the United States buy back all of its dollars and give them gold. They know that there is not enough gold to go around and that they would force the United States to renege on its pledge to give gold for dollars whenever a foreign country asks.

The United States is living on the sufferance of its friends but their patience is wearing thin. They may play along for a few more months, perhaps for much longer.

AMERICA: A NATION OF HANGARS AND LANDING FIELDS?

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, today is April Fools' Day and perhaps for that reason as good a time as any for looking back with a somewhat jaundiced eye at the so-called American triumph embodied in the defeat of SST. It was no triumph at all. It only means that foreign-made SST's will now be flying over, and around, this country—SST's which have been neither environmentally approved nor produced in this country. Therefore, neither environmentalists, nor laborers, and more significantly, not even taxpayers, will have benefited from the product. We will simply be consumers, easy riders on the industry of foreign nations. It is a move which is congruent with what is happening in other sectors of our economy—in steel, in textiles, in glass, where American producers are being driven out of production by the wage-slave competition from abroad. Soon, if the trend continues, this Nation will be reduced to a wasteland of warehouses and distributing points, of hangars and landing fields. We will become a country of the leisure class, and second rate in every respect for that.

Reiterating these points, I would like to place into the RECORD an editorial from the State, Columbia, S.C., of March 27, 1971.

I include the article as follows:

SENATE DECISION ON SST IS NO-CONFIDENCE VOTE

Senate rejection of further federal funding of America's supersonic transport plane (the SST) is saddening on several counts, chief among which are two of paramount importance:

The United States has withdrawn from international competition in challenging aeronautical arena, abjectly yielding the field to our British and French friends on the one hand and to our Russian adversaries on the other. The development is less than edifying, especially since it represents a step back-

ward from our long-established position of supremacy in the air.

Secondly, the refusal of Congress to continue its support of the SST reflects an attitude of skepticism that American science and technology are capable of overcoming the ecological problems which were predicted (sometimes rather hysterically) as unavoidable consequences of SST flight.

To be sure, there are other considerations, such as the depressing impact already being felt within the aircraft industry. The loss of jobs and contracts which now head down the drain, however, must be considered a by-product of a decision which involves the even greater issues cited above.

Conversely, the tax monies to be saved are appreciable (although \$866 million already has been spent on the project). But here, too, the dollars are secondary to the larger factors of maintaining American parity, if nothing better, in the continuing global outreach for improved aircraft and of conquering environmental hazards.

We hope, as do a number of the SST opponents who prevailed in the final voting, that research and development will proceed apace in the field of supersonic flight with the goal of determining and overcoming whatever adverse effects might result from such flight. But without the incentive and support of governmental funding, research might move at reduced speed.

Admittedly, the members of the House and Senate who decided the SST issue were confronted with extremely complex questions and few hard-and-fast answers. We make no pretense of having answers of our own, but we regret what seems to have been a vote of no confidence in American capacity to surmount supersonic obstacles.

CHARLES FRASER

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to call the Senate's attention to an article about an industrious South Carolinian which appeared in this week's New Yorker magazine.

Mr. Charles Fraser is the son of the late Lt. Gen. Joseph B. Fraser. He graduated from Yale Law School in 1953 and began developing real estate in 1956. Since then he has developed the best of two worlds on Hilton Head Island, S.C.

As a conservationist and developer, Mr. Fraser has blended progress with preserving the beauty of nature. He criticizes those conservationists who are "preservationists" who would sacrifice humanity to the environment.

A true conservationist, such as Mr. Fraser, sees man and nature harmonizing in a better world. His idea of destruction on the other hand is uncontrolled development, a type of development which results not only in destruction of our wilderness and pollution of our natural resources, but also in a "visual pollution."

On Hilton Head Island Fraser has blended houses and golf courses among the trees with a view toward preserving the environment for man's use. He is the nonelected mayor and zoning board. At

the age of 41 he has parlayed controlled land development into a \$20 million fortune; he is commissioner of parks, recreation, and tourism for the South Carolina coast and was on President Johnson's Citizen's Advisory Committee on Outdoor Recreation and Natural Beauty.

Mr. President, I insert the article entitled "Profiles: Encounters with the Archdruid" which appeared in the March 27, 1971, New York, in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the New Yorker magazine, Mar. 27, 1971]

PROFILES: ENCOUNTERS WITH THE ARCHDRUID

(By John McPhee)

David Brower, who talks to groups all over the country about conservation, refers to what he says as The Sermon. He travels so light he never seems far from home—one tie, one suit. He calls it his preacher suit. He has given the sermon at universities, in clubs, in meeting halls, and once in a cathedral (he has otherwise not been in a church for thirty years), and while he talks he leans up to the lectern with his feet together and his knees slightly bent, like a skier. He seems to feel comfortable in the stance, perhaps because he was once a ski mountaineer.

Sooner or later in every talk, Brower describes the creation of the world. He invites his listeners to consider the six days of Genesis as a figure of speech for what has in fact been four billion years. On this scale, a day equals something like six hundred and sixty-six million years, and thus "all day Monday and until Tuesday noon, creation was busy getting the earth going." Life began Tuesday noon, and "the beautiful, organic wholeness of it" developed over the next four days. "At 4 p.m. Saturday, the big reptiles came on. Five hours later, when the redwoods appeared, there were no more big reptiles. At three minutes before midnight, man appeared. At one-fourth of a second before midnight, Christ arrived. At one-fortieth of a second before midnight, the Industrial Revolution began. We are surrounded with people who think that what we have been doing for that one-fortieth of a second can go on indefinitely. They are considered normal, but they are stark, raving mad."

Brower holds up a photograph of the world—blue, green, and swirling white. "This is the sudden insight from Apollo," he says. "There it is. That's all there is. We see through the eyes of the astronauts how fragile our life is, how thin the epithelium of the atmosphere."

Brower has computed that we are driving through the earth's resources at a rate comparable to a man's driving an automobile a hundred and twenty-eight miles per hour—and he says that we are accelerating. He reminds his audiences that buffalo were shot for their tongues alone, and he says that we still have a buffalo-tongue economy. "We're hooked on growth. We're addicted to it. In my lifetime, man has used more resources than in all previous history. Technology has just begun to happen. They are mining water under Arizona. Cotton is subsidized by all that water. Why grow cotton in Arizona? There is no point to this. People in Texas want to divert the Yukon and have it flow to Texas. We are going to fill San Francisco Bay so we can have another Los Angeles in a state that deserves only one. Why grow to the point of repugnance? Aren't we repugnant enough already? In the new subdivi-

sions, everybody can have a redwood of his own. Consolidated Edison has to quadruple by 1990. Then what else have you got besides kilowatts? The United States has six per cent of the world's population and uses sixty per cent of the world's resources, and one per cent of Americans use sixty per cent of that. When one country gets more than its share, it builds tensions. War is waged over resources. Expansion will destroy us. We need an economics of peaceful stability. Instead, we are fishing off Peru, where the grounds are so rich there's enough protein to feed the undernourished world, and we bring the fish up here to fatten our cattle and chickens. We want to build a sea-level canal through Central America. The Pacific, which is colder than the Atlantic, is also higher. The Pacific would flow into the Atlantic and could change the climate of the Caribbean. A dam may be built in the Amazon basin that will flood an area the size of Italy. Aswan Dam, by blocking the flow of certain nutrients, has killed off the sardine fisheries of the eastern Mediterranean. There is a human population problem, but if we succeed in interrupting the cycle of photosynthesis we won't have to worry about it. Good breeding can be overdone. How dense can people be?"

More than one of Brower's colleagues—in the Sierra Club, of which he was for seventeen years executive director, and, more recently, in his two new organizations, Friends of the Earth and the John Muir Institute for Environmental Studies—has compared him to John Brown. Brower approaches sixty, but under his shock of white hair his grin is youthful and engaging. His tone of voice, soft and mournful, somehow concentrates the intensity of his words. He speaks calmly, almost ironically, of "the last scramble for the last breath of air," as if that were something we had all been planning for. "There is DDT in the tissues of penguins in the Antarctic," he says. "Who put the DDT in the Antarctic? We did. We put it on fields, and it went into streams, and into fish, and into more fish, and into the penguins. There is pollution we know about and pollution we don't know about. It took fifty-seven years for us to find out that radiation is harmful, twenty-five years to find out that DDT is harmful, twenty years for cyclamates. We're getting somewhere. We have recently found out that polychlorinated biphenyls, a plastic by-product, have spread throughout the global ecosystem. At Hanford, Washington, radioactive atomic waste is stored in steel tanks that will have to be replaced every fifteen years. We haven't done anything well for a thousand years, except multiply. An oil leak in Bristol Bay, Alaska, will put the red salmon out of action. Oil exploration off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland will lead to leaks that will someday wreck the fisheries there. We're hooked. We're addicted. We're committing grand larceny against our children. Ours is a chain-letter economy, in which we pick up early handsome dividends and our children find their mailboxes empty. We must shoot down the SST. Sonic booms are unsound. Why build the fourth New York jetport? What about the fifth, the sixth, the seventh jetport? We've got to kick this addiction. It won't work on a finite planet. When rampant growth happens in an individual, we call it cancer."

To put it mildly, there is something evangelical about Brower. His approach is in some ways analogous to the Reverend Dr. Billy Graham's exhortations to sinners to come forward and be saved now because if you go away without making a decision for Christ coronary thrombosis may level you before you reach the exit. Brower's crusade, like Graham's, began many years ago, and Brower's may have been more effective. The clam-

orous concern now being expressed about conservation issues and environmental problems is an amplification—a delayed echo—of what Brower and others have been saying for decades. Brower is a visionary. He wants—literally—to save the world. He has been an emotionalist in an age of dangerous reason. He thinks that conservation should be "an ethic and conscience in everything we do, whatever our field of endeavor"—in a word, a religion. If religions arise to meet the most severe of human crises, now and then religions may come too late, and that may be the case with this one. In Brower's fight to save air and canyons, to defend wilderness and control the growth of population, he is obviously desperate, an extreme and driven man. His field, being the relationship of everything to everything else and how it is not working, is so comprehensive that no one can comprehend it. Hence the need for a religion and for a visionary to lead it. Brower once said to me, "We are in a kind of religion, an ethic with regard to terrain, and this religion is closest to the Buddhist, I suppose." I have often heard him speak of "drawing people into the religion," and of being able to sense at once when people already have the religion; I also remember a time, on a trail in the Sierra Nevada, when he said, "We can take some cues from other religions. There is something else to do than bang your way forward."

Throughout the sermon, Brown quotes the gospel—the gospel according to John Muir ("When we try to pick out anything by itself, we find it hitched to everything else in the universe"), the gospel according to Henry David Thoreau ("What is the good of a house if you don't have a tolerable planet to put it on?"), the gospel according to Buckminster Fuller ("Technology must do more with less"), and the gospel according to Pogo ("We have met the enemy and he is us"). A great deal of the sermon is, in fact, a chain of one-liners from the thinking sector: "The only true dignity of man is his ability to fight against insurmountable odds" (Ignazio Silone), "Civilization is a thin veneer over what made us what we are" (Sigurd Olson), "Despair is a sin" (C. P. Snow), "Every cause is a lost cause unless we defuse the population bomb" (Paul Ehrlich), "The wilderness holds answers to questions man has not yet learned how to ask" (Nancy Newhall).

Brower has ample ideas of his own about what might be done. He says, "Roughly ninety per cent of the earth has felt man's hand already, sometimes brutally, sometimes gently. Now let's say, 'That's the limit.' We should go back over the ninety and not touch the remaining ten per cent. We should go back, and do better, with ingenuity. Recycle things. Loop the system." When he sees an enormous hole in the ground in the middle of New York City, he says, "That's all right. That's part of the ninety." In non-wilderness areas, he is nowhere happier than in places where the ninety has been imaginatively gone over—for example, Ghirardelli Square in San Francisco, a complex of shops and restaurants in a kind of brick Xanadu that was once a chocolate factory. When someone asks him what one person can do, Brower begins by mentioning Rachel Carson. Then he tells about David Pesonen, a young man in California who stopped a nuclear-power station singlehanded. Then he sprays questions, "Are you willing to pay more for steak, if cattle graze on level ground and not on erodible hills? Are you willing to pay more for electricity, if the power plant doesn't pollute air or water?" He taunts the assembled sinners. "You are villains not to share your apples with worms. Bite the worms. They won't hurt nearly as much as the insecticide does. You are villains if you

keep buying automobiles. Leave these monsters in the showroom." Invariably, he includes what must be his favorite slogan: "Fight blight, burn a billboard tonight!"

The cause is, in a sense, hopeless. "Conservationists have to win again and again and again," he says. "The enemy only has to win once. We are not out for ourselves. We can't win. We can only get a stay of execution. That is the best we can hope for. If the dam is not built, the damsite is still there. Blocking something is easiest. Getting a wilderness bill, a Redwoods Park bill, a Cascades Park bill, is toughest of all."

Brower is somewhat inconvenienced by the fact that he is a human being, fated, like everyone else, to use the resources of the earth, to help pollute its air, to jam its population. The sermon becomes confessional when he reveals, as he almost always does, that he has four children and lives in a redwood house. "We all make mistakes," he explains. His own mistakes don't really trouble him, though, for he has his eye on what he knows to be right. After he gave a lecture at Yale once, I asked him where he got the interesting skein of statistics that six per cent of the world's population uses sixty per cent of the world's resources and one per cent of the six per cent uses sixty per cent of the sixty per cent. What resources? Klee-nex? The Mesabi Range?

Brower said the figures had been worked out in the head of a friend of his from data assembled "to the best of his recollection."

"To the best of his recollection?"

"Yes," Brower said, and assured me that figures in themselves are merely indices. What matters is that they feel right. Brower feels things. He is suspicious of education and frankly distrustful of experts. He has no regard for training per se. His intuition seeks the nature of the man inside the knowledge. His sentiments are incredibly lofty. I once heard him say, "It's pretty easy to reverse life if you think of all the things it's done while it was onstage." He is not sombre, though. Reading a newspaper, he will come upon a piece by a conservation writer and say, "I like that. He's neutral the right way."

Brower is a conservationist, but he is not a conservative. I have heard him ask someone, "Do you like the world so much that you want to keep it the way it is?"—an odd question to be coming from David Brower, but he was talking about the world of men. The world of nature is something else. Brower is against the George Washington Bridge. He is against the Golden Gate Bridge. He remembers San Francisco when the bridge was not there, and he says the entrance to the bay was a much more beautiful scene without it. He would like to cut back the population of the United States to a hundred million. He has said that from the point of view of land use the country has not looked right since 1830. There are conservationists (a few, anyway) who are even more vociferous than Brower, but none with his immense reputation, none with his record of battles fought and won—defeater of dams, defender of wilderness. He must be the most unrelenting fighter for conservation in the world. Russell Train, chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, once said, "Thank God for Dave Brower. He makes it so easy for the rest of us to be reasonable. Somebody has to be a little extreme. Dave is a little hairy at times, but you do need somebody riding out there in front."

The office of Charles Fraser, the developer, is in a small building about halfway between an undeveloped jungle and an alligator pond on Hilton Head Island, South Carolina. Alligators sometimes crawl along the sidewalk between the jungle and the pond. The alligators are natives and Fraser is not. Fraser

was anxious lest the alligators be disturbed when, in 1957, he began building roads and golf courses and clearing homesites on some five thousand acres of the island, so he fed them great hunks of raw beef to lull them into acceptance of his bulldozers. The alligators swallowed it. They live now in water hazards and other artificial ponds throughout Fraser's Sea Pines Plantation. On his office wall Fraser has a picture of himself, in a white suit and a panama hat, walking an alligator. Signs along the fairways say, "Please do not molest the alligators." Fraser tried something similar with the bald eagles that were there, but the eagles would have none of it, and they flew away.

Fraser is a short man, heavyset, prominent in the forehead, dark curly hair wisping out behind. The first time I saw him, he was standing on a floating dock at his Sea Pines marina, drinking Portuguese rose and wearing tennis shoes, white trousers, and a blue striped shirt. Those who know him would not instantly recognize such a snapshot, for although Fraser has built one of the creamiest resorts in America, he himself is not the resort type. He drinks little and plays less. Recreation is his business, and business seems to be his recreation. He almost always wears a plain dark suit. He tucks his chin in and sits straight when he is saying something important, and the more important it is, the straighter he sits. He talks about "marketing-acceptance factors" and about how "public money floats better than joint-venture money." His conversation is predominantly about money—its flows, its freezes, its cataclysms, its sources, its deltas. He speaks in a clear, authoritative voice, very slowly, as if he were writing a contract as he goes along.

When Fraser first saw Hilton Head Island, rimmed with beaches and the ocean, it was a wilderness of palmettos, live oaks, Sabal palms, egret rookeries, and tupelo swamps shimmering with rattlesnakes and cottonmouths. What he saw there horrified him. Fraser is a visionary. He did not see the rattlesnakes. He saw Coney Island rising from the swamps. He saw what he calls "visual pollution." He saw Myrtle Beach, Asbury Park, Seaside Heights, and Atlantic City. He saw the whole sorry coastline of the Atlantic states—two thousand miles of used flypaper. The flies had missed here and there—Black-beard Island, Cape Fear, Hilton Head—leaving pristine and visible some segments of one of the longest and most beautiful chains of barrier beaches in the world. Fraser, who was twenty-one, felt that development of some kind was inevitable at Hilton Head, and that it need not look like Myrtle Beach, and need not be done in dissonance with nature. He went to Yale Law School, and the course that most absorbed him was Myres McDougal's Land Use Planning and Allocation by Private Agreement. The gist of what McDougal had to say was that the use of property ought to be planned, because when development is allowed to occur without control the result can be a form of destruction. Throughout his years in New Haven, Fraser was obsessed with a desire to create on Hilton Head Island a resort community over which he would retain absolute aesthetic control, and he was in a position to do so, since his family owned much of the island.

Fraser's father, Lieutenant General Joseph B. Fraser, was a lumber king in Hinesville, Georgia, whenever there was not a war. He and several partners had bought the island for its timber and its speculative potentialities. Charles Fraser worked in summer with the timbering teams and successfully urged that no cutting be done in oceanfront stands of virgin pine. He also drove up and down the coastline from Virginia Beach to Miami seeking out the original developers of beach-

front properties wherever he could find them and asking, "If you had it to do over again, what would you do differently?" From *haut monde* to honky-tonk and back again, they told him what a short-sighted mistake it had been to line up a row of houses along a beach and then put a road just behind the houses, creating a safety hazard and reducing the value of all the lots on the inland side of the road. They told him that large houses have a way of becoming boarding houses. They told him that control is quickly lost if it is not ironclad. Fraser regularly read almost all the journals of architecture. He went to the National Archives, in Washington, and looked up surveyors' notebooks from the eighteen-sixties, because he wanted his development to be of a piece with history, and he tried to locate old cotton fields, wartime fortifications, and vanished Taras. In 1956, with no development experience and not much money, he returned permanently to Hilton Head, where he began to sketch in the air with his hands scenes that he alone could see. Locally, he was considered a major and absolute nut. To his mother he confided, "I may never make any money, but I want to create something beautiful." She told him he was going to waste his time and his legal talent. She says now, "Of course, a person doesn't often have a chance to take wilderness and make something of it. Charles has a sense of beauty and balance. He saw the possibilities there. I think he would have been a painter if he hadn't chosen to do something else."

Sea Pines Plantation appears to be something painted by a single hand, in greens, grays, and browns. Its roads, meandering among the live oaks and Sabal palms, were bent wherever necessary to miss the big trees. All stop signs are green. Private roadside mailboxes are all green. Fireplugs are green. So far there are five hundred and fifty private houses, built by five hundred and fifty individual owners, yet most of the houses have cedar-shake roofs and bleached-cypress siding, the intention being that they should blend into their environment like spotted fawns. Some houses are set back in the woods along the fairways. (There are fifty-four fairways.) Other houses are on narrow drives that lead toward the beach from the principal roads, which are considerably inland. No one in the plantation lacks convenient access to the sea, because Fraser left dozens of fifty-foot public swaths between his arterial roads and the beach, and he has built walkways through the swaths. Neither the beach nor the line of primary dunes behind it has been built upon. Fraser spent fifty thousand dollars to save one live oak when he built a seawall for a harbor he dredged. Trees crowd the roads—dangerously in some places—but Fraser will not remove a tree until automobiles have crashed into it at least twice. He has one section of about a thousand acres that he calls the Main Wildlife Sanctuary and Woodland Recreation Area, and he has legally committed himself to leave twenty-five percent of the plantation in its natural state. When prospective buyers used to ask about snakes, Fraser would say amelioratively, "Snakes? We'll show you a couple this afternoon." But the snakes eventually received the message, and now they do not show anymore. Alligators are packed up and sent to zoos when they become six feet long. Fraser has a private police force that spends most of its time protecting alligators and deer from poachers. The alligator hides are worth a hundred dollars apiece. Fraser's live oaks were once Methuselan with moss, but after he discovered that rain-soaked Spanish moss can get so heavy it cracks limbs, crews of barbers were sent into the trees to create an overhead garden of Vandykes.

An aerial view of Sea Pines Plantation reveals the great numbers of houses there, and how close to one another they really are, whereas an observer on the ground—even in the most densely built areas—feels that he is in a partly cleared woodland with some houses blended into it, nothing more. Fraser accomplished this in a region where people have traditionally liked to proclaim their prominence by piling red bricks into enormous cubes and placing before them rows of white columns. He did it—although he occasionally met strong opposition from buyers, bankers, and even subordinates in his own organization—by writing some forty pages of restrictions to attach to every deed. It was a reverse bill of rights (ironclad), a set of ten times ten commandments—take it or leave. The first restriction in the long list gives a suggestion of the whole: it says that any plan or specification can be disallowed by Fraser for any reason whatever. In the early days, when Fraser was operating more on hope than on money (and in full knowledge that half the bankers in South Carolina thought he would soon go under), he was nonetheless so uncompromising that he was ready without hesitation to reject the house plans even of a textile king. If the king refused to conform, Fraser bought back his land. One giddy homeowner tried to paint his house yellow—a historic moment at Sea Pines Plantation—but Fraser backed him down, blending him into the landscape along with his house.

Fraser is cruising through Sea Pines in an air-conditioned green Dodge. A man who is opening a green mailbox marked "H. F. Scheetz, Jr." looks up and waves hello. Fraser lowers the window. "Hi, Henry!" he says as he glides by. Up goes the window. "I operate as nonelected mayor, so I have to act as if I were elected," he explains. "There is democracy of communication here but autocracy of decision-making. Our corporate contracts and deed covenants are the constitution and bylaws of the community. The only way you can have aesthetic control is through the power of ownership. We have more power than a zoning board has. I have centralized the decision-making process, but I'll listen to anybody." The marvel is not whom he listens to but who listens to him. The car passes some of the nation's most authoritative mailboxes—McCormack of Comsat, Hipp of Liberty Life, Taylor of New York State wine, Twining of the Air Force, Simmons of the mattress, Close of Springs Mills. Fraser calls the plantation "a high-quality destination resort," and it has proved to be the destination of a fairly extensive variety of people—not just the barons of war and commerce but also retirees with wan incomes, golfers of most incomes and all handicaps, tennis players of the wider levels, a few painters, a few writers, and rich widows from the North, who bring their late husbands to Fraser's graveyard and then build homes for themselves in the plantation. What these people have in common is Fraser. He is Yahweh. He is not merely the mayor and the zoning board, he is the living ark of the deed covenant. He is the artist who has painted them into the corners he has sold them. A few owners have put sums like two hundred and fifty and three hundred thousand dollars into their houses, but most are in the forty-to fifty-thousand-dollar range, and Fraser has also built condominium villas that sold originally for as little as nineteen thousand—a minimum that has since risen to thirty-eight thousand. He has also built a small town, shops and all, with apartments that rent for two hundred and fifty to three hundred dollar a month. He figures he can blend fifteen hundred more houses into the trees, and one more golf course.

The chairman of the Continental Mort-

gage Forum recently introduced Fraser as "one of the two finest developers in the United States," not mentioning his peer. Lyndon Johnson appointed him to the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Outdoor Recreation and Natural Beauty. Fraser is also Commissioner of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism for the South Carolina coast. Now forty-one, he has made twenty million dollars in the past ten years, but he, his friends, and his enemies all agree that personal profit is not paramount among his motives. Fraser's drive seems to have been directed toward accomplishment for its own sake, toward aesthetics for the sake of an aesthetic criterion. Sea Pines has evolved, perhaps, as a kind of monument.

Fraser considers himself a true conservationist, and he will say that he thinks of most so-called conservationists as "preservationists" but that he prefers to call them "druids." "Ancient druids used to sacrifice human beings under oak trees," he says. "Modern druids worship trees and sacrifice human beings to those trees. They want to save things they like, all for themselves." He is aware of the importance of the larger environment. He says he would like to establish a College of the Oceans—"you know, pot, ecology, the whole bag." He reads the newsletter of the Conservation Foundation. He knows the vital position of salt marshes in marine ecology. "Salt marshes are productive feeding grounds for seafood," he says. "In the immediate marsh boundaries of Hilton Head Island, in the marsh flood plain, we save seventy-five per cent of the marsh, as a balanced approach between the interests of recreation and the interests of the druids. Man has to use some of the salt marsh if he is going to live near the sea. A few years ago, anybody would have said it was O.K. to build anything in a salt marsh. Now the society has so much money that we can afford to wonder. The druids get emotional and say you are upsetting ecology if you as much as touch the salt marsh, and you have to be polite. But you can't take the position that production of seafood is the most important issue in America. The druids dismiss me as a quote developer unquote, and that makes me mad."

There must be a very remarkable druid at Hammond, Inc., in New York, for Hammond has published a large map that seems particularly notable for what can only be a deliberate omission. It happens that the longest undeveloped beach on the Atlantic coast of the United States forms the eastern shoreline of a very large island, no part of which appears on this map—Hammond's Superior Map of the United States, four feet wide, one inch to seventy miles—although the map shows clearly such islands as Ocracoke, Hatteras, Assateague, Long Beach, and Manhattan, all of which are smaller. The name of the missing island is Cumberland. Virtually uninhabited, it lies off the coast of Georgia. It is the largest and the southernmost of the Georgia sea islands, and on the map the place where Cumberland Island should be is filled with nothing but blue Atlantic, although other sea islands—St. Simons, Sapelo, Ossabaw—stand forth in bold outline to the north. Clearly the work of a druid cartographer.

Cumberland Island, a third larger than Manhattan, has a population of eleven. Its beach is a couple of hundred yards wide and consists of a white sand that is fine and soft to the touch. The beach is just under twenty miles long, and thus, although there are no obstructions whatever, it is impossible to see from one end of it to the other, because the beach itself drops from sight with the curve of the earth. Wild horses, gray and brown, roam the beach, apparently for the sheer pleasure of the salt air. Poachers round them

up from time to time and sell them to rodeos for fifteen dollars apiece. Wild pigs seem to like the Cumberland beach, too. The figure of a man is an unusual thing there. New, young dunes rise behind the beach, and behind the dunes are marshes, fresh or tidal. In some of the marshes and in ponds and lakes elsewhere on the island live alligators fourteen feet long. The people of the island will not say specifically where the alligators are. They are fond of their tremendous reptiles. Poachers, commando-fashion, come for them by night, kill them, and take just the hides. Behind the marshes stand the odd dunes, high, smooth as talc, sloped precipitously like lines of cresting waves, and covered with pioneer grasses. At the back of the dunes begins a live-oak forest. The canopies of the oaks nearest the beach have been so pruned by the wind that they appear to have been shaped by design in a medieval garden. Among the oaks are slash pines and red cedars—trees also tolerant of salt. Sand-lane roads wind through the forest. Poachers use them in pursuit of white-tailed deer. Hotels in Jacksonville pay thirty-five dollars a deer. Through the woods run thousands of wild pigs. Now and again, a piglet is stopped by a diamondback.

A generally high bluff rims the western shore of the island, and along it are irregular humps—Indian burial mounds that have never been opened. Watched from the bluff, sunsets gradually spread out over a salt marsh five miles wide. This distance from the mainland in part explains why Cumberland Island remains as it is at this apparently late date in the history of the world. There is no bridge. The salt marsh is the most extensive one south of the Chesapeake. It is dominated by cord grass that rises higher than a man's head. The higher the tide, the higher the grass in a tidal marsh, and the Georgia coast has seven-foot tides. An acre of that marsh is ten times as fertile as the most fertile acre in Iowa. Roots of the cord grass reach down into the ooze and mine nutrients. When the grass dies and crumbles, it becomes high-protein detritus. Shrimp spend a part of their life cycle in there eating the crumbled grass. In the marsh, too, is a soup of microscopic plants, of phosphorus, nitrogen, calcium. Oysters grow there. Fish feed in the marshes and on marsh foods washed by the tides. If a quarter acre of marsh could be lifted up and shaken in the air, anchovies would fall out, and crabs, menhaden, croakers, butterfish, flounders, tonguefish, squid. Bigger things eat the things that eat the marsh, and thus the marsh is the broad base of a marine-food pyramid that ultimately breaks the surface to feed the appetite of man.

Tidal creeks penetrate Cumberland Island, and along their edges, when the tide is low, hundreds of thousands of oysters are exposed to view. Shrimp, fast-wiggling and translucent, feed between the beds of oysters. No wonder the Indians wanted to be buried on Cumberland Island. The only wonder is that the island now is much as it was when the Indian mounds were built. It has not always been so. There are stands of virgin pine and virgin live oak on Cumberland, but the island as a whole is a reclaimed wilderness. Orange and olive groves stood there once, and plantations of rice, indigo, and cotton. At the outbreak of the Civil War, the sea islands were abandoned. Later, rich Yankees began competing with one another in the acquisition of Georgia islands, and nearly all of Cumberland was bought by a Carnegie—Andrew's brother Thomas. His family, as it increased, built several enormous houses, and two or three of these are still in fair condition, but the others make Cumberland the world's foremost island in salt-sprayed baronial ruins.

The Carnegie heirs are in the third, fourth, and fifth generations, and their number is so large that they went to court not long ago and had the island divided. Conservationists, noting this, and realizing that not all Carnegies could afford to hold land anymore, began to move toward finding a way to keep the island from being developed. They spoke of Cumberland as—in the words of one of Brower's colleagues in the Sierra Club—"a spot in our eyes, a dream that may not come true." Then, in October, 1968, three Carnegies—Tom, Andrew, and Henry—sold three thousand acres of Cumberland Island for one and a half million dollars to Charles E. Fraser.

There was an expression that had been in the air there since the days of the rice and indigo plantations, and now it rose again to currency: "The Devil has his tail wrapped around Cumberland Island."

With "the purchase of lands on Cumberland Island," as Fraser termed the event, the issue was joined for one of the great land-use battles of recent times. Remaining Carnegie heirs closed ranks against him. All over the coast and, in fact, all over the South—particularly in Atlanta, Augusta, Columbia, and Athens (the University of Georgia)—people began talking intensely about Fraser.

"He walked into the Cloister at Sea Island and he said, 'I'm the golden boy of the Golden Isles, and I've just bought three thousand acres of Cumberland Island.'"

"I want to shoot the son of a bitch."

"He is a visionary young man who has learned that conservation can pay."

"No. Charlie is a conservationist in the real sense. He wants to harmonize a modern environment with all the endowments of nature."

"Conservation to Charlie means, in great part, that Charlie should not be bitten by a mosquito."

"He thinks he's a home boy with a lot of clout in Georgia, but he'll find out what he can do with his pinksock golfers."

"Charles himself is interested in power. That's what motivates him. Everybody thinks he will go into politics."

"He would dearly love to be governor of South Carolina, and he would be fabulous."

"He doesn't have the stomach for it. In politics, there's a lot you can't control. Where he is, he controls everything."

"I'm an ecosystems man. It's not the island alone that interests me. It's the island, the marsh, and the sea. If the marshes are saved, there would not be much ecological loss with development. If you're going to have a developer, I'm all for Fraser. Unplanned development would spoil it."

"I don't think his declared intentions are always his true intentions."

"He's a demon. He has no principles."

"He is a little man walking empty with a cartoon balloon before his mouth, talking and talking as if to create a Charles Fraser who isn't there."

"Fraser says he wants to make these islands available to the people. Horse manure. He means taking it from the old rich and giving it to the new rich. Let's just be straight, a fifty-thousand-dollar investment ain't too many of the people."

"He does things no other developer would. Those concrete bulkheads at Hilton Head cost him three-quarters of a million dollars. He could have had steel for two hundred thousand."

"Steel bulkheads are an eyesore."

"Mr. Fraser does preserve environment. The university hopes that most of Cumberland can become a National Seashore, so people can enjoy it. It can't be all wilderness. We think it should be a mix—people in nature."

"The guy is tearing off an island just as if

it were a postage stamp. He's behaving like a hunter knocking off buffaloes. We'll challenge anyone who wants to be the Buffalo Bill of the Georgia coast."

"He has half-baked, two-bit ideas. He's thinking very small. I challenge Charlie Baby to come up with something exciting. We are going to come into an age when people want more than a bag of sticks and some white balls."

"We can't afford to think in Colonial land-grab terminology anymore. We could set a precedent on Cumberland Island for recreational land use in America. Let's do something imaginative. Fraser's plans are not big enough. The golf-course bit should go to the mainland. There could be three planned communities on the mainland, with Cumberland their open space."

"You come in to the coast slowly. It grows on you. River mouths, marshes, tidal creeks, islands, the continental shelf, and the continental slope are really an integral unit, a single system. We have had integration of the races in the sixties, and we are going to have integration of man and the land in the seventies, or we'll all be gone in the eighties."

On a cold but sunlit November day, a small airplane, giving up altitude, flew down the west shore of Cumberland, banked left, crossed the island, and moved out to sea. Sitting side by side behind the pilot were Brower and Fraser. The plane turned, still descending, and went in low over the water and low over the wind-pruned live oaks and down into a clearing, where the ground was so rough that the landing gear thumped like drumfire. A man in khaki trousers and a wild-boar skin shirt waited at the edge of the woods. The aircraft wheeled around at the far end of the clearing and taxied back toward him through waist-high fennel.

Fraser and Brower had met only the evening before, at Hilton Head, and Fraser, in his direct way, had begun their relationship by giving Brower a dry Martini and then telling him what a conservationist is. Fraser said, "I call anyone a druid who prefers trees to people. A conservationist's too often is just a preservationist, and a preservationist is a druid. I think of land use in terms of people. At Hilton Head, we have proved that you can take any natural area and make it available to people while at the same time preserving its beauty." Brower listened and, for the moment, said nothing. He had not expected so young a man. Fraser's dynamism impressed him, and so did Sea Pines Plantation. Fraser, for his part, was surprised by what he took to be, in Brower, an absence of thorns. Expecting an angry Zeus, he found instead someone who appeared to be "unargumentative, quiet, and shy."

Now, on Cumberland Island, the pilot cut the props, and into the resulting serenity stepped Fraser and Brower. Fraser wore a duck hunter's jacket and twill trousers that were faced with heavy canvas. Brower had on an old blue sweater, gray trousers, and white basketball shoes. The name of the man in the boarskin shirt was Sam Candler. Hands were shaken all around. Brower said it was "nice to be aboard the island." The weather was discussed. Amiability was the keynote.

Candler, who was thirty-eight, had spent much of his life on the island. He grew up on its oysters and shrimp. His children were doing the same. Candler knew where the lighthouses were, and he had a boxful of diamondback rattles, from snakes he had killed with a hackberry stick. Notches on the stick corresponded to rattles in the box, and Candler would have dearly loved to be able to make an additional notch that corresponded to Charles E. Fraser. There was native gentility in Candler, however, and he did not

permit his darker sentiments to surface in the presence of his new neighbor. Candler spoke even more softly than Brower did, and the accents of Atlanta were in his voice. He was a slim man of medium height, with dark hair. He owned, with others in his family, the part of Cumberland Island that Thomas Carnegie did not buy. The Candler property, about twenty-two hundred acres at the north end, was the site of a rambling wooden inn (now Candler's house) in which business flourished around the turn of the century but atrophied after causeways were built to other islands. Candler's great-grandfather was the pharmacist who developed and wholly owned the Coca-Cola Company; his son, Candler's grandfather, bought the Cumberland property in 1928.

The pilot said goodbye. The airplane waddled into position and took off.

"An airport is essential here," Fraser said. "But it's not a nice neighbor," Brower told him.

"Yes, but ours would be just large enough for small private jets, no more," Fraser said. "Let's go see Cumberland Oaks."

Cumberland Oaks was Fraser's working title for the development he intended to build on Cumberland Island. To get to the site, we drove about ten miles on narrow sand-lane roads, Fraser at the wheel of a Land Rover that belonged to his company. Sunlight came down in slivers through the moss in the canopies of huge virgin oaks. We stopped near one, and Brower paced the ground under it. The limbs reached out so far that, bent by their own weight, they plowed into the ground, from which they emerged farther out, leafily. Yucca grew in a crotch twenty feet high. Brower computed that the canopy covered fifteen thousand square feet of ground.

We drove, through long stretches that were straight to the end of perspective. "This is a vast island," Fraser said. "It can absorb dozens of different kinds of uses. You won't even be able to find the uses, it's so vast—if it is handled with discretion." Brower was silent. "By going into islands, I tarnish my shining image, because I irritate so many druids," Fraser said. Brower smiled. The Land Rover raced along at forty miles per hour and occasionally bounced over a corduroy bridge. Eventually, Fraser said, with both humor and sarcasm in his voice, "Now we're on my property. Don't it look lovely?" Brower said sincerely that lovely was how it looked, with its palmettos, its live oaks, its slash and longleaf pines. To Fraser, it was obviously raw and incomplete, but even now he could clearly see before his eyes finished villas and finished roads. So complete was this vision, in fact, that Fraser turned off the existing road and began to zip through the trees, rounding imaginary corners and hugging subdivisive curves. Spiky palmettos rattled against the Land Rover's sides like venetian blinds. Pine branches smacked against the windshield, making explosive noises and causing us all, instinctively, to blink and cover our heads with our arms. A buck and two does leaped away from the oncoming vehicle, and Candler, raising his voice above the din, commented pointedly that on an island heavy with deer they were the first we had seen. "Variety of wildlife increases sharply with variety of food," Fraser said, accelerating. "A place like Sea Pines Plantation has more wildlife than an untouched forest—more browsing, more habitat variation."

The western edge of Fraser's property was a high bluff over the Cumberland River, a tidal lagoon separating the island from the broad marsh, and as we stood there looking down at the water and across to the distant mainland Fraser said, "We'll have slides here, so kids can slide down the bluff."

"You could have swings here on these cedars," Brower offered.

Fraser said that some of the cedars on his property had been planted by Scottish soldiers who had built and manned a stockade there in the early eighteenth century. Development was thus nothing new around Cumberland Oaks. Looking west across the water and the marsh, he confided that he was envisioning a seven-hundred-and-fifty-thousand-dollar system of towers, cables, and aerial gondolas to carry people to Cumberland Oaks from the mainland. "Brunswick Pulp & Paper owns those forests over there," Fraser said. "I would describe Brunswick Pulp & Paper as 'friendly.'"

Wild grapevines as thick as hawsers hung from the high limbs of Fraser's pines, and as we moved east through the woods Brower found them irresistible. Fraser stopped the Land Rover so Brower could get out and swing on one—fifty feet in an arc through the air. He crashed into a palmetto.

Between the deep woods and the beach, among the secondary dunes of Cumberland Oaks, was a freshwater lake—Whitney Lake—so clear and lustrous that it gave Fraser's property a slight edge over all other parts of the island. Set in all the whiteness of the big hills of powder sand, the lake was so blue that day it paled the blue sky. Near the north end of the lake, three skeletal trees protruded from the slopes of sand—branches intact, but spare and dead. A buzzard sat in each tree. The trees were dead because the dunes were marching. Slowly, these enormous hills, shaped and reshaped by the wind, were moving south. They had already filled up half of Fraser's lake, and, left alone, they would eventually fill it all. Five buzzards stood at the edge of the water. Fraser stood there, too, with the unconcealed look on his face of a man watching a major asset disappear. "We've got to stabilize these dunes," he said.

Brower, for his part, was moved by the lyricism of the scene. If destruction is natural, Brower is for it. "I think it's just fine to see it happen," he said.

Fraser said, "I've got to restore dune-grass vegetation here. I've got to put the lake back to its original size. I'm an advocate of lakes."

"There's a place for development and there's a place for nature," said Candler.

"What would you move the dunes with?" I asked Fraser.

"Spoons, hoes, shovels—earthmoving equipment. You change natural gradings very cheaply with a bulldozer," he said.

Fraser went on to tell us that the lake had been named for Eli Whitney. Planters on the island had given Whitney financial support toward the development of the cotton gin. "This lake shouldn't be allowed to disappear," Fraser said. "There should be canoes on it for children. Children should be fishing here for brim. There is nothing here now but buzzards and dead trees."

Thinking of his three thousand acres as a whole, I asked him privately what he would like to build there by Whitney Lake.

"Houses!" he whispered.

The northernmost tip of the ocean beach was a long spit owned by Candler. We drove up there, inadvertently filling the sky with sandpipers and gulls. Then we turned and, in the late-afternoon light, went south all the way. The big beach ran on and on before us, white and dazzling in the clear sunlight. No other human beings were there. Of the several houses on Cumberland Island, the one nearest to the beach was a half mile back in the woods. We had been driving for a while when Candler remarked that we were nearing the end of his property. He has two and a half miles of beach. He said, "The only thing wrong with this beach—the traffic's so bad." Shells crunched under the wheels and salt

foam flew out behind us. Plastic jugs, light bulbs, bottles, and buoys had drifted up along the scum line, but nowhere near enough of them to defeat the wild beach. I remembered the shoreline of the Hudson River at Barrytown, New York. A photographer from *Sports Illustrated* had caught up with Brower near there, and they had gone to some difficulty to get down to the river's edge, so that Brower could be photographed with the wind tousling his white hair against a background of natural beauty. For the occasion, Brower had changed from a topcoat into a ski parka, and the picture was successful—this ecological Isalah by the wide water. It was just a head-and-shoulders shot, so it did not include the immediate environment of Brower's feet. The shore of the Hudson River, a hundred miles upstream from Manhattan, was literally obscured by aerosol cans, plastic bottles, boat cushions, sheets of polyethylene, bricks, industrial scum, globs of asphalt, and a tattered yacht flag. Now, on the Cumberland beach, Fraser, for the moment, was sounding much like a hard-line real-estate man. He was saying that we had beside us "the finest, gentlest breakers on the Atlantic coast." Brower said that where he came from such ripples were not called breakers. We got out of the Land Rover and walked for a while. Brower paused and studied that reflection of the falling sun on the surfaces of the breakers. This was what mattered to him—that play of light. He saw a horseshoe crab and had no idea what it was. He picked up a whelk shell and a clamshell and asked the names of the creatures that had lived in them. He wondered what made the holes of fiddler crabs. Shrimp boats were working offshore. Brower said he liked the look of them, bristling with spars. Brower seems to think in scenes. He seems to paint them in his mind's eye, and in these scenes not everything made by man is unacceptable. Shrimp boats on a bobbing sea are O.K. On the waterfront in San Francisco, he and I once drove at dusk past a big schooner that is perennially moored there, and its high rigging was beautiful in the fading light. "There should be more masts against the sky," Brower said. And now, back in the Land Rover, he looked up at high cumulus that was assembling over the ocean and he spoke of "sky mountains," while Fraser looked the other way and said that the primary dunes were in a process of severe disintegration, and the Land Rover moved on at forty miles per hour, crunching Paisley-spotted shells of the tiger crab.

"Have you ever been on a shrimp boat to see how they work?" Brower said.

"I have—when I was twelve," said Fraser. "I want a shrimp boat out of Cumberland Oaks, taking four or five kids a day."

The distance was so great across the beach and the dunes to the woods that I asked Fraser how far back he thought the nearest of his houses ought to be.

"The mainland," said Candler.

"That's a real dilemma here," Fraser said. "If the houses are set back in the trees, it's bad for recreation. What we need is an extensive tree-planting program to build up destroyed areas by the shore."

"Destroyed?"

"Destroyed. These dunes are not ordinary."

"They have always looked all right to me," Candler said.

"Pine trees grow exceedingly fast down by the ocean," Fraser went on.

Brower was silent.

"Within thirty years, there need to be fifty thousand more points for a week's visit on the Georgia coast," Fraser said. "You don't decrease the number of Americans taking a vacation by sealing off a particular land area. Surveys show that seventy-five per cent of Americans prefer beaches to all other places of recreation. I believe in human enjoyment

of beaches, but, of course, the druids think it would be a shame and a crime to have people on this beach—a shame and a crime."

Acres of ducks darkened the swells of the ocean. A wild brown mare and her gray colt stood ankle-deep in a tidal pool. "Sam, why didn't you buy the property I bought?" Fraser said.

"I didn't have enough money," Candler said.

A line of pelicans—nineteen of them—flew south just seaward of the breakers. Pelicans fly single file, and Candler said he could remember them going by in lines a hundred pelicans long. That was in an era that seems to be gone. DDT has got into the bodies of pelicans and eventually into the shells of their eggs, and its effect on the shells is that they come out so thin they crack before chicks are ready to be born. Brower remarked that the pelican is one of the earth's oldest species. He quoted Robinson Jeffers, saying that pelicans "remember the cone that the oldest redwood dropped from." We were nearing the end of the beach, and we could see Florida across the mouth of the St. Mary's River. The pelicans kept going, like flying boxcars, across the river. "They're doomed," Brower said. "Maybe we're lined up behind those pelicans."

Fraser is descended from the Frasers of Inverness and the Bacons of Dorchester, who began their existence in the New World as Puritans of seventeenth-century New England and gradually moved in a southerly direction, establishing Dorchester, Massachusetts; Dorchester, South Carolina; and, eventually, Dorchester, Georgia. The Bacons and the Frasers were on the original roll of the Midway Church Settlement, a seat of Presbyterian enlightenment important in the history of Georgia and the South. The Frasers regularly sent their sons to Edinburgh to be educated. The 1810 census showed the Frasers to be among the ten foremost slaveholders in the state. One distinguished Fraser voted against secession, and another used a slingshot against troops of General Sherman. For two hundred years, the family has had what Fraser calls "substantial amounts of land," and the family's "social antennae" (as he would phrase it) have developed a length and sensitivity commensurate with the family's history and standing. Consequently, nothing makes Fraser sit straighter and tuck his chin in deeper than the assertion—often repeated in gossip—that his acquisition of property on Cumberland Island was something straight out of Chekhov: the capitulation of a fine old family under inexorable pressure from a *nouveau riche* developer.

Having returned to the middle of the island, Fraser stopped at a small graveyard, not by chance. Its walls were made of tabby—lime, sand, and oyster shells—and it was only twenty feet square. Dusk had come and was now heavy, and Brower grew rhapsodic about the penumbral grays, the deep shafts of varied gloom under the high trees. Fraser, meanwhile, was intently pointing to a stone, and there was still enough light to reveal what was written there: "Thomas Morrison Carnegie, born Dunfermline, 1843, died Pittsburgh, 1886." What Fraser wanted us to note was that the Carnegies are comparatively recent immigrants. He referred to them as "upstarts," and said, "I have no patience with them. They have no sense of history. They think the history of the island is the history of their occupancy. They think history began when they arrived. Look there." He was pointing to another stone. The inscription said, "In memory of Catherine Miller, widow of Major General Nathaniel Greene, Commander-in-Chief of the American Revolutionary Army in the Southern Department, 1783, who died November 2, 1814, aged 59

years. She possessed great talents and exalted virtues." "More talents and more virtues than all the Carnegies put together," Fraser said. "Her friend General Lighthorse Harry Lee died here on Cumberland Island. Did you know that, Sam?"

"Yes, I did, Charles."

"The family of my friend Brailsford Nightingale, in Savannah, owned parts of this island when the Carnegies were still herding sheep. The Nightingales have been elegant for more generations than you can count. They are descendants of General Greene. They had subdivided this island and were going to make it a rich man's retreat before the Carnegies had ever heard of it, but the Nightingales were thwarted by history. Reconstruction was a brutal wipeout. And now the Carnegie druids do not wish to share the island with other people. They think only Carnegie eyes are sensitive enough to appreciate the beauties of that beach out there. On any list of America's hundred most selfish families these poor new-rich Carnegies must be placed very high."

On the way in from the beach we had passed another kind of graveyard—a place where at least twenty automobiles and pickup trucks were disintegrating in flakes of rust. It was this scene that had set off Fraser's ridicule and fulminating scorn. Here, he said, was a family posing as conservationists, attempting at this very moment to enlist the support of the federal government in protecting their island with them on it, and this junk heap was their idea of preserving natural beauty. He said he would like to bring a bulldozer to the island and cover the junk up. And he said, "How about your place, Sam? You must have some things up there that need covering up. Could I give you a neighborly hand?"

"I have nothing to hide," Candler said.

"You haven't got anything one day with a bulldozer won't cure."

Fraser's relationship with the Carnegies had not always been as clearly defined as it now appeared to be. The Carnegie heirs were a diffuse group. Most of them spent little or no time on the island. Two or three of them lived there. During early negotiations, the Carnegies' attitudes toward Fraser varied considerably. Then a social event framed the nature of things to come. A few days after Fraser was given the deed to his new lands, one of the Carnegie heirs, a pretty girl in her twenties, was married on Cumberland Island. The groom, a junior executive in Fraser's Sea Pines Plantation Company, had been assigned to the Cumberland Island project and had met his bride there. That should be plot enough for a Deep South Lorca, but there was more: The bride was the author of a Sierra Club book. Fraser arrived for the wedding, as various Carnegies recall the scene, wearing an ascot and carrying an enormous leather map case. They say that he unstrapped his case in the middle of the reception and displayed plats and plans for his new utopia on Cumberland Island. They say he called them idiots not to understand the concept of conservation easements. Moreover, they say, he burped in front of ladies. According to the bride, Fraser "galvanized the Carnegies into unanimity." They united in order to block Fraser in any way possible, most notably by promoting a Cumberland Island National Seashore, with "inholding" or "lifetime-estate" provisions for established residents. The groom, for his part, defected. He quit the Sea Pines Plantation Company, the better to live happily ever after.

And now, by the little graveyard, in the near-darkness, Fraser said to Candler, "Sam, what do you think of that line about the hundred most selfish families? Do you think I can get some mileage out of that? Shall I hone it?"

Candler said, "You don't want to develop that line, Charles. You might spoil it."

"All right, I'll leave it as it is, but did you know that one of the older Carnegie ladies told Stewart Udall that only blooded heirs of Thomas and Lucy Carnegie should ever be allowed to set foot on this island?"

"How do you know that?"

"I was told by someone present. She wagged her finger under Udall's nose and said, 'Only blooded heirs of Thomas and Lucy Carnegie should ever set foot on Cumberland Island.' You know, during all the present talk about National Parks and National Seashores the Carnegies have been keeping something under the table. A few years ago, most of them were in favor of stripmining the beach. The sand is full of ilmenite, zirconium, and rutile. I have no patience with the Carnegies. All they want to do is maximize their dollar, either through the mining industry or through the federal government or by piggybacking on me. Now look at one more headstone."

The inscription said, "Thomas Hutchison, Golf Professional, eldest son of William and Helen H. of St. Andrews, Scotland. Born October 6, 1877. Died December 8, 1900."

"He was surely the first golf pro to be buried in America," Fraser said. "When this property was bought by the Carnegies, there were no golf courses in the United States. A golf club had once been in operation in Charleston and another in Savannah, but they had long since ceased. The oldest continuing golf organization in the United States is St. Andrews of Yonkers. It was built in 1888, and from then to 1900 golf swept the country. Hundreds of courses were built, including one here on Cumberland Island—where we landed in the airplane. The Carnegies brought this young man from St. Andrews, Scotland, and he died here when he was twenty-three."

Fraser had already made something out of his research into the history of golf in the South. He had arranged with the Professional Golfers Association a new hundred-thousand-dollar tournament, to be held at Sea Pines, and to be called the Heritage Classic, because the first golf club in America had been built in South Carolina. The first Heritage Classic was won by Arnold Palmer, and because Palmer had not won a tournament in three years this was major news in the sporting world, and the names of Sea Pines and Hilton Head were publicized throughout the United States. As we stood there in the graveyard on Cumberland Island, I looked at the tombstone and then at Fraser, feeling a kind of awe for his luck. Someday, if he had his way, there would surely be a hundred-thousand-dollar First Pro Classic on the Thomas Hutchison Memorial Golf Course, Cumberland Oaks.

Reflectively, Fraser placed a hand on the tombstone and said, "Druids hate golf. I keep telling them golf was here seventy-five years ago. Dave, you wouldn't mind if I built a little golf course here on Cumberland Island, would you?"

"I suppose not, if you don't take too many trees," Brower said.

"You know I don't take too many trees, Dave," Fraser said. He turned to Candler. "Sam, Dave is going to let us have a golf club here."

"He is?"

"Yes."

"That's damned white of him."

That night, in a place called Greyfield, before a big fireplace that glowed with burning logs and coals of oak, Fraser and Brower spread out on the floor a map of Cumberland Island twelve feet long. Together they crawled around on it, pushing cocktails from one part of the island to another. Antlers hung

above them, and portraits of Carnegies, and a portrait of George Washington, while the skull of a loggerhead turtle, huge and primordially human—or so it seemed—faced them from a cluttered shelf. The map was about twenty years old and bore the names of quick and dead Carnegies—Thomas M. Carnegie, Jr., Florence Carnegie Perkins, Carter C. B. Carnegie, Lucy Ricketson Ferguson, Nancy Carnegie Johnston, Andrew Carnegie II. Greyfield, with high porch and high columns and a need of paint, belonged to Lucy Ferguson's son Rick, who once ran a plastics factory in Jacksonville and was now running Greyfield as an inn for selected guests. Fraser could hardly be said to have been selected, but he was made welcome at Greyfield, and nearly all the inimical things said about him were said behind his back. Meanwhile, on his hands and knees on the big map, a Martini at his fingertips, Brower was saying, "When you get onto a floor with a big map, something happens. You think you're in an airplane."

Fraser said to Brower, "Dave, suppose you owned this island. Suppose you were the dictator and were under no financial pressure whatever. How do you think this island ought to be used in the last thirty years of this century?"

Brower said, "I'd have one feeder point to the beach per mile."

Fraser seemed to levitate, to float above the map. He might have been a skin diver who had just picked up a doubloon. The excitement he felt was almost, but not quite, palpable. Was this the David Brower of Friends of the Earth and the Sierra Club—the sprayer of environmental dragons, the uncompromising defender of wilderness? Fraser's face was a mask. He tucked in his chin and said unflickeringly, "I call them 'beach social points.'"

The conversation was semi-private. Several duck hunters and the odd Carnegie or two moved around it. Beyond the firelit room was long hall, and off this was a small room where Rick Ferguson had set up a self-service bar. He was there, a short man, wiry and strong, in tennis shoes, khaki trousers, an old blue oxford-cloth button-down shirt—the great-grandson of Thomas Carnegie. Ferguson's wife, in a long hostess gown, was with him.

"Cumberland Island is going down the drain," Ferguson said.

"Fraser's drain," said his wife.

"I feel like a man who has just been told his block is up for urban renewal. We seem to be on the sidelines while this big show is going on. All I want to protect here is my children's inheritance."

"We have no rights except what the majority lets us do."

"I was giving Charles the benefit of the doubt once when I called him insensitive. I think his rudeness is an inherent characteristic."

"Charles is over-self-righteous. He thinks he is absolutely right and is doing good—and that is his mistake."

"No one is interested in this island but the family, basically."

Ferguson excused himself and went off to slice a roast of beef.

On the floor in the big room, Brower was learning on his elbows. Fraser was on his knees.

"How many people would you, as dictator, permit on the island July 4, 1980?" Fraser asked.

"I don't know," Brower said. "An answer is needed, but if on the evening I come here I come up with an answer, I'm an ass."

"Ninety per cent of Americans want bedrooms when they are on vacation," Fraser went on. "Ten per cent want to camp with automobiles. Only five per cent of that ten

per cent—or five people in a thousand—want wilderness camping. How many would you permit on this island, and how would you accommodate them?"

"Let's keep Cumberland Island for the five per cent or the ten per cent who want wilderness," Sam Candler said.

"I think I'd recommend the Yosemite formula," Brower said. "Seven square miles of Yosemite bears heavy and concentrated use. The rest is open."

Brower has deep affection for the Yosemite, which is, or was once, the most beautiful valley in the Sierra Nevada. He has spent whole years there, and a great deal of time in or around the valley throughout his life. When he is in the Yosemite, he seems to be packed in nostalgia, and he appears to be unaffected by the valley's peeled-log Levittowns, its tent cities, its bumper-to-bumper traffic, and its newsstands—all results of what has been described as the fatal beauty of Yosemite. In all likelihood, he accepts Yosemite whole because the valley was already urbanized when he was young. And now, on Cumberland Island, he was recommending something similar. "I would cluster all development in one place," he said to Fraser. "People could walk elsewhere. Walking on the beach is the most important thing a person can do here. If you were going to develop just one spot on the entire island, where would that be?"

"To be very explicit, my tract has tremendous diversity," Fraser said. "I have Whitney Lake, the Scotch fort, the marching dunes. But we're pretending you're the dictator. The island as a whole is twenty miles long. How many people can your area of concentration absorb?"

"You mean at night?"

"Yes, at night."

"They do have to be there at night," Brower mused. "People will want to see what the sky is saying. It's their last contact with Mother Earth."

"How many people?" Fraser said again.

"It's their last chance to listen to the sun and the moon."

"How many people?"

Brower shrugged. He said, finally, "I wouldn't mind having a population of twenty thousand here."

"Twenty thousand?"

"Twenty thousand."

Brower got up and went in to make himself another drink. When he came back, he and Fraser agreed that if a National Park or Seashore could surround Fraser's place on Cumberland Island, that would be very good. Brower said that what worried him was that if Fraser were to go ahead and develop his land without some such federal protection of the rest of the island, the value of the remaining properties would rise so sharply that the neighbors might have to let the land go to less capable developers. Fraser said that worried him, too.

"Whatever happens to this island, the automobile should be ruled out," Brower went on.

"I agree," said Fraser.

"No tourist vehicles. No bridge. No private automobiles or other vehicles on the beach."

"I agree."

"How would you get people around?"

"Perhaps jeep trains."

"How would you bring in food and services?"

"In sky vans—mini flying boxcars."

"Whatever you do, don't give the island to Detroit, Zermatt is carless. Stehekin, in the state of Washington, is carless. It is good conservation practice, if you are going to develop, to concentrate people and leave wild land around them. People need earning territory—territory they have to earn by walking, limping, crawling, or whatever they can do. With that around them, the concentrated area is

important, and I wouldn't mind so many people. Not at all. When you get out of the city, you hear the planet talk, and here it is talking. If the dunes want to march, they ought to march. I know how you feel, but the land itself should not be controlled."

"The Brower Plan is economically sound," Fraser said. "I could live within the constraints imposed by the Brower dictatorship. As the island is now, birds enjoy it but nobody's swimming here. Nobody's in the woods. There are no people. The island's stable population is eleven. That comes to one person per mile and three-quarters of beach."

Rick Ferguson had come into the room to say the roast beef was ready. "One person per mile and three-quarters of beach is just about right," he said.

"Why do you think the family have kept it this way?" said Mrs. Ferguson. "Because they feel so strongly."

"If you can keep it the way it is, fine," Brower told her. "But I don't think that is one of your choices."

Not long after Fraser acquired his property on Cumberland Island, he established a public campsite there. He admitted privately that he had several motives. For one thing, it was a way to acquaint the public with the island. For another, it would set a precedent for public use of the island at a fee. Finally, and most ingeniously, it would put Stewart Udall in a position where he might have to criticize camping—for Udall had been employed by the Carnegies as a conservation consultant, or, as Fraser insisted on putting it, as "a hired mudslinger." Udall said of Fraser, "I want to push Charlie into a corner where he has to face the truth. He is good news as a developer and bad news for Cumberland Island. He is not interested in having a reputation as a spoiler, but he can't have it both ways. He tries to incorporate conservation with economic development, but it doesn't work."

One motive Fraser emphatically did not have for establishing his campsite was a desire to camp on Cumberland Island himself. Fraser is not in any sense a woodsman or a man of the outdoors, as he will acknowledge without shame. Nonetheless, under urging from Brower and from me, he had agreed to sleep in his own campsite. And now, after dinner at Greyfield, the three of us went out into the black, cold night and headed for the campsite, which Brower was eager to see. After we had gone some distance through the woods, Fraser said, "I'm most happy to go along with this, but, frankly, you are taking me out of my element."

It would be difficult to say whose element the campsite was. It consisted of fifteen so-called recreation vehicles—tent-covered, two-wheeled automobile trailers, with electric lights, electric heat, and four-burner gas stoves. A central toilet facility had hot showers, an ice machine, and a cedarshake roof in the Sea Pines manner. Fraser said he believed in "use," and that this was a good way to start. He said he planned to build a small store at the campsite and, eventually, to rent jeeps by the day. Meanwhile, he was charging five dollars a night for the mobile tents—loss leaders if ever there were any, for they cost him fifteen hundred dollars apiece.

Two of the vehicles had been set up for us, and they faced each other, like canvas tourist cabins, across an area filled with palmettos and cast-iron grills that were mounted on galvanized pipes. Brower went into one tent and Fraser and I into the other. While we were unrolling our sleeping bags, Fraser said, "Very interesting, his views. They're so different from what I thought they would be." Spreading out the contents of a briefcase on a Formica-topped table, Fraser looked

through them. Then he got out a pen and began to read and make marginalia. He read an article in the *Yale Law Journal* on large lot zoning; he read a piece from the Beirut *Daily Star* on a new kind of sewage-disposal system; and in an issue of *American Forests* he read something called "The Destiny of Conservation Depends Upon Truth." "At the moment, I am rather aggravated about the distrust of statements made by certain druids," he commented. "But Dave is not a druid—not the way he was talking. Arthur D. Little would get ninety thousand dollars for the consultancy Dave did tonight." For morning, Fraser set aside a copy of *Audubon Magazine*, a book called "Land, People, and Policy," and the first draft of a prospectus for the first public issue of stock in his company. He shut off the light. "The highest and best use of this island is for children," he said as he was settling to sleep. "I believe, however, that the struggle here is too complicated, and therefore hopeless, and that no reasonable development will ever go on here."

Brower called out from across the palmettos, "Good night, and sleep well if your conscience is good."

Fraser called back, "My conscience is always bad, and I always sleep very well. Good night."

"Good night."

Sleep was not all that easy, in part because the bunks folded out and were cantilevered from either end of the mobile unit. Fraser and I were balanced on a kind of rubber-tired seesaw. Every time he rolled to his right, I went up a little, and every time he rolled to his left I went down. I lay there long into the night thinking mainly about the peculiar pattern of the relationship developing between him and Brower.

A beach is for children, Fraser had said. I didn't think he was just groping for a key to a bank vault. I had seen savings of various kinds all over Sea Pines Plantation—swings hanging from the eaves of covered walkways, swings hanging from the limbs of trees. He had bought tricycles and scattered them around. He had strung hammocks at the height of children. Walking among the fresh foundations of his new town, he had once said to me, "Landscape architects won't hang swings. They say swings are not a strong enough design statement. I'll wait until the landscape architects are finished, and then I'll hang a hundred swings from the live oaks. I'll have a vender selling watermelon, too—roasted oysters in the winter, ice-cold slices of watermelon in the summer." Fraser and his wife, Mary, lived in a glass-and-cypress Sea Pines house. Gardeners took care of the environment. The Frasers had two daughters, aged four and two. The Frasers believed that the direction of a life was established almost at the beginning—that no years were as telling as the earliest ones. Hence, among other things, the Montessori School (where Mary Fraser worked) and the swings all over the plantation.

Brower was reverent toward the young. His faith had told him that the young would do better with the earth. He did not associate lumber companies, motor companies, chemical companies, or mining companies with youth. He admired Young Turks while he attacked Old Philistines. By his ready admission, he had learned a great deal from his two children, all of whom were college age or older. Brower himself looked almost unnaturally young, his white hair notwithstanding. He sometimes seemed to trust young people's judgment over his own. He often said, "I'm impressed with what young people can do before older people tell them it's impossible." Any number of times since we had come to Cumberland Island, he had commented on the youth of Charles Fraser.

"I didn't know he was so young. . . . What energy! I didn't expect so young a man."

Out through a picket fence and down a deeply shaded street Fraser, as a boy, had walked every day to school. He was blond then, and had curly hair. His mother and father used to buy athletic equipment for him, but he would give it all away and sit on the porch reading books while his friends—endangering the camellias—played football or baseball on his family's lawn. His family owned nearly half of Hinesville. Their house had been the first in Liberty County to have running water, inside toilets, and two pianos. The land for the First Presbyterian Church had been a gift from his grandmother. His father had been moderator of the Presbyterian Church of the State of Georgia and president of the Men of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America. The church was the Frasers' locus of being. "Holy, holy, holy," Fraser had chanted one day at Hilton Head, waving his hands like a choir leader as he revealed these credentials. "As a Calvinist, I was told that you're not supposed to do all the pleasurable things in life. But eventually I realized that I would be part of the elect no matter what sins I might commit." He said that at the age of thirteen he had been a newspaper entrepreneur. Under his ironclad managerial control, his entire Boy Scout troop sold papers. He fished the creeks, hunted squirrels, collected buckeyes. He became the first Eagle Scout in the history of Liberty County. Now the executives of the Sea Pines Plantation Company included a high proportion of former Eagle Scouts. On the Sea Pines boardroom wall was a life-size portrait of Fraser's father, in uniform, and beside this portrait stood two flags—a United States flag and the three-star flag of a lieutenant general. General Fraser commanded the first ground troops to land on New Guinea. He went into France with Patton. Charles Fraser, at the age of ten, had been quite relieved when his father's unit was converted from cavalry to anti-aircraft. Charles hated horses and did not want to ride them. His interests were elsewhere. In becoming an Eagle Scout, he won merit badges in birds, reptiles, conservation. He loved beautiful objects and had a gift for design. He painted his family's coat of arms on a mug, applying the paint with toothpicks. His brother, Joe, was an athlete. Liberty was a coastal county, and one thing Charles particularly liked to do was to go to the beaches and build castles in the sand.

Fraser's mother-in-law, before she became that, used to send newspaper clippings about him and his plantation to her daughter wherever she might be—at Stephens College, in Columbia, Missouri, for example, or later, in Washington, D.C., where she worked for Senator Thurmond. "Mary's mother is a very sensible Southern mother, who knows that her daughter's standard of living depends on her husband's income," Fraser once explained. "Mary was accustomed to a very elegant standard. She had a Cadillac to drive to school when she was sixteen—and that was just the leftover car around the place." Mary, in her college days, had not so much as met him. He was twelve years older than she, and he lived two hundred miles from Greenville, her home town. Nonetheless, she dutifully read and saved the clippings. Eventually, she would more or less save Fraser. Small details not being his forte, she had assumed responsibility for looking after them. He forgot everything—his money, his briefcase, his topcoat, his whereabouts. He lost every hat he ever owned. "Hats are a nuisance and an absurdity," he complained. He was not absentminded, his wife decided. He was simply not interested in petty detail. He read all the time. He read walking upstairs, he read until his food was cold, and he rigged up extra

lights in the car so he could read while she drove. He forgot his raincoat but remembered facts. Three minutes after he walked into a room, it was a shambles. "Have you read this? What did you think of it? What do you think about that?" Newspapers hit the floor. Sixteen books came off the shelves. "Charles says there is so little time, and never a convenient time for anything, so if you want to do something you have to just do it," Mary once said. "He applies this to a trip to Europe, to conceiving a child—to anything." Mary, dark-haired, dark-eyed, slender, was collaterally descended from a family named Lawton that once grew cotton on Hilton Head Island—in fact, on the site of Sea Pines Plantation. When Fraser's archival researches yielded this fragment, he was most pleased. He and Mary began to refer to it as "the heritage." He would talk about it with a detached grin, but he was obviously happy that he had something like that to be detached about. "The Lawtons were planters," he liked to say, invoking images of antebellum wealth and antebellum elegance. He once introduced his four-year-old daughter, Laura Lawton, to a stranger.

"Hello, Laura," said the stranger.

"It will have to be Laura Lawton, I'm afraid," said Fraser. "Laura Lawton, say 'My great-great-great-great-grand-daddy planted cotton here.'"

In an office at the University of California Press, in 1941, Anne Hus had demonstrated to David Brower that she could lean over and pick a newspaper off the floor with her teeth. She wondered if he could do the same. They shared the office. Both were editors, working on what she called "rewarmed dissertations with the scaffolding taken out." He said stiffly, about the newspaper stunt, that one does not do that sort of thing in an office, and he refused to try. Brower as an editor made her jealous. "He was so much better than I. I have never understood where he got his feel for words. He is a great editor. He liberates what is good in an author's work. It just infuriates me that anyone who has read so little can do that. I have been reading since I was four. He has never read anything. He hasn't read novels. He knows very little about English literature. Yet he has a remarkable sense of language." Anne had been born in Oakland. Her father was a man who failed at so many jobs that he said he should go into undertaking in order to prolong human life. Her grandfather John P. Irish, editor and politician, was the man who was debating with William Jennings Bryan when Bryan said, "You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold." Brower was in the 10th Mountain Division when, in 1943, he proposed to Anne by mail. Before he went overseas, they lived in Colorado for a time, and then in West Virginia, where Brower taught climbing to the mountain troops, on the Seneca Rocks. He spent so much time on bivouac that she despaired and went to Washington, where she edited combat narratives for Army Intelligence. Later, she went back to the University of California. She was still an editor there when I met her, in 1969. A gentle person, she seemed almost complacent—an impression that belied her sharpness of ear and eye. I remembered her telling him once, "I never see people I'd rather be married to than you—especially in National Parks." Brower obviously needed her guidance. Away from her, he could scarcely pass a phone booth without getting into it and calling her. At the Press, in their early days, he had dropped from sight now and again and gone off to the Sierra Nevada. After he had been doing this for a while, she told him he was getting away with murder. Leaning over, he picked a newspaper off the floor with his teeth and said he had to practice somewhere. He asked her to go with him

to the mountains. She loved the sea and didn't like the mountains. "Edna Ferber said mountains were beautiful but dumb, and that is how I felt, too. Finally, I went on a Sierra Club trip just to fill in. To get through it, I took a bottle, and took nips. After three days, I really loved the trip—such incredible country. Until you've seen him up there, you don't know him."

I thought of Brower in the Sierra Nevada, in the Valley of the Mineral King. To conservationists, the Mineral King had become an Agincourt, a Saratoga, an El Alamein. Walt Disney Productions wanted to string the slopes with lifts and build enough hotels there to draw a million people a year. Mineral King had been mentioned as an excellent setting for the Winter Olympics of 1976, celebrating the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the nation. Brower and I went to Mineral King together. My impression was that—all other considerations aside—it was an extraordinary good site for a skiing resort. A stream ran through the middle of the valley, and if you stood beside it and looked up and around you saw eleven conical peaks, the points of a granite coronet. The steep slopes of these mountains were covered with red fir, juniper, aspen, and foxtail pine. Great rising swaths were treeless and meadowed. Hannes Schneider had called it the best potential ski area in California. So much snow had been there the winter before that avalanches had sheared off many hundreds of trees twenty feet above the ground—the snow was that deep. The avalanches had been so powerful that they had not stopped at the bottom of the valley but had climbed the other side, smashing trees. In the geological history of the Sierra Nevada, Mineral King was an old valley. The Sierra Nevada had been a minor mountain range of about four thousand feet when it began the great upheaval that made it higher than the Rockies. New streams cut through the new uplift and created valleys like the Yosemite, with wide, flat floors and sheer walls. The Mineral King was lifted with the mountains and remained intact, a V-shaped valley—alpine, ancestral—and it caught snow like nothing else in a mountain range that was named for the snow that fell there. Brower had done a ski survey of Mineral King once, long ago, and had said that he favored limited development. He said now that he essentially felt the same way. Sitting under a big cottonwood with his feet in the stream, he pointed out that the valley was, for one thing, not wilderness. A road reached into it. A couple of dozen buildings were there, a sawmill, and corrals belonging to a pack station. Listening to him, a surprised conservationist might have thought that the Antichrist had come to the Mineral King disguised as David Brower. But to the Disney interests Brower would not have seemed like much of an advocate. Looking around at the Mineral King peaks, he decided that although he was for limited development, he was against ski lifts. He said he preferred to see people earn their ski runs by climbing with skins attached to their skis. Moreover, he was against improvement of the existing access road, an incredibly twisting cliff-hanger so narrow and serpentine that a million people trying to use it would grow old before they reached the valley. Brower said Disney Productions should build a hundred-million-dollar tunnel, or fly people in—save the approaching mountains, hang the cost. Told he was being almost poetically impractical, Brower responded that the Disney people were going to change something forever, so they could amortize the changes over a thousand years.

Fraser rolled over and sighed in his sleep. I wondered if in the day to follow he would find that Brower's apparent tolerance for the development of Cumberland Island was

equally tied in string. He sighed again. Possibly he was dreaming of Badische Anilin- & Soda-Fabrik Aktiengesellschaft, a name, of all names, that haunted him. Fraser was hoist on a most ironic petard. Badische Anilin- & Soda-Fabrik Aktiengesellschaft, known as BASF, was a company that made, among other things, petrochemicals and dyes for the textile and furniture industries, and not long before they had decided to expand beyond Ludwigshafen and into the American South. They searched in several states for a site for a new plant. There were plenty of possibilities. What in the end attracted the Germans most in all the South was Sea Pines Plantation. German chemical kings apparently liked golf and the good life, too. They had found a plant site on Victoria Bluff, three miles from Hilton Head Island. Air and water pollution would surely follow. Fraser, meanwhile, had become the unlikely leader of a battalion of druids, whose war cry was "BASF—Bad Air, Sick Fish!" Ultimately, Fraser and his druids would drive the Germans away, but he had learned that even in the beauty of Sea Pines Plantation there could be something fatal.

One night of camping out, even in a fifteen-hundred-dollar mobile tent, was quite enough for Fraser, and the following evening we transferred our gear to a motorship called the Intrepid, which had slipped quietly down the coast from Hilton Head and into the Cumberland River. The size of Fraser's yacht was proportionate to his distaste for wilderness. The yacht was ninety feet long. It contained five staterooms and a floor-through saloon. Its bar was stocked with Tanqueray gin. Fraser's Southern antennae had reached out unobtrusively, suprasocially, and their research had shown that Tanqueray is Brower's gin of gins. With the moral support of a friendly doctor, Brower once used gin as his principal weapon in humbling a stomach ulcer, and he was so successful that he has ever since been a friend of the preventive Martini. With something beatific in his eyes, he ritually asks for "a Martini with Tanqueray gin, straight up with nothing in it." Lemon, he feels, changes the taste, while only a madman would accept an olive, for an olive displaces two cubic centimeters of gin. It had been a long, full day on the island, and Brower now settled back with a drink innocent of additives and watched the sun fall behind the Georgia mainland. Fraser sipped bourbon and Calvinistically worked on his stock prospectus—for several hundred thousand shares of something he was calling Recreational Environments, Inc., at twenty-five dollars a share. He needed money for expansion—not only to Cumberland Island but to half a dozen other places he was interested in, from North Carolina to Hawaii. He had just bought six miles of beautiful and undeveloped white beach under coconut palms on the east coast of Puerto Rico, and only the week before he had gone as far as Kuwait looking for funds. "I'm just an oyster catcher from South Carolina begging for money," he said, moving a blue pencil over the prospectus. "A million dollars. A million dollars. Can you spare a million dollars?"

"Look at that sun on that smog!" Brower said. Shining low through the air over the paper-mill country, the sun tended to embarrass Georgia. It appeared to be setting in black-bean gumbo. "American industry never asked my permission to shorten my life," Brower went on. "They have taken two years off my life and will take seven years off my children's. These are figures I can't support, but I believe them."

"Let's put a paper mill over here on Cumberland Island and get the smell away from the cities," Fraser said, looking at Sam Candler, who went on looking at the sunset.

"Whatever their economy is, they haven't

paid for the people's air," Brower said. "They should be given six months to clean up or go out of business. Roll, you earth. I swear the sunset is slower than the sunrise."

On the beach at six-fifty-seven that morning, we had watched the sun jump into the clear sea air like a rubber ball released from a hand below the ocean's surface. Fraser, over breakfast, read an article called "The Dying Marsh" in *Audubon Magazine*, and throughout the day he pelted Brower with sachets and nosegays. Hurling along a narrow, curving sand road through the forest, Fraser said, "We'll call this the David Brower Scenic Drive." And later, approaching an attractive swamp, he said, "We'll call this the David Brower Wildlife Sanctuary and Woodland Recreation Area." In a small skiff on a tidal creek, Fraser stood in the bow like George Washington and spoke what were apparently the first words of a press release he was forming in his mind: "Charles Fraser announced today the results of a detailed study for the use of Cumberland Island." Sam Candler had one hand on the skiff's tiller and with the other he was bailing. Flights of ducks passed overhead. The tide was low. Using a small anchor as a kind of oyster rake, Fraser knocked hundreds of oysters loose from an exposed bed. He was clearly feeling very good. On the beach, he drove at fifty-five miles an hour and said gleefully that he had decided to name his new development the Cumberland Island Conservation Association.

Brower was feeling good, too—obviously enjoying himself on the island. Why he did not rise up and clout Fraser, verbally, seemed a little odd to me, but I had seen him before in situations where he was getting the sense and feel of something, and while his mind was working toward a settled attitude he had vacillated or lapsed into an uncharacteristic passivity. In the North Cascades, he had known where he was. He had been there before, and had fought for the wilderness there. He had never before set foot on Cumberland Island. Fraser, ebullient, was finding Brower so docile that he wouldn't even call him a druid, and in a sense Fraser was right, for the rote behavior of an ordinary member of the priesthood should be simple to predict. This, however, was—as Fraser apparently did not grasp—no ordinary member of the priesthood. This was the inscrutable lord of the forest, the sacramentarian of *ecologia americana*, the Archdruid himself. Fraser's difficulties with druids were anything but over.

Lacking a target in the invisible Brower, Fraser eventually attacked Candler. Candler, whose original intention had been merely to help show Brower around the island, had tried to hold off from saying much, but now there was a gun-fusillade argument.

"Sam, you just don't want people on this beach, do you?" Fraser said.

"I didn't say that," Candler said.

"A man has no more right to personal private property on a beach than he has to a highway, an Army camp, a railroad, a school, a hospital, an airport, a valley to be flooded for a dam. A fundamental part of the pursuit of happiness is one's annual vacation. Hence this beach is for a public purpose."

"Your purpose. I'm happy to have people use the island now, if they make the effort to get over here and to enjoy it."

We happened to be at the southern boundary of Fraser's proposed development. Fraser said that a National Seashore should begin just there and extend all the way to the southern tip of the island—about fifteen miles—and that the north end, above his property, should become "an environmental-protection zone." The development, he promised, would include nothing that would pollute the environment.

"What would it have?" Candler asked.

"Houses, a marina, an airport, a store."

"That is not my idea of conservation."

"Tell me, Sam, which Carnegies will break ranks and sell out next?"

No answer.

"How many Carnegies will rub their hands with glee when prices go up because of development?"

No answer.

"Those snobs—high on the list of the hundred most selfish families."

"I'd like to make a list of island destroyers," Candler said.

Fraser said, "The government has a perfect right to condemn my land here if it thinks its use is wiser than mine."

It emerged that a Cumberland Island Conservation Association already existed.

"Name all organizations that exist on the island," Fraser said.

"What do you mean?" Candler asked him.

"Every time I pick up a paper, I read about another organization."

"You mean like your Cumberland Island Holding Company?"

"Name another one."

"The Cumberland Island Conservation Association is the only one I know about," Candler said.

"Is it incorporated?"

"I believe so."

"You believe so?"

"Yes."

"Who is the president of the Cumberland Island Conservation Association?"

"I am."

"Is it incorporated?"

"I'm not real sure."

"The light is nice on the water there," Brower said. "The light is getting good."

Brower and Fraser climbed a high dune. Candler stayed on the beach. From the dune, he appeared a lonely figure—the only person on twenty miles of white sand. "People develop passionate attachments to these islands, and any change from the way they have known them since childhood is emotionally disturbing to them," Fraser said. "It's a jolt to them to have any of their property used by strangers."

One afternoon in Atlanta, Candler had told me what Cumberland Island meant to him. "Changes come slowly there, and leave marks on one another," he said. "There is a blending from one era to the next. Indian mounds are there. When I am on Cumberland Island, I see the same things the Indians saw. I would like to live where the Indians lived. They were closer to the earth, a part of the environment. Fraser said that after the hurricane there were no sea oats on Cumberland. The island teaches you the value of patience. The sea oats came back. Dunes that are washed down will return. You've got to have some places that are hard to get to. I don't think this is a selfish thought. I think it's thoughtful."

Fraser, for his part, had told me that nothing would please him more than to develop his property in consonance with a National Seashore that would take up the rest of the island. In fact, he would be hesitant—even unlikely—to develop his land without knowing what might happen around it. Another Sea Pines freshly rising among the live oaks could so enhance the value of the island as a whole that the Carnegies and Candler might find irresistible the offers of tucktail developers. There was so much of Cumberland that, even for a man of Fraser's resources, protective buying was out of the question. So he dreamed of a beautiful enclave in various shades of income, with forever-protected wildernesses stretching away from either side and rationed quantities of the public wandering the great beach.

Now, on the dune, Broker and Fraser—Columbus and Cortez—stood high above the

wild and pristine seascape. Fraser said, "I think it is wise public policy for the government to take a place like this from private owners. Don't you agree?"

"Yes."

Candler, who had moved farther down the beach, was an even smaller figure. From the dune, he could be framed between a thumb and forefinger a quarter inch apart. His hands were in his pockets.

"I would like to reverse my ninety-ten here," Brower said. "I would like to see ten per cent developed here and ninety not."

Fraser said, "I hope that can be arranged."

Oysters on the half shell, when they are as fresh as the ones we ate for lunch that day, are so shining and translucent, so nearly transparent, that if you were to drop one on a printed page you could read words through the oyster. I had lived beside tidal creeks at various times in the past, and had once set up my own amateur oyster farm, from which I regularly removed a hundred and forty-four oysters each day to eat before lunch, but even the memory of my oyster farm was turned slightly opaque by the quality of the oysters from Candler's tidal creek. Mantle to palpi, each vitrescent blob was a textural wonder. We ate at least five hundred of them, raw or roasted (over an oak fire)—*Ostrea virginica*, better than the best oysters of Bordeaux, and, as it happened, long-range appetizers to the roasted game hens that were spread before us that evening on Fraser's yacht.

On the yacht, Brower held up his glass and studied the prismatic coupling of gin and light. He then looked off into the rouge afterglow over the marshes to the west. "The outdoor life is all right," he said. "But don't knock the amenities." Pale wines escorted the game hens, and brotherhood bobbed on the water with the yacht, while the dark mass of Cumberland Island stood beside the boat with what Joseph Conrad once described as "the stillness of an implacable force brooding over an inscrutable intention." No one was looking at the island. On a color-television set inside the yacht, the San Francisco 49ers were bombing the Baltimore Colts. Brower said, "Long live the instant playback—the nicest thing technology has given us!"

"We will create a conservation conference center here on the island," Fraser said.

"That will require an airport," said Brower. "I'm Machiavellian enough to know that if you are going to have a conference center you have to have a way to get there."

"We'll let druids land free," Fraser said. "If you were dictator, what would you do with that marsh?"

"Save it! Save the greenery! I can make noise, but you can make deeds," Brower said. "Save the marsh! Grasses are one of the nicest ways the green thing works. The green giant is chlorophyll, really. When I come back in another life, I am going to spend my whole life in grasses. I'm addicted to the entire planet. I don't want to leave it. I want to get down into it. I want to say hello. On the beach, I could have stopped all day long and looked at those damned shells, looked for all the messages that come not in bottles but in shells. Life began Tuesday noon, and the beautiful organic wholeness of it developed over the next four days. At three minutes before midnight, man appeared. At one-fourth of a second before midnight, Christ arrived. At one-fortieth of a second before midnight, the Industrial Revolution began. You, Charles Fraser, have got to persuade the whole damned movement of realtors to have a different kind of responsibility to man than they have. If they don't, God will say that man should be thrown away as an experiment that didn't work. I have seen

evidence of what you can do. Now make others do it. The system must be used to reform the system."

Fraser had been listening with his hands clasped behind his head. When Brower finished, Fraser said nothing, and sipped his wine.

In the early morning, in the yacht's saloon, Brower performed his matins. He spilled out and sorted the contents of his briefcase—an old and thick one, jammed with books, notebooks, magazine, clippings—and he read for an hour or so, as if to put himself in context. He read a Sierra Club tract called "Machiasport: Oil and the Maine Coast." He read a copy of a letter from Earl Bell, the planner, to Senator Henry M. Jackson, asking how the island Amchitka could still be called a National Wildlife Refuge since it had become a military missile dump, a military garbage dump, and a site for atomic testing. Simultaneously, Brower made cryptic notes for a talk he would give at Harvard: "Loop the system . . . Ravisher of the Month . . . SST . . . Signs . . . Dams . . . Sawlogs." Reading on, he piled up newsclips on the table before him: "JOIN POLLUTION FIGHT, NATO TOLD," "BP OIL ESTIMATES ALASKA TRACT AT FIVE BILLION BARRELS," "DROWNING AN ECOLOGICAL PARADISE," "CAN ANYONE RUN A CITY?" "PLANNER URGES TWO-CHILD LIMIT," "SLOW DOWN THE OIL RUSH," "BAN ON ABORTION STRUCK DOWN," "THE MAZE OF HAZE THAT SPOILS OUR DAYS," "WE ARE SUBVERSIVES IN THE STATE OF NATURE," "NORTHWEST PASSAGE TO WHAT?" He had heretical material, too: "ALARMISTS IGNORE THE FACTS," "MAN MUST CONTROL NATURE," "THE POPULATION FIRECRACKER" (William Buckley arguing that there is no population explosion), and an editorial from the *New Scientist* mocking the excessive excitability, and the platitudes and dogmas of "ecological high priests." Brower next examined a dummy for a conservation newsletter to be called the *National Hammer*, an article from the *Stanford Law Review* called "The SST: From Watts to Harlem in Two Hours," and a list of proposals—to him as publisher—for a series of *Suppose We Didn't* books, on things that would be best left undeveloped: the SST, the oil refinery in Machiasport, the Alaska pipeline, the sea-level canal through Central America. He read the Leopold Report ("Land drainage . . . will destroy inexorably the South Florida ecosystem") and an article from *Trial* called "Can Law Reclaim Man's Environment?" Finally, he read a piece on architectural ravages in New York City's West Village, and he waved in the air a *Business Week* article—"The War That Business Must Win"—and said, "Here is the first faint streak of dawn coming up over the business world. They are at last finding out that environment is not only to sell."

From below, Fraser appeared, dressed in a dark suit and tie. After breakfast, he was going to leave Cumberland Island in order to do battle with druids in other parts of the South. The rest of us would stay on for a while. Fraser clearly felt that Cumberland was safe, for the moment. In the Land Rover, he drove to the primitive airstrip. The same small plane was waiting in the field of fennel. Fraser walked confidently away from an atmosphere of cordial farewells and climbed into the plane. The pilot advanced the engines to maximum r.p.m. Four wild horses slowly walked off the runway. The plane raced through the fennel and into the air. Watching it rise and turn, Brower said softly, "What makes Sammy run in the South?"

We got into Candler's jeep and spent the day slowly reviewing the island. At Candler's speed—ten to twenty miles per hour—details came into focus that, at Fraser's speed, had previously tended to blur. The jeep, for one

thing, was open, and we felt the island around us in a way that we had not in Fraser's Land Rover, which was closed in. "You can't see the whole island anyway—it's too big—so you might as well enjoy what you can see," said Candler. "Going along in Fraser's Land Rover was like going over Niagara Falls in a barrel."

"I've never run into anybody quite like that," Brower said.

"Are you sorry or glad that he developed Hilton Head Island?"

"I don't know. I think probably I'm not glad. I'd rather have more wilderness on the coast than there is. But if it had to be developed, I'm glad it was developed by him."

As we moved along, deer walked across the road in front of us. Candler showed us a place where he had often found arrowheads at low tide and a place where we picked wild grapefruit. We went to the south end of the island, which was ribbed with hummocks and was full of freshwater ponds and tall magnolias. A jetty there had been built ninety years ago at what was then the southernmost point of the island. The jetty was now at least two thousand feet inland from the southern shore. Land had simultaneously been eroding from the north end. Cumberland Island was gradually migrating to Florida, and had already crossed the state line. A sonic boom hit us with a report so loud that Brower staggered as if he had been shot, and tens of thousands of birds—oyster catchers, pelicans, sandpipers, gulls—rose screaming into the air between the Cumberland shore and the Florida mainland. They stayed up there, flapped in panic, for ten minutes, clouds and clouds of shrieking birds. Candler showed us where he had once dug into a mound and found a skeleton in a sitting position, and he told us how as a boy he used to play with muzzled alligators. We visited a tame buzzard at Lucy Ferguson's place, where a rusting automobile engine hung from a tree and no one but the buzzard was home. The buzzard's eyes glittered like the running lights of an airplane. The buzzard nibbled at Brower's basketball shoes. Brower stroked the bird and talked gently to it. The buzzard nibbled at his fingers and draped a talon over his hand. We saw blue herons, bluebills, and egrets in the marshes, and cacti hanging like strings of sausages from live oaks in the woods. At Candler's place, we ate a foot-high pile of shrimp from the tidal creek—under a big kitchen clock on which red lettering said, "Things Go Better With Coke." Shrimp, like oysters, are as transparent as clear gelatine when they come out of the creek. On the beach, Candler noticed the remains of a loggerhead turtle, its back as large as a steamer trunk. It had been there for days, but we, whipping by, had not seen it before. We saw wild pigs in the tidal marshes eating seafood, and a flight of seventy cormorants, in imprecise formation, passing overhead.

"What are they trying to spell to us?" Brower said.

"Pepsi-Cola," said Candler.

As far as I could see, though, the message in the sky over Cumberland Island was "Finis." We drove up a marching dune and snowplowed down the other side, leaving fresh tracks in the powdery white sand. The wind would cover them. But how many tracks could the wind cover? Since early morning—in fact, for three days—we had roamed an island bigger than Manhattan and had seen no one on its beach and, except at Candler's place and Greyfield, no one in its interior woodlands. In the late twentieth century, in this part of the world, such an experience was unbelievable. The island was a beautiful and fragile anachronism. We were, as Candler had said, seeing what the Indians saw, and it was not at all difficult to understand why he wanted to "live where the Indians lived . . . closer to the earth, a part of the environment." We, too, had eaten from the

tidal creeks and had gone where and how we pleased—a privilege made possible in our time by private ownership. That was the irony of Cumberland Island and the index of its fate. The island was worth nothing when the Muskogean Creeks lived and fished there. Now it was worth at least ten million dollars, a figure that could swell beyond recognition. Need, temptation, and realistic taxes would eventually wrest the island from its present owners. They would not be able to afford it. The question whether it was right for a few individuals to own twenty miles of beach had already been bypassed by these inexorable facts of economics.

Actually, the resolution was to arrive swiftly. In months to come, druids in massed phalanx were to create so many pressures—social, political, financial—and so much ecological propaganda that Fraser would give up his Cumberland territory, selling Cumberland Oaks to the National Park Foundation. Money for the purchase was to be made available to the Park Service by the Andrew Mellon Foundation, with enough left over to acquire the rest of the island from the other owners. Thus Fraser, in his coming and going, was in the end to be the catalyst that converted Cumberland Island from a private enclave to a national reserve. The other owners, as Brower had said, were without choice, really. They would have preferred to keep the island the way it was—and no wonder. It was Earth in something close to its original state. The alternatives—private development, public park—came nowhere near that, and never would. In the battle for Cumberland Island, there could be human winners here or there, but—no matter what might happen—there could be no victory for Cumberland Island. The Frasers of the world might create their blended landscapes, the Park Service its Yosemites. Either way, or both ways, no one was ever to be as free on that wild beach in the future as we had been that day.

SCHOOL AID

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge today that most, if not all, of the 18,000 school districts in the Nation face a constant financial crisis. The soaring cost of elementary and secondary education has put an almost unbearable squeeze on everyone, the taxpayer and the taxing body. There is overwhelming evidence that expenditures for education, whether on the local, State, or Federal level, have been improperly distributed. School districts which most need additional financial help are denied it.

I have cosponsored a bill I feel will solve the dilemma. In brief, I am proposing the Federal Government assume, over a 3-year period, one-third of the cost of elementary and secondary education in the Nation. It would boost the present level of Federal contribution from 6 percent to 33 1/3 percent and, I believe, thereby save our educational system from total collapse.

Throughout most of the Nation the elementary and secondary education programs receive the most support from the local level. The majority of these local

funds come from a tax on an individual's real property. Therefore, it is this taxpayer who has been literally clobbered by soaring taxation, with the school tax carrying the knockout punch.

In my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, there is no question the school tax is the worst of all tax villains. It takes the biggest bite from the family budget, and the situation has reached the point where talk of a tax revolt no longer is dismissed as an idle threat. People are angry. They have been forced to cut down on family needs just to meet their tax obligations. They have been forced to sell home and property to escape the school tax club. The seeds of discontent have been sown and watered over the years and now are reaching their maturity. Open rebellion against additional taxation is a very real threat.

Similarly, the governmental bodies charged with the responsibility of providing funds to support education find themselves caught in the same squeeze. They are faced with the prospect of either curtailing educational programs, cutting services, laying off teachers, or face the anger of the taxpaying public by asking even higher tax rates.

Personally, I would like to see the school tax abolished completely. I have been studying such a possibility for more than a year now but the problem is most complex. Any solution is complicated by the fact there are various tax structures within our 50 States, and what might work in Pennsylvania would not necessarily work in a sister State.

I believe it is essential the Federal Government move to bolster the Nation's shaky educational system and correct the glaring deficiencies and discrepancies. For example, the inequities of expenditures for elementary and secondary education as compared to what is spent for higher education is staggering. Last year the cost difference was \$2,100 for a college student and only \$700 for a high school or grade school student. This is appalling, particularly when you realize less than 20 percent of our school students go onto college for a degree.

Inadequate funding is one problem; the distribution of funds is another. Local sources nationally still provide 52 cents of every dollar spent on education. It is obvious, then, that the more affluent a school district is the better chance a student has for a good education. Wealthy districts can raise great sums with a modest tax rate on their residents and offer the best in education. Conversely, the poor school district with little revenue must impose staggering tax rates to pick up the money needed to support its educational program. Children born in such communities are almost certain to receive a second rate education and probably will pass that inheritance onto their children.

This discrepancy is not a new discovery. It is recognized years ago and attempts were made to correct it through State and Federal contributions to the less affluent school districts. Unfortunately, a number of studies have confirmed the fact that State and Federal formulas, designed to help the poor district, backfired. Instead of going to the

needy districts, the funds somehow found their way into the more affluent districts. The result was a lessening of the educational financial burden on the wealthy districts and an increase of the financial burden on the poor districts.

This bill would give each school district a Federal grant for every school age child and the amount of the grant will be determined by four factors. The first is reimbursement, according to the rate the Government will assume the cost of education. The suggested rate is 10 percent for fiscal 1972; 20 percent for fiscal 1973; and 33 1/3 percent for fiscal 1974.

The second factor is the need for the school district which will be determined by the number of poor children within the district. The third factor is the average local and State expenditures per pupil in the State where the school district is located. The national reimbursement, which will be influenced by the fourth factor, will be multiplied against this expenditure to determine the Federal grant per pupil. The final factor is the average. This will be used to increase the Federal reimbursement for poor States and decrease it for rich ones.

I am aware, of course, this reform will cost money, approximately \$22 billion spread over 3 years as the Government assumes a greater portion of financing education. This amount is approximately \$17 billion more than the Government's present contribution of \$4.5 billion or 6 percent of the educational cost.

The next question is: "Where will the money come from?" We already have it, a little prudent weeding in the garden of bureaucracy, I am convinced, will harvest enough funds for this undertaking. Money has been found to finance such dubious projects as the ABM, the SST, the F-111, and the C-5A. It often appears money is no object when we talk about that kind of expenditures but, when we attempt to correct a serious domestic problem involving social needs, money suddenly becomes an item of scarcity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can find the necessary funds to provide a good, sound education for all our Nation's children and at the same time alleviate some of the financial strain now placed on our school districts and our taxpayers.

DR. VALLERA GRANNIS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the Sunday, March 28, 1971, issue of The State newspaper there appeared an article about a very courageous educator entitled "Handicap Motivates Retiree." Dr. Vallera Grannis is 72 years old and partially blind. She is a retired teacher from Coker College where she was chairman of the Modern Language Department. Dr. Grannis has now begun a new program of teaching. Her handicap has become a motivation rather than a liability, and it has led Dr. Grannis to help

illiterates learn to read and write. Dr. Grannis is a driving force behind the Hartsville project of the South Carolina Literary Association's "each one teach one" program. The initiative and valor of this teacher deserves the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Handicap Motivates Retiree," which appeared in the Sunday, March 28, 1971, issue of The State newspaper be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

HANDICAP MOTIVATES RETIREE

(By Luke West)

HARTSVILLE.—Dr. Vallera Grannis, 72 years old and partially blind, has given her life to teaching others. Although "retired" from the teaching profession, she is helping illiterates learn to read and write.

Dr. Grannis labels herself "an illiterate of sorts" which accounts for part of her interest.

"I have lost my ability to read due to falling eyesight," she explains.

"You don't know what it's like not to be able to read names in telephone books or a newspaper or letters, until you can't. It became apparent to me that for these people that couldn't read and write it was such a stumbling block in helping them help themselves."

The retired educator became involved in the S.C. Literacy Association's "each one teach one" program last summer. She was "motivated" because she realized what it was like not to be able to read. "It was through this that I actually realized how difficult it is for people who can't read."

The President of the Literacy Association, Ben Bagwell of Greenville, says Dr. Grannis is "the spark-plug" in the Hartsville project. It is part of the association's statewide project to teach functional illiterates to read and write.

Dr. Grannis is quick to point out that the success of the project to Hartsville was due to a community effort. "You get a lot of cooperation on this deal," she said in an interview. "Hartsville is a good working town . . . it is a town where a great many people care. It is a doing town."

A great deal of the Hartsville program's success is due to Dr. Grannis' efforts. She contacted various civic clubs, churches and educators in promoting the project. "You just about have to stay on the telephone all the time. You have to put on the big push," she said.

"I was anxious this first year for money not to be a deterrent. I hated to think they wouldn't be able to take the course because of money," said the educator who raised nearly \$500 to pay for the publicity and the cost of reading kits.

A workshop for volunteer teachers followed the promotional effort.

In the Hartsville area some 60 functional illiterates are being taught to read and write. In Darlington County alone Dr. Grannis said, there are 5,800 functional illiterates. Slightly less than half of them are white.

Despite the large number, Dr. Grannis said it is difficult to motivate illiterates to want to learn to read and write.

"You are working with people with a low motivation level. If they had a high motivation level they would have been able to learn already."

The "each one teach one" method is simply where one volunteer teacher works with one pupil. It involves a "commitment" on the part of both members, according to Dr. Grannis.

The students come from a "cross section" of persons 18 and over.

"The nicest thing that happened to me this past Christmas was this card from an elderly pupil," said Dr. Grannis as she produced a small card. Her name and address were neatly printed on the envelope. Inside, was a typical Christmas message and underneath a more important message was neatly printed: "I can read and I can write. Thank you."

"I was moved by that," said Dr. Grannis. "If nothing else had come out of it except that Christmas card I would have felt repaid." She spoke of other incidents.

"A woman whose sister lives in Germany wanted to learn to write to her sister. She did."

An elderly Negro man who was a deacon in his church wanted to learn to read the Bible. "Now I'll be able to read the Bible for myself," Dr. Grannis quoted the man as saying after he became a student.

"A house-bound cripple who said he wanted to read the Christmas Bible story to his children learned to read the story prior to this past Christmas.

"And one man who works in a mill wanted to learn to read. He said they put notices for the employes on the bulletin board and he would go up to it and look at the board, pretending to read while listening to other employes talk about what the notice said. 'Now I can read for myself,' the man responded after being taught to read."

She also told of a janitor in a local school who was about to lose his job because he could not read labels. He learned. Another student was a car dealer who delivered cars to South Carolina but he could not read road signs. He also learned to read through the "each one teach one" concept.

"I found a pleasant surprise," Dr. Grannis said. "Some of the students have dropped out, but nothing like I would have expected. I think it is admirable."

"We haven't tried to go out into the county yet. But we will," said Dr. Grannis, adding with a grin of satisfaction that the students "just keep trickling in."

A native of Kentucky, the gray haired, bespectacled educator received her Master's Degree from Cornell University and her Ph. D. from Columbia University. She studied at the University of Mexico, Middlebury Language School, Middlebury, Vermont, and at the University of Paris.

Prior to formal retirement, Dr. Grannis was a teacher at Coker College for 37 years, where she was chairman of the Modern Language Department.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this time of economic crisis, the words debt and deficit have become almost synonymous with urban mass transportation. It is rare indeed, to hear of a situation where a rail line is breaking even, let alone showing a profit.

Well, yesterday Mr. Speaker, The Christian Science Monitor carried the story of a midwestern line which has become a very pleasant exception to this trend. This very well-written article discussed the surprising success of the Chicago & Northwestern Railroad.

I feel that Ben Heineman, chairman of the Chicago & Northwestern and Larry Provo, president of the line, and in fact, all the staff and employees of the railroad, deserve to be commended for their unique ability to maintain a quality operation during a time when most lines are going bankrupt in their efforts to provide even minimum service.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert this article in the RECORD as I believe it will be of considerable interest to my colleagues.

I include the article as follows:

HAPPY COMMUTERS LEAD TO CHICAGO RAIL PROFITS

(By Merelice K. England)

For many of America's suburbanites, commuting is a miserable way to start the day—trains are late, grubby, crowded, and infrequent.

Yet Chicago railroads—the Chicago & North Western in particular—are now proving that rail commuting can be pleasant—and profitable.

How long the profits will continue is an open question, however.

There are very few railroads in the United States that actually think they can make money shuttling people back and forth to work, leaving tracks and cars idle the rest of the day. Even Larry S. Provo, president of the North Western (which does make a profit on commuters), hedges his optimism.

The North Western's profit story will change, he says, if subsidized, mass-transit lines parallel railroad-commuter lines with cheaper fares.

"We can't compete. Our people will pay a certain premium. But then the mass-transit siphons off our customers," he observes.

More than 90,000 commuters a day—45,000 into Chicago and 45,000 out—currently travel the clean, brightly lit North Western for an average run of slightly more than 20 miles each.

That adds up to the nation's largest privately run commuter service. The larger Long Island Rail Road into Manhattan is a publicly run, New York State operation. Although Long Island commuters outcrush the North Western loads, they are more likely to criticize than to compliment their service, which is no competition for the streamlined Chicago suburban service.

A random sampling of North Western's customers shows a remarkable loyalty—even though the circumstances of this correspondent's chats with riders were regarded as unfavorable by the railroad:

North Western had just notified its customers that it was applying for a 7 percent fare increase. And cold, wintry weather is said to make even the most pampered commuter grumpy.

The railroad's prior justification of possible disagreeable comments, however, was unnecessary. Almost unbelievably, no evening customer talked to while riding outbound from Chicago to northern Waukegan, Ill., had any complaints.

RIDER PRAISES EXCELLENCE

John M. McCarthy, a three-year commuter from Evanston, Ill., says that service "is excellent. It leaves on time. It arrives on time. It is air-conditioned in summer, cheaper than driving, and it's faster."

A former Washington, D.C., resident, M. Joel Shuffield, says: "I was tired of driving." Since moving to Highwood, Ill., in September, 1969, Mr. Shuffield has taken to the train. Washington had just begun construction in 1970 on a 98-mile rapid-transit system scheduled to open in 1973.

A college recruiter for an insurance company, Steven Kollmann, says traffic was "too much" and that the North Western's schedule is flexible enough for his work.

The North Western didn't always garner such praise. Mr. Provo tells what the railroad had to do to get it.

Since 1957 when the railroad began modernizing its suburban service, it has:

Acquired modern double-deck coaches resulting in a high peaktime capacity along with a high degree of comfort.

Purchased push-pull diesel-powered locomotives which eliminate the need to switch engines from one end of the train to the other when reversing directions.

Eliminated some of the in-city stops which duplicated service provided by the Chicago mass-transit system—thus concentrating on service for the growing suburban communities.

Revised tickets and fare structures which now include a ticket-by-mail program, flash-card tickets that require no punching and are good for a month, half-month, and week for an unlimited number of rides, and the traditional one-way and round-trip tickets.

Emphasized arrivals and departures on time to the extent of holding a freight train to let commuters through. Workers are cautioned to stay overnight at hotels if it appears bad weather might hamper their getting to the train from home the next morning.

PASSENGERS MEAN PROFITS

Results were that the railroad's suburban service went from a \$3 million deficit in 1956 to a \$2 million profit in 1970—creating a possibly unique situation of having passenger service ball out an otherwise money-losing railroad operation for a net profit in 1970 of \$1.5 million.

More typically, a railroad loses money on passengers and makes it up on freight. And in fact, the North Western does lose money on its other passenger service—longer-distance intercity travelers.

Even with the North Western's suburban service as an example, most private railroads have yet to decide whether commuters are their business—enough to similarly sink some dollars into decent service and equipment.

And Railpax, the new quasipublic national railroad passenger corporation, for all its efforts to improve medium- to long-distance intercity passenger service will not affect daily, short-distance commuter service.

Yet, of the nation's 300 million annual passenger trips, all but some 30 million are short-distance commuter rides, notes Anthony Haswell, chairman of the National Association of Railroad Passengers.

Expected to be an eventual source of relief for embattled commuters is the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act signed by President Nixon on Oct. 15, 1970. The \$3.1 billion authorized by the act, however, has not been appropriated, and there is some uneasy speculation here that a revenue-sharing plan for transportation funds, recently presented to Congress by President Nixon, might eliminate the earlier legislation which was much welcomed by public transportation systems.

The North Western and the five other Chicago-area commuter railroads have proposed forming and joining a "Chicago metropolitan area transportation system." The railroads contend that highway officials, private carriers (buses and ralls), and the publicly owned Chicago Transit Authority should be coordinating their efforts.

Such a system would be eligible to receive federal funds and would, the railroads insist, spend funds efficiently instead of for overlapping services.

THE PRIME IMPORTANCE OF CHROMIUM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Richmond-Times Dispatch of March 14 included an excellent column by Ross Valentine on the subject of chrome.

I ask unanimous consent that the column, entitled "Prime Importance of Chromium," be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRIME IMPORTANCE OF CHROMIUM

The strategic importance of chromium to the U.S. steel and defense industry can hardly be overestimated. The metal is exceeded in hardness only by carbon (in the form of diamonds) and the element boron, which is not suitable for ferro-alloys.

As chrome steel it is essential to the making of armor plate, projectiles, and the wearing parts of ore-crushing mills. Stainless steel is about 12 per cent chromium. A chromium-nickel alloy is used in electrical heating devices because of its very high melting point.

Unfortunately for U.S. industry—and defense—chromite ore is thinly scattered in this country, so that domestic production is negligible, and our huge steel industry depended almost entirely on ore from Rhodesia, and formerly from Cuba.

But in 1965, after Rhodesia had declared her independence from Great Britain, the United Nations, including Arthur Goldberg (then our ambassador to the UN) invoked economic sanction against Rhodesia, and condemned that peaceful country as "a threat to international peace and security"—an absurdly fictitious charge.

Ambassador Goldberg, in arguing for drastic sanctions against Rhodesia, said:

"What is happening now in Rhodesia is an effort to perpetuate the control by 6 per cent of the population over the other 94 per cent."

As Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., pointed out on the floor of the Senate on March 4, the Communist party of Soviet Russia, which is about 1 per cent of the population, controls 99 per cent of the people.

Comparable percentages control all citizens in North Vietnam, Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Cuba, and 700,000,000 in Red China.

Yet, said Sen. Byrd, "the UN has not imposed sanctions on any of the Communist countries, nor has the United States asked the UN to impose any such sanctions."

Thanks to Ambassador Goldberg's vote in obedience to President Johnson's directive, we severed diplomatic relations with Rhodesia, and at first called for voluntary boycott of Rhodesian exports.

The Johnson administration, through Goldberg, then voted for a UN council resolution calling on Britain to "use force" to prevent oil shipments to Rhodesia, and went so far as to assure the UN that the United States would (in Goldberg's words) "apply the 'full force' of its law to implement" this prohibition.

Johnson went even further. He declared it a criminal offense for any American to engage in the importation of certain Rhodesian products.

The Ian Smith government, despite hostile action by the United States, Russia and other members of the council, not only survived but prospered, because 31 nations, of which 27 were UN members, ignored the sanctions.

There remains only the blackmailing threat of military punitive intervention prescribed by Article 42 of the UN Charter defining ultimate steps to be taken under "mandatory" sanctions.

Senator Byrd pointed out the incongruity of Britain's action in not only maintaining a consulate in Hanoi but permitting some 250 British ships to carry cargo to Haiphong, principal port of a country which has been, and is, an overt "threat to international peace" by invasions of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

Rhodesia, said Sen. Byrd does not threaten any nation.

He quoted former Secretary of State Dean Acheson as condemning UN sanctions and threats to Rhodesia as "unprovoked, unjustified by a single legal or moral principle—barefaced aggression" in which the government of the United States has participated.

Even if the U.S. steel industry has not been cut off from 85 per cent of chrome supply—vital to our defense—the immorality and illegality of Johnson's shortsighted policy should be repudiated by prompt abrogation.

FOREST SERVICE URGES LOWERING OF BARGE CANAL RESERVOIR

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, evidence of the wisdom of President Nixon's decision to halt construction of the cross-Florida barge canal continues to mount. The President's historic action, halting a public works project one-third complete, was based on findings that the canal would do irreparable damage to Florida's environment and pose a serious threat to the State's water supply.

The U.S. Forest Service has issued a press release saying it intends to do everything possible to protect the wild and scenic Oklawaha River, which was threatened by the canal project.

The Forest Service said aerial photographs show as much as 13,000 acres of semitropical woodlands are being threatened because of Rodman Reservoir, a vital part of the canal. The Service reported that its professional foresters strongly recommend lowering of the reservoir to the normal river channel at once if the remaining trees are to be saved.

Here, in its entirety, is the Forest Service's press release on this matter of critical concern to all of us.

FLORIDA RIVER PROTECTION PLANNED

The Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, today reported its intention to do everything possible to protect the wild and scenic values of Florida's Oklawaha River within the Ocala National Forest, now that President Nixon has halted construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Forest Service Chief Edward P. Cliff said he has requested Regional Forester T. A. Schlapfer in Atlanta, Georgia, to take all necessary steps, in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Council on Environmental Quality and the State of Florida, for the river's protection.

In announcing on January 19 that work on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal by the Corps of Engineers would be stopped, the Presi-

dent said the Oklawaha is "a uniquely beautiful semi-tropical stream" which would be destroyed if the canal were built. He said he was asking the Secretary of Army to work with the Council on Environmental Quality in developing recommendations for the future of the river.

The Forest Service administers land along a third of the length of the 45-mile river which forms a boundary of the Ocala National Forest.

Chief Cliff said he was instructing Forest Service personnel to do all in their power to protect ecological values of the river and contiguous lands within Forest Service jurisdiction. In addition, he said, the Forest Service will soon begin a land classification study to determine whether or not the Oklawaha now meets requirements for consideration as part of the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers.

He expressed particular concern about 1,426 acres of National Forest land which have been flooded by the Rodman reservoir at the edge of the forest. The river furnishes the water for the reservoir, and many persons have contended it will destroy wild and scenic values of the stream.

Several agencies have made studies of the Rodman Reservoir and predicted long-range management problems, including such difficulties as water weed control, low dissolved oxygen, deterioration of sport fishing, and reduction of recreational opportunities. Also, the Forest Service has taken a series of infrared aerial photographs which indicate as much as 13,000 acres of semi-tropical woodlands are being threatened.

Chief Cliff added that "our professional foresters strongly recommend the lowering of the reservoir to the normal river channel at once if we are to save any remaining live trees." He said the foresters expect some stricken trees will sprout again from the roots, and seeds on the forest floor will start new growth. Some hand planting may also be necessary.

Finally, he pointed out the river valley is habitat for such rare and endangered species as the eagle, alligator and Florida panther. It also contains Indian shell mounds of archaeological interest, some of which have been covered by rising waters of the reservoir.

ASSOCIATION OF U.S. ARMY POSITION PAPER ON BLUE RIBBON DEFENSE PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Association of the U.S. Army recently issued a position paper on the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel.

This position paper deals with only a small number of the Defense Panel's recommendations, although the ones discussed are certainly some of the more far-reaching changes ever proposed in this Nation's defense structure.

While I am not in agreement with all of the views expressed in the Army association paper, it is my view that it would be helpful, for this information should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the position paper of the As-

sociation of the U.S. Army be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

AUSA POSITION ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON DEFENSE PANEL

I. In July of last year, the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, appointed by the President, made its recommendations for the reorganization of the Department of Defense and subordinate agencies and commands. Supporting material for these recommendations is still being issued.

Because of the very basic and far-reaching effects of some of the proposals, AUSA has chosen to use the intervening period to study them carefully before taking any position with respect to them. We have been most fortunate to be able to draw upon the advice and counsel of some of the very experienced and knowledgeable people to assist us in our deliberations. However, the positions taken and the views expressed are those of the Association and are not necessarily concurred in by all who were kind enough to give us their expert views.

The total report contains well over 200 recommendations. Obviously, not all of these have the same importance. A number of them are most worthwhile particularly some of those in the fields of management of resources and procurement procedures. Many of these are not controversial and should be endorsed by all services for early adoption.

There are four areas of recommendations that seem to us to be particularly significant and to contain the really crucial portions of the report. These include recommendations that dealt with:

1. The reorganization of DOD itself.
2. The role of JCS in operations.
3. Proposals to revise the structure of the unified commands.
4. Certain personnel and management actions.

It is to these four areas that the Association has given particular consideration and on which we wish its views recorded. We wish to make it crystal clear that while there are many of the committee's recommendations in these four important areas with which we do not agree, we are in no sense blessing the status quo. We share the committee's concern that burgeoning bureaucracy, particularly at Departmental levels, seriously hampers our defense establishment. Greater authority for decision-making at lower levels is badly needed.

Reliance on centralization has one far reaching implication that appears to have not been recognized at all or at best to have been accorded only cursory consideration. The consequence could be that field commanders, with the passage of time, will turn more and more to Washington for answers to field problems and will assume less and less responsibility for their actions. In an emergency, when time will not permit consultation, the field commanders will be ill prepared to make the tough decisions and to stand behind them.

There is a need for streamlining in our defense establishment. Perhaps the committee's basic suggestion that reductions are needed in layers of headquarters and size of staffs may be the most sensible starting point. Thus the need for improvements is not an issue between our view and that of the committee—how we solve the dilemma is.

II. REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

In its examination of the Defense Department, the panel listed the following as some of the major discrepancies which should be corrected:

A. Effective civilian control is impaired by a generally excessive centralization of decision-

making authority at the level of the Secretary of Defense.

B. The President and the Secretary of Defense do not presently have the opportunity to consider all viable options as background for making major decisions because differences of opinion are submerged or compromised at lower levels of the Department of Defense.

C. There are too many layers of both military and civilian staffs and staffs are too large both within DOD itself and the services.

There were other weaknesses cited but the committee felt these were the most significant.

The committee's recommendations to correct the foregoing alleged discrepancies included the following:

A. Divide the Department of Defense into 3 major groupings:

1. Military operations including operational command, intelligence and communications.
2. Management of personnel and military resources.
3. Evaluation type functions, including financial controls, testing of weapons, analysis of costs and effectiveness of force structures.

B. Each of the groups in (A.) above would report to the Secretary of Defense through a separate Deputy Secretary, drawn from civilian life, who would rank above all others in the Department of Defense except the Secretary.

C. The Military Departments would continue to operate under the supervision of their secretaries who would be subordinate to the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Management of Resources.

The Association of the United States Army does not accept entirely their view of the extent of the deficiencies in the present system, with the possible exception of their comments with respect to the size of the staffs.

We challenge the changes recommended by the panel for the reasons which follow. Foremost is our view that the changes recommended do not appear to provide solutions to the discrepancies perceived.

First and perhaps most basic, is the unprecedented suggestion by the panel that this diversified and largest of all establishments be organized on a functional rather than a mission basis. The separation of operations from materiel and manpower resources seems to us to be totally unworkable and could well stultify integrated planning. Mission and means must go hand in hand.

While it is not possible to compare directly the operation of the Defense Department with that of a major business corporation there are striking similarities. Most of our biggest corporations (automobile manufacturers are a good example) are mission-oriented and organized around profit centers. If you substitute the word "readiness" for "profit" it is clear that the basic rationale is not dissimilar. We know of no commercial organization operating successfully with an organizational structure of the type recommended by the committee.

The committee report is extremely vague on the planning function as it relates to the planning for the implementation of strategy and policy. It is equally unclear as to how the Department of Defense would effectively carry out its responsibilities for contributing to the evolution of national policy through the National Security Council. There needs to be complete integration of intelligence, operation and resources at all levels of coordinated planning. The committee's recommendation would seem to preclude this.

The panel's proposed organization adds still another layer of review and control to what it says is an already overstuffed and presumably overlaid operation.

In the organization suggested by the panel, responsibility is even more diffused than at present even though the panel specifically

pinpointed increased individual accountability as a goal.

It is hard to reconcile the panel's point that more decentralization of DOD is necessary with its recommendation to add at the top three Deputy Secretaries with their attendant staffs. We support Deputy Secretary of Defense, David Packard, who, in a speech in Los Angeles, reacted to the panel's views on decentralization and responsibility this way: "I agree in particular with the committee's recommendation that more decentralization of the Department of Defense is necessary. To me that means more decision-making at a lower level and less time-consuming and duplicate second-guessing top-side. This gives me a problem on the recommendation for the three deputies. We do not want to create a structure that involves more top-level involvement in the workingman's business. I appreciate the implication that I have to work hard. I do put in long hours, I assure you, however, that much of my time has been spent doing things that lower levels should do. Three deputies would tend to pull even more decision-making to the top and we do not want to move in that direction. What we want to do is give a man a job and let him do it."

We further support the stated views of Mr. Packard when he said, "We intend to give the Service Secretaries and the Services more responsibility so that they can do their job. Before they can do their jobs right they will have to break down some of the multi-layer staffing that has built up over the years and work together better to avoid unnecessary duplication." It is imperative to appreciate that layering results in duplication without commensurate benefit.

Certainly it is clear from a study of the panel report that while ostensibly aimed toward the decentralization of DOD functions, the recommendations tend to result in the increased centralization of power in the Office of the Secretary of Defense at the expense of the Services to such an extent that the separate Services would largely wither away. There is much to be gained by taking the opposite course and turning back to the services and their secretariats, more of the responsibility and those tasks which do not properly belong at top-policy-making level. Moreover, a continuation of the present trend toward greater centralization clearly leads to a single service at some point in the future. The attendant risks of this course have been decryd by Defense experts for years.

III. THE ROLE OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF IN OPERATIONS

The second major area of the committee's recommendations on which we wish to comment is that dealing with the organization and responsibilities of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Fitzhugh Committee expressed its view that the Joint Chiefs of Staff as now constituted are not capable of being wholly responsive to their responsibilities as advisors to the Commander-in-Chief and the Secretary of Defense. The committee advocated removing the JCS entirely from the operational chain of command and setting up a separate staff under a new civilian Deputy Secretary of Defense to handle operations. So that there may be a clear understanding of the committee's recommendations with respect to the JCS, it is worthwhile quoting them:

"The responsibilities now delegated to the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Secretary of Defense to serve as military staff in the chain of operational command with respect to the Unified Commands, and all other responsibilities so delegated which are related to military operations and the Unified Commands, should be assigned to a single senior military officer, who should also supervise the separate staff which provides staff support on military operations and the chan-

nel of communications from the President and Secretary of Defense to Unified Commands. This officer should report to the Secretary of Defense through the Deputy Secretary of Defense (Operations). This senior military officer could be either the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as an individual, not ex-officio, the Commander of the Tactical Command, or some other senior military officer, as determined by the President and the Secretary of Defense.

"The responsibilities now delegated to the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Secretary of Defense to serve as military staff in the chain of operational command with respect to the Unified Commands, and all other responsibilities so delegated which are related to military operations and the Unified Commands, should be rescinded; and consideration should be given to changing the title of the Chief of Naval Operations to Chief of Staff of the Navy.

"All staff personnel positions in the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in the headquarters military staffs of the Military Services which are in support of activities, such as military operations, which are recommended for transfer to other organizational elements, should be eliminated.

"The Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be limited to include only the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a reconstituted Joint Staff limited in size to not more than 250 officers augmented by professional civilian analysts as required."

We do not share these views. We do not favor a "single Chief of Staff" for Operations nor do we subscribe to the principle of separating planning from operations. Committee member Robert C. Jackson, in his dissenting statement to the report, made some telling points which express very clearly our position:

"As presently constituted, the JCS system permits Service views to be expressed as a necessary protection against unilateral thinking and the adoption of a one-sided strategic concept. The existence of differing points of view in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their ultimate melding into strategic guidance and policies are not evils to be abolished, but are healthy values to be preserved.

"The present JCS organization and procedures are designed to ensure precise, careful determination of the best military strategy and necessary strategic guidance for the Armed Forces. This requires careful examination of all alternatives. It is important to note that in generating strategic guidance, quality rather than speed is necessary. Better solutions result from thorough consideration of differences of opinion. Planning decisions should be made only after all aspects of complex strategic problems have been examined.

"Operational decisions, on the other hand, usually require a more rapid decision making procedure than do strategic problems. It is my understanding that operational decisions have been made during the Vietnam war principally by the Chairman of the JCS acting on Joint Staff advice, and on most occasions the Chairman acts without consulting the Chiefs. At the same time, if the Chairman feels an important policy is involved, he can, and frequently does, conference the Chiefs by telephone in a matter of minutes.

"It is important to differentiate between the planning problems which require mature consideration and the operational decisions which can be made very rapidly. In my opinion the Joint Staff and the Joint Chiefs of Staff do have the flexibility necessary to make decisions or to submit proposals to higher authority within the time limit required.

"It is quite necessary to have a military operations command unit in Washington and it should be composed of the best qualified officers available. However, to set up another

staff to handle operations while the Joint Staff of the JCS concentrates on planning and other advice to the Secretary would create untold problems. For example, it is most difficult to separate planning from operation. Where does planning stop and operations begin? What part of logistics is operational logistics?

"Two separate Joint Staffs at the national level would create a highly unsatisfactory situation. I believe it would be chaotic to set up another large military staff in Washington to parallel the work now done by the Joint Staff of the JCS."

We would only add that effective solutions can only result from integrated planning which considers all elements of the issue or problem. In the field of strategic planning, the Joint Chiefs stand alone as the effective and logical integrators of a strategic plan.

The Fitzhugh Committee apparently misread the record when they made the assertion that President Eisenhower intended that the JCS be taken out of an operational role when he submitted the 1958 Reorganization Act to Congress. President Eisenhower's message of transmittal refers to "Secretaries of the Military Departments" and "Chiefs of individual services" and those who "clearly . . . should not direct unified operations and therefore should be removed from the command channel." The message does not refer to the JCS as a corporate entity. Moreover, on April 3, 1958 when the President submitted his reorganization plan to the House, he said that from his plans would flow several significant results, one of which was "the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be provided the professional military assistance required for efficient strategic planning and *operational control*" (emphasis added). The President's plan included certain executive actions to be taken, two of which were:

1. Use of the JCS as a staff to assist the Secretary of Defense in his direction of unified commands, including the issuance of commands under the authority and in the name of the Secretary of Defense; The JCS not to exercise these duties independently of the Secretary's direction.

2. Abolition of the JCS Committee and adding of an "operational division".

Thus it would appear that the present directives (No. 5100.1) are clearly in consonance with what was intended. It appears that the problem really is that in the intervening years, a duplicate civilian-directed staff developed in OSD which has challenged and in many cases usurped the delegated responsibilities of the JCS. This has resulted in delay, confusion and serious question as to where the responsibility for certain actions really lies below the level of the Secretary of Defense.

Organizational and management purists will continue to be impatient with the "committee system" of the JCS which by its nature will invariably operate on a basis of negotiated compromise. However, it exists within the constraints established by statutes which reflect Congressional suspicion of centralized military authority and intent to incorporate in the JCS System the same pattern of checks and balances found elsewhere in the government.

From an operational viewpoint, whatever delays might be inherent in the JCS Committee System, and they must be few indeed, are offset in good measure by the significant evolution in the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. While by law he is but one among equals with the other Chiefs, he has come, as a result of practice, precedent and personality to be what is implied in his title, the senior military officer of the United States.

As indicated in Mr. Jackson's statement quoted earlier, the Chairman can and does act without consulting the Chiefs and where important policy matters are involved can ob-

tain their view and concurrence by phone in a matter of minutes.

The preponderance of evidence is that the JCS system is working and does enable the Chiefs to carry out all of their roles in both the advisory and operational capacity. Moreover, the evidence clearly points to the fact that the system has steadily improved. We in AUSA, therefore, take issue with the committee's recommendations.

IV. RESTRUCTURING THE UNIFIED AND SPECIFIED COMMANDS

The committee report expressed serious doubts about the suitability of our present Unified Command structure for the conduct of war, either general or localized, for the conduct of peacetime activities or for handling recurring crises. It goes on to say, "an examination of the primary missions of the present commands, and some of the specific problems indicates that the present structure is not effective, and probably would have to be radically changed to support a major war effort".

The committee made the following recommendations:

A. "Three new major Unified Commands should be created: (1) A Strategic Command, composed of the existing Strategic Air Command, the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff, the Continental Air Defense Command, the Fleet Ballistic Missile Operation; (2) A Tactical (or General Purpose) Command, composed of all combatant general purpose forces of the United States assigned to organized combatant units; and (3) A Logistics Command, to exercise for all combatant forces supervision of support activities, including supply distribution, maintenance, traffic management and transportation. No Commander of a Unified Command should be permitted to serve concurrently as Chief of his Military Service.

B. "The Unified Commanders should be given unfragmented command authority for their Commands, and the Commanders of component commands should be redesignated Deputies to the commander of the appropriate Unified Command, in order to make it unmistakably clear that the combatant forces are in the chain of command which runs exclusively through the Unified Commander.

C. "In consolidating the existing area Unified Commands into the Tactical Command, major organization and functional advantages will be obtained by:

1. Merging the Atlantic Command and the Strike Command;

2. Abolishing the Southern Command and reassigning its functions to the merged Atlantic and Strike Commands;

3. Abolishing the Alaskan Command and reassigning its general purpose function to the Pacific Command and its strategic defense functions to the strategic Command; and

4. Restructuring the command channels of the sub-unified commands. The responsibilities related to civil disturbances currently delegated to the Army should be redelegated to the Tactical Command; and

D. "The Unified Commanders should be given express responsibility and capability for making recommendations to the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Operations, for operational capabilities objectives and for allocations of force structures needed for the effective accomplishment of the missions assigned to their Commands."

AUSA does not support the Fitzhugh Committee's assessment of the effectiveness of the present Unified and Specified Command organization nor do we support their recommendations for changes in these areas.

First of all, the committee violates one of its basic tenets in its recommendations for the restructuring of these commands. The adoption of its recommendations would result in even more duplication of staffs and

headquarters and would accentuate disintegration rather than integration of the services.

The committee would prefer to see a more rigid, neat and orderly organization with every type of unit assigned to a specific command. Unfortunately, the nature of warfare makes such a scheme a luxury no country can afford. Flexibility is essential and we will need to continue to attach and detach units to the various commands as the situation dictates. Moreover, the distinction between tactical and strategic forces is becoming less clear. The essence of mutual support is essential between elements of the strategic and tactical forces.

The committee states, for example, that, "the forces which provide the prime deterrent against general war must be reserved solely for that mission, because their use and attrition in limited war would reduce an aggressor's incentive for keeping the war limited." Had this doctrine been followed, it would have precluded the use of B-52s in Vietnam—certainly a limited war.

In another example, the committee states, "All forces which are dedicated to deterrence and equipped for general war should be under a single commander who can establish doctrine for these forces and assure that they are properly trained and kept in a high state of readiness."

It should be apparent that all of our forces play a deterrent role and certainly all of them would be used in the event of a general war. Again, it seems the committee has overlooked the economics of flexibility which require that we have the capability of applying our forces when and in the kinds and numbers a particular situation requires. This is especially important in an era when the impact of relative nuclear parity is neither fully understood or adequately assessed.

There are undoubtedly improvements that could be accomplished in the present structure of the Unified and Specified Commands and perhaps some consolidation would be useful. But nothing constructive can be gained by trying to assign all of our Armed Forces on the basis of whether they are strategic or tactical. They just would not be used that way in time of war or during periods of heightened tension short of war.

Robert C. Jackson's comments with respect to the committee recommendation for the establishment of a Strategic Command are most appropriate:

"Strategic direction must come from the JCS level with direct and close supervision from the Secretary of Defense. At present the JCS provide strategic direction, with the Unified and Specified Commanders responsible for implementation of JCS directives. The Single Integrated Operating Plan provides optimum integration of the committed forces. The national strategic targeting and attack policy provides supplemental strategic direction. Assumption of additional responsibility by a newly created Strategic Command would only duplicate functions now performed by the JCS and the Unified Commanders, and quite possibly would result in unsafe, uneconomical, and inefficient operations. It is highly important to have direct and rapid communications between the JCS and the operational command in an emergency situation and a new intervening command echelon would tend to increase communications time in an unacceptable degree.

"What would be gained, for example, by marrying three completely diverse operational elements—the Strategic Air Command, Continental Air Defense Command, and the Polaris Submarines into a so-called Strategic Command?"

"What would it do better than the present set-up? Would it improve the readiness or the wartime control? Readiness of submarines, for example, involves complex and expensive maintenance systems, specialized training, and operation in a manner which

takes into account all the other elements below the surface, on the surface, and in the air that have means of detecting submarines. These functions are now performed by the Atlantic and Pacific Fleet Commands. The proposed command echelon would tend to hinder rather than improve their performance. Similarly, coordination of targeting is accomplished by the Joint Target Planning Group in Omaha in a most satisfactory manner and does not require the assistance of the newly proposed command echelon. However, this new command grouping would create a demand for a mammoth staff, so economy certainly cannot be the objective."

The arguments for the formation of a new tactical command seem to us to be even more specious. The committee recognized that, "the make-up of the Unified Command structure is significantly influenced by various mutual security agreements and arrangements to which the United States is a party. The most influential is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and of another type is the United Nations Command in Korea. The United States Unified Command structure is intended to mesh with the combined structure that would exercise operational command of the multi-lateral forces should combined operations be undertaken."

There are a number of virtues in our present set-up. As Mr. Jackson explains, "the present Unified Commands combine geopolitical knowledge with a command and control system needed to operate military forces in the area." Rapid decision-making is possible by the direct contact which these Unified Commands have with the JCS. The introduction of an intermediate Tactical Command level would thrust another layer into the decision chain and, as Mr. Jackson emphasizes, would "slow up decision-making" and "create a demand for a mammoth staff, a large headquarters, and a proliferation of communications systems."

In addition, the Panel's recommendation that commanders of component command should be redesignated Deputies to the Commander of the Unified Command would create a cumbersome, unwieldy unified staff which would restrict the efficiency of the Unified Command, as Mr. Jackson explains, assignment of all administrative and logistic responsibilities to the unified staff, which is what is being recommended, is unnecessary. In fact, the Unified Commander has all the authority he needs to accomplish the mission, through operational command of his forces. Operational command also gives the Unified Command "authoritative direction necessary to accomplish the mission." Thus, under the present organization, the Unified Commander can assume control of any aspect of his Command when it is mission-essential, without being burdened with those routine matters which would divert the attention of the staff from the mission of the Command.

In his dissenting paper, committee member Wilfred J. McNeil made the very good point that the committee's recommendation to place component commanders as staff to the Unified Commander "would result in the creation of a large single staff dealing in a myriad of technical and logistical detail of all the services that normally a unified commander should not be burdened with." Moreover, one service does not have the competence to deal with the technical problems of another service.

The committee's recommendation that "the responsibility for providing supply, distribution, maintenance and transportation services to the combatant forces in the Unified and Specified Commands under the Strategic and Tactical Commands should be assigned to the Unified Logistics Command" might not have been made this way had the committee delved deeper into logistics improvements already in process and been

aware of the joint efforts to apply lessons learned which were already under way. The Joint Logistics Review Board, under the Chairmanship of General Frank S. Besson, Jr., has made a number of important recommendations based on our very taxing logistical experience in Vietnam. The results of eight year's work to develop an interface between data processing systems are just now nearing fruition.

Within a given theater, which presumably is under the command of a unified commander, a Joint Logistics Command may be a practical concept. But in a worldwide situation including CONUS, the conflicts that would arise between the unified commanders would give rise to the intolerable situation of the Secretary of Defense or his Deputy being drawn into the resolution of such differences.

It is difficult to reconcile the committee's view that the Unified Tactical Commander needs greater control when the establishment of the Logistics Command would lessen what he has now.

Major logistics commanders of the services get together regularly now on the Joint Logistics Commander's Council, where the problems that concern the committee can be solved.

Again, the Logistics Command would add another layer of higher headquarters staff with no assured benefits in terms of productivity or solutions to existing problems.

V. PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES ACTIONS

The committee made rather extensive recommendations in the areas of procurement policy, management and personnel actions. Many of these recommendations are most worthwhile; others we do not support. There are some on which we should like to comment.

The Blue Ribbon Committee's recommendations with respect to procurement policy reflected what DOD already had underway and which for the most part represented the consensus of the contracting community.

These were reviewed in the Report of the House Committee on Government Operations which we would like to quote since it summarizes so well not only what the committee recommended, but also DOD's philosophy and on-going actions.

"Reduction of technical risks through demonstrated hardware before full-scale development" and 'flexibility in acquisition strategies' were to be the basis for a 'new policy.' The panel called for 'a major revision of policy' in weapons acquisition to (1) introduce more flexibility, (2) rely more on hardware development than paper studies in the early stages, (3) develop subsystems and components not necessarily tied to a given system, and (4) designate 'multiple decision points.' Concurrence between development and production was to be avoided whenever possible, total package procurement banned, gold-plating eliminated, paperwork from contractors reduced, and testing and evaluation emphasized. Also echoing the new official policies, the role of the program manager was to be strengthened and measures taken to improve the selection, training, and career development of managers, who were to include civilian as well as military personnel.

"Testimony before the subcommittee in September, 1970 developed more fully the policy changes recommended by the Department of Defense and endorsed by the Defense Blue Ribbon Panel. Mr. Packard started out by observing that there were no simple answers to the immensely complex problems of defense procurement. Formal rules covered the great majority of procurement items and actions, but these accounted for a relatively small fraction of the procurement dollars. Effective management of the big, complex systems depends heavily on the judgment of people, and hence he concluded that

the key to better procurement was better qualified people.

"Because we believe that his emphasis on capable people is so important, we have asked all services to renew their emphasis on selecting better people for these jobs, giving them better training, keeping them on special assignments long enough to be effective, and providing better incentives for good officers and good people to go into the professions related to weapons systems acquisition as their careers.

"Upgrading of personnel would include civilian as well as military officers. Declining employment and layoffs in the Department of Defense, Mr. Packard explained, made it difficult to attract civilians of promise and to replace the less qualified ones who had seniority under civil service regulations. In his opinion, these regulations should be revised to give more weight to performance and less to seniority. He described this problem as one of serious national import and deserving attention by the Congress.

"If capable people were to be recruited and retained, Mr. Packard then pointed out, it was essential that they work in the proper organizational setting, with authority and responsibility clearly defined. Organizational needs were identified along these lines:

"(1) To clarify overlapping relationships among offices in the OSD, particularly as between the Director of Defense Research and Engineering and the three Assistant Secretaries for, respectively, Installations and Logistics, Systems Analysis, and Comptroller, Mr. Packard said that when he entered upon his job, he had the impression that there was a great deal of confusion as to who was responsible for what in the weapons system acquisition area. A special study group was formed, under the direction of Vice Admiral Vincent P. dePoix, Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering, which attempted to sort out and delineate more precisely the interoffice relationships and responsibilities.

"The Defense System Acquisition Review Council (DSARC) was established at the OSD level as a co-ordinated group to review major weapon system developments, determine that objectives were being progressively achieved, and release necessary increments of funding. Mr. Packard said he viewed DSARC as a temporary or transitional measure. OSD evaluation and approval actions and procedures would diminish as service performance improved and more confidence was established. The OSD would maintain budget control of programs, and its main review and approval functions ultimately would be related to the release of funds.

"(2) To give the military services more autonomy and responsibility in managing weapon system procurement. The OSD offices, according to Mr. Packard, had become so deeply involved in evaluating program management by the services that they 'often were telling the services how they should do the job.' This made for duplication of effort and considerable confusion. Decentralization was the order of the day. Mr. Packard made it clear, however, that decentralized management was favored only when it made sense. The department would not 'back away' from further centralization which also made sense, as in consolidations of procurement and supply through the Defense Supply Agency and other measures for increasing integrated management of supplies and services." Obviously, much of this has merit and we support it. However, a comment on the much publicized "fly before you buy" concept seems to be in order. The committee has advanced this as a greater panacea for our procurement ills than we believe it to be.

The procurement system recommended (i.e. "fly before you buy") will not in all cases necessarily produce the advantages claimed, nor is the system a real innovation.

A major Fitzhugh argument against procurement practices is that under the present "total package" system production starts at

a point in development where it appears that a weapon system will work, but well before the system is fully developed. Therefore, goes the indictment, unforeseen problems continuously arise after a contract for production has been negotiated and this leads to the cost overruns typical of the 1960's. The case in point is the 120 C-5A's which were to be developed and produced by Lockheed at a price preset in 1965. The cost overrun (allegedly 80%) has been visible to all.

Under the "fly before you buy" system, there is a guarantee that a weapons system will work before a contract is let for production. However, there is no guarantee in this procurement system *per se* that cost overruns ("cost growth") can be prevented (inflation being a notable variable in this respect) or that cost overruns will be less than those incurred under the "total package" system.

With the first publicized contract let under the "fly before you buy" system, i.e., the B-1 advanced bomber being developed by North American Rockwell, the possibilities for invisible (to Congress, the public and, perhaps, to the various defense contract agencies) cost increases are legion. Reports are that the contract does not include production for which contracts will be negotiated later *in increments* if the prototypes meet specifications. Since the increments of production could stretch over a number of years, Congress and the public might have to wait a long time indeed to see the total price of the B-1 system, and to identify any significant "cost overruns."

In fact, the B-1 contract appears to be a partial throwback to the so-called "iceberg" weapons procurement system of the 1950's which resulted in massive cost overruns that were hidden because weapons were produced in yearly increments. It was just these cost overruns which led to the "total package" concept developed by Secretary McNamara in the 1960's.

Procurement is the final step in the research-development-procurement sequence. Rationality requires adoption of a decision strategy which optimizes between the successive reduction of uncertainty and the incurring of costs during this sequence. "Fly before you buy" is but one method and is optimal only where uncertainty is relatively insignificant. Otherwise, this simplistic concept insists on buying only when *all* uncertainty has been removed—at additional cost during the development phase. For example, if three systems are to be considered, all three must be developed to the prototype stage—and the prototype is *by far* the most expensive.

Total package procurement attempts to place some decision points (namely the decision to buy) earlier in the game where (considering the costs of reducing uncertainty) uncertainty has been reduced although not entirely eliminated. The rate at which the field of alternatives is narrowed depends on the uncertainties involved in the particular system.

Hence, "fly before you buy" will not correct cost overruns; again, it will only make them less visible. Moreover, since it attempts to minimize costs only in the procurement portion of the sequence, it will in many cases actually increase costs for the entire sequence. The measure of this approach's inefficiency may well be the cost of the parallel systems which must be developed all the way to the prototype stage.

It would appear to us that there would be times when the total package procurement approach would be better to use than "fly before you buy." We should keep this flexibility.

The parametric costing techniques recommended in the report might help prevent traumatic surprises in development and production costs, but they are not very effective in preventing cost increases in either area.

However, even in cost forecasting, parametric techniques have severe limitations when applied to the "known unknowns", not to mention the "unknown unknowns."

We particularly wish to express our wholehearted support for the following committee recommendations:

"Specialists careers should be established for officers in such staff, technical and professional fields as research, development, intelligence, communications, automatic data processing and procurement.

"In order to improve the process of acquisition and retention of military personnel, the Executive Branch should develop, and submit to the Congress for its consideration as necessary, a total military personnel program which coordinates and reconciles all the separate considerations, particularly including: (1) military compensation and retirement, (2) personnel policies on promotion and rotation, and (3) acquisition programs, such as Reserve Officers Training Corps.

"The duration of assignments for officers should be increased, and should be as responsive to the requirements of the job as to the career plan of the officer. Officers continued on an assignment for this reason should not be disadvantaged in opportunity for promotion."

Much effort is being made to expand and improve the specialist career programs, and more needs to be done.

It is desirable for commanders to retain their commands longer so that they can exercise personal leadership in the development and discipline of their command.

Secondly, we want to keep in the staff, technical and professional fields the qualified personnel needed and at the same time have the proper means of rewarding them by promotion.

As soon as it can possibly be accomplished a program of stabilized tours of at least three year's duration should materially strengthen many areas of weakness.

While the committee did not lay great stress on the subject, the whole area of acquisition and retention of good people for the services is basic to any material improvement of our Armed Forces. AUSA continues to support strong measures for increasing career attractiveness.

VI. CONCLUSION

There are obviously a host of committee recommendations upon which we have not commented. We have selected the ones covered here because they seemed to us to be those most basic and far-reaching.

Early in its report the committee expressed the following philosophy which is most germane.

"In retrospect, the evolutionary approach to reorganization of the Department of Defense, while falling significantly short of the objectives of organizational and management purists, and at the same time overriding the inhibitions of the organizational traditionalists, has, on the whole, served the Nation's interests well. A more revolutionary approach to military reorganization might have destroyed values inherent in the traditional military organization which have been worth preserving. Even more significant, revolutionary changes would probably have seriously disrupted the operation and reduced the effectiveness of U.S. military forces during a period when the world situation necessitated maintenance of credible military power."

The committee undertook a gargantuan task, one that was too big in one chunk for any group to handle successfully. Time did not permit the quality inputs that are required for a full grasp of the problem nor was there as much expertise within the committee itself as the task may have required. There are pluses. A number of recommendations will be adopted and fresh thinking has been focused on weaknesses. Most importantly, the committee and its report have

forced a detailed examination of how the Department is organized and how it does operate; this introspective stimulation will undoubtedly bear the fruit of continuing evolutionary improvement in the Department of Defense and our Armed Forces.

**ADMINISTRATIVE TAXBREAK:
ILLEGAL TAX LOOPHOLE**

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, the administration announced an unprecedented and—I believe—illegal \$3 billion tax break to American business through a "liberalization" of depreciation rules and guidelines.

This action, giving away more money from the Treasury than will be spent under the President's welfare proposal is a direct slap at the constitutional authority of the Congress—and more particularly, the House of Representatives which is designated in the Constitution as the sole authority over originating tax law and changes in taxation.

As a member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee, I intend to appear at the public hearing on May 3 to protest this invasion of congressional authority through the creation of this totally unwarranted tax loophole. I hope that other Members of this Congress will join me in this effort to prevent this raid on the Treasury.

Following is a column which appeared in today's Washington Post written by Don Oberdorfer which describes this "curious" tax break:

A CURIOUS TAX BREAK

(By Don Oberdorfer)

January 11 was a dreary morning in Laguna Beach, Calif., and it was not brightened by the word from the White House press staff that the daily news briefing would be held that afternoon instead of the customary 11 a.m.

Noon on the West Coast is 3 p.m. on the East Coast—the closing hour for the New York Stock Exchange—and thus the common expectation among the reporters was that some sort of economic news was in the making, timed for release after the closing of the Big Board.

The guess was correct. At 12:20 Presidential Press Secretary Ron Ziegler turned up with Under Secretary of the Treasury Charls Walker, Deputy Assistant Secretary John Nolan and a two-page presidential statement which began, "Today I have approved three important changes in the administration of the depreciation provisions of the tax laws . . ."

The news release and the briefing by the Treasury officials was dry-as-dust, and most reporters found themselves scratching their heads and wondering what the story was all about. Now, more than two months later, more information and perspective is available. It is quite a story.

As calculated by the Treasury Department, the new depreciation rules for taxing equipment will permit corporations to "defer" paying \$3 billion in U.S. taxes in the coming fiscal year and even larger sums in years to come. Since millions and billions and trillions sound pretty much alike to most of us, it is difficult to grasp what an enormous sum that is. By comparison with the \$3 billion corporate tax break:

The President's welfare reform proposal to bring every family of four in America up to a minimum income level of \$1,600 a year would cost \$2.1 billion. This has set off a big battle in Congress and the country.

Total U.S. aid to preschool, elementary and secondary education in the coming year is budgeted at \$3.6 billion.

Last year, Mr. Nixon vetoed the education bill because Congress exceeded his request by \$453 million and the housing bill because it exceeded his request by \$514 million.

Another surprising thing about the "depreciation" tax change is that congressional action was not requested. Assistant Treasury Secretary Nolan said in an interview last week that since Congress had authorized a "reasonable" tax rebate for the obsolescence of machinery, the costly change did not need further legislation.

There is doubt about the legal authority. A 1968 Treasury study quoted "leading experts" as indicating that legislation would be required for further changes in the depreciation rules. Moreover, President Nixon's Task Force on Business Taxation, headed by a partner of Mr. Nixon's former Wall Street law firm, "strongly" recommended last fall that depreciation changes be made by legislation.

A 26-year-old 1970 law school graduate named Tom Stanton, now working for Ralph Nader's Public Interest Research Group, filed suit in federal court to force the Treasury to at least hold a public hearing before making the \$3 billion-per-year tax change. The Treasury replied that it had planned to hold a hearing all along—though the Jan. 11 announcement said nothing about hearings and presented the tax changes as presidential "actions."

The public hearing is scheduled for May 3, based on written opinions from the public, which are due April 12. Assistant Secretary Nolan told me "we will listen to everybody who has something to say—I will add that it is highly unlikely we will change the concept of what we recommended."

As the Treasury sees it, the \$3 billion change in tax rules is necessary to encourage the modernization of American industry to compete with other nations. According to the Treasury to weigh this need against the possible use of \$3 billion for school aid, family assistance, antipollution efforts or other purposes.

"An expenditure decision is up to Congress," Nolan said—but in a world of limited resources, revenue decisions are crucial to expenditure decisions.

Despite the traditional jealousy about the power of the purse, hardly a voice has been raised in Congress about the substance, procedure or impact of the Treasury-White House decision of Jan. 11. Maybe the lawmakers agree with it. Then again, maybe they don't understand it either.

**J. EDGAR HOOVER'S DIRECTION TO
LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS**

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the Thursday, March 11, 1971, issue of the North Augusta Star there appeared a very relevant editorial entitled "A Timely Reminder."

This editorial contains a statement by FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover that is directed to law enforcement officers. J. Edgar Hoover points out that self-respect

and respect for one's fellowman are landmarks of good citizenship. I stand with Mr. Hoover in urging respect for the rule of law and all its facets, including its enforcement officers. It is certainly heartening to note Mr. Hoover's call to all members of law enforcement to serve with dignity and honor. These interesting comments deserve the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A Timely Reminder," which appeared in the Thursday, March 11, 1971, edition of the North Augusta Star be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A TIMELY REMINDER

The following, edited by FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover and directed to law enforcement officers is reprinted from the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

Mr. Hoover has recently come under attack from some of the more liberal members of Congress. His philosophy on a topic such as this, in our opinion, as indicative of the man's character as the remarks of his detractors are indicative of theirs.

Frequently, some belligerent, anti-law enforcement elements of our society refer to police officers as "pigs." Obnoxious four-letter words are shouted at policemen, and the familiar chant, "Off the Pigs," meaning "Kill the Police," is a prominent cry wherever these groups assemble. Further, cartoons and publications depicting police officers as pigs are common fare, even for children. The ridiculous statement, "The only good pig is a dead pig," is a slogan of violent protesters. Such deplorable epithets can be gratifying only to little minds.

Self-respect and respect for one's fellow man are hallmarks of civility under any recognized measure of achievement. Further, the proven concepts which enable men of all races, creeds, and backgrounds to live together with a reasonable degree of harmony should be respected. One such concept is the rule of law. Without the rule of law our world would be a jungle. Thus, it is important that the rule of law and all its facets, including the policeman, be respected. In a free society where law—not man—is supreme, the policeman is a living symbol of freedoms shared by all.

In light of the humanitarian aspects of a policeman's work, I would like to repeat a comment made here a few years ago:

"In any emergency, real or imaginary, the first cry that goes forth is for the police. The officer on the beat must be a journeyman of many trades—an on-the-spot doctor, plumber, or baby-sitter. Today's enforcement officer is expected to have multifarious ability, explicit judgment, and an unshakable temperament. He performs on a public stage. The audience is 'live'; every observer is a critic. There can be no retakes of his efforts nor pretaped performances. He is second-guessed, ridiculed, abused, cursed, assaulted, and sometimes murdered. But when he leads a small, lost tot from a dense wooded area to the arms of a joyously weeping mother, his is a rewarding and satisfying service."

Policemen should be respected, at least for what they represent; they should not be called pigs.

We badly need to shore up some eroding ideals and principles in our country today. Community leaders, professional spokesmen, educators, clergymen, and others in positions of influence should take a firm stand to preserve our sense of values. Too many are swayed or intimidated by loud unruly, and aimless rambles—people with a lot of dialog but no message.

In a free society, which owes its very existence and prominence to the rule of law, abuse and ridicule of the law and those charged with enforcing it should not be taken lightly. I urge all members of law enforcement—in spite of personal indignities suffered—to serve with dignity and honor. As a rule, a repulsive slur is more descriptive of its origin than its target.

**THE "INTERNATIONAL" EDUCATION
OF A YOUNG JOHNSTOWN STUDENT**

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, many young people go abroad these days on exchange programs. On the whole, I believe such opportunities to be very valuable to the student in his total learning process. I have graphic proof of this in relaying the story of Tom Reynolds, one of the top scholars from my hometown high school who is currently in Guayaquil, Ecuador, as an exchange student.

Tom has written his fellow high school students an "open letter" which briefly but graphically gives an insight into the young minds of two cultures. Tom's comments on Ecuadorian "nationalism" will particularly interest our colleagues in light of the recent, lamentable, fishing boat incidents.

Mr. Reynold's letter to the students of Johnstown High School, Johnstown, Pa., follows:

GUAYAQUIL, ECUADOR,
February 2, 1971.

To the students of J.H.S.:

Young people the world over have a lot in common. Similar interests in clothing, music, dancing, etc., all act as factors uniting today's youth. However, of course, one must expect some differences because like people, no two nations are exactly alike. Each nation has developed specific characteristics that together form an overall personality. If I had to cite one area where the youth of Ecuador differs from that of the United States it would be its inescapable nationalistic pride.

The young people here take a genuine interest in world events & especially those world events concerning the "mighty neighbor to the north." They know all about discrimination, drugs, hippies, & Viet Nam. They are informed well enough but they don't always stop to think. For instance, I've recently been confronted with the following reasoning. *Basis:* The U.S. has participated in wars in Korea & Viet Nam. *Automatic Conclusion:* The U.S. is bad. Why else would it always be fighting.

These half-truths combined with a fierce nationalism provide the basis for much of the anti-American sentiment that exists in Latin America today. As an example of this nationalism, I wish to introduce the case of the 200 miles territorial fishing limit concerning captured U.S. tuna fisherman. Upon U.S. inquiries into the seizure, the incident was promptly viewed as a national insult & dubbed as the "War of the Tuna" by the newspapermen of Guayaquil. Anti-American scrawlings promptly appeared on various buildings throughout the town & students took to the streets in a series of protests & demonstrations denouncing the "Yankee Pirates."

This nationalism, I might add, is one of the most obnoxious things imaginable to anyone

interested in promoting greater international friendship and cooperation. Even the 18 yr. old son of the family I'm staying with has bluntly & quite rudely come up with such enlightening remarks as "the U.S. thinks it owns the world" and "We don't like Americans down here" etc. etc. etc.

This isn't to pretend America hasn't made mistakes in the past & won't continue to make them in the future. However these people underestimate one basic characteristic of the American people; our fundamental desire to do what is right.

After being in Ecuador awhile, I was able to see more clearly how great our country really is. But I also realized the tremendous responsibility that goes along with being the most powerful nation on earth. I write this now to the students of J.H.S. so they might better understand the need for our great country to be right.

TOM REYNOLDS.

**REPORT OF SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE
ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL
SHELF**

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I refer to the report by the Special Subcommittee on the Outer Continental Shelf of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I read this report with interest and wish to congratulate the subcommittee on the very thorough and intensive examination which they have given to the question of United States policy regarding the Continental Shelf, and am happy to note the general support expressed therein for the new United States Oceans Policy announced by President Nixon on May 23, 1970. I regret, however, their opposition to the President's proposal that—

All nations adopt as soon as possible a treaty under which they renounce all national claims over the natural resources of the seabed beyond the point where the high seas reach a depth of 200 meters, and would agree to regard such resources as the common heritage of mankind.

The President proposed that this action be taken by treaty, and that the very same treaty would provide for a trusteeship zone embracing the remainder of the continental margins in which the United States and other coastal nations would license exploitation of seabed resources off their coast. I should like to express my support for the administration's imaginative yet practical solution to this problem.

The President's report of February 25, 1971, to Congress summarizes his oceans policy very well, and I ask unanimous consent that the relevant portions be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. I should also like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by the New York Times praising the President's Oceans Policy and a very telling commentary on that editorial by Dr. Wolfgang Friedman, professor of International Law at Columbia University, Mr. Anthony Wayne Smith, chairman of the Environmental Coalition for North America, and president and general

counsel of the National Parks and Conservation Association, has also commended the President's policy and commented that the proposed treaty "would strengthen the forces of conservation immeasurably everywhere." I ask unanimous consent that his commentary in the National Parks and Conservation magazine also be printed in the RECORD.

The Washington Post has endorsed the Draft Convention on the International Seabed Area. It points out that the President's proposal was "courageous as well as enlightened" and refers to the:

many oceanic interests—navigation, defense, research, fishing and so on—which [the United States] pursues not only off its own coast but off the coasts of a hundred other countries.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Post's editorial be printed in the RECORD.

During 1970, the New York Times published three other editorials expressing enthusiastic support for the President's Oceans Policy and the U.S. Draft Convention. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the future of the oceans is of vital importance to this country. It affects not only the use of valuable seabed resources, but our security and that of our allies, the supply of food from the sea to meet the world's ever expanding needs, the movement of goods and people around the world, and the protection of the environment of over two-thirds of our planet. This country can no more subscribe to the rule of raw power in the oceans than it can on land.

What the President seeks is the rule of law reflecting the real needs and interests of all countries, and new opportunities to build a more stable system for joint international action in the common interest. His task will not be easy, and he needs and deserves all the support we can give him. The promise of peace, order, and equity in the oceans is too important to future generations to be lost in controversies over detail and ambiguous legal provisions. These matters can be settled at the 1973 Law of the Sea Conference, where, I am confident our representatives will take into account both our Nation's immediate and long-term interests.

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

EXCERPT FROM PRESIDENT NIXON'S REPORT TO
THE CONGRESS ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY FOR
THE 1970's, FEBRUARY 25, 1971

THE OCEANS

The oceans cover two-thirds of the earth. Man's use of this common asset is now undergoing a transformation. New techniques exist or are being developed which will lead to a vastly increased exploitation of the mineral and living resources of the oceans, including the mineral riches of the world's seabeds.

It is, frankly, not yet clear whether this fact will prove a boon to mankind. There is at present, no authority, international or otherwise, which can ensure the orderly and rational exploitation of these resources. That fact, plus the vast potential wealth at stake, gives cause for deep concern. There is a clear world interest in this matter, and there is a clear danger that, unless it is asserted in time, it may be lost in the confusion of unbridled commercial and national ambitions.

A closely related problem relates to the age-old right of freedom of navigation on the high seas. Traditional usage and current international law have proved to be inadequate barriers to claims which generate international tensions and endanger the rights of all to use the oceans. The claims of some nations now extend 200 miles seaward. The temptation to assert and defend such claims can only increase as technology provides new means to profit from exclusive rights to the ocean's surface.

In the past year, the United States has taken the initiative in moving the world toward an equitable resolution of these two problems, while they are still soluble.

On May 23, I set forth an oceans policy which called for both a system of international regulation for the deep seabeds, and a new agreement on the breadth of territorial seas.

Our proposal for the seabeds would divide the ocean floor into two basic categories:

Coastal states would maintain their rights to the natural resources of the seabeds up to the point where the high seas reach a depth of 200 meters.

Seabeds under the remainder of the high seas would be regulated by an international regime. However, coastal states would license exploration and exploitation of resources as trustees for the international community beyond the 200 meter depth line to a further line which would embrace the continental margins.

As I said at the time: "The regime should provide for the collection of substantial mineral royalties to be used for international community purposes, particularly economic assistance to developing countries. It should also establish general rules to prevent unreasonable interference with other uses of the ocean, to protect the ocean from pollution, to assure the integrity of investment necessary for such exploitation, and to provide for peaceful and compulsory settlement of disputes."

In August, our Government submitted to the UN a draft treaty suggesting in detail how such a system would work. We are seeking a system which fully protects the interests of the less-developed countries in the ocean resources, as well as the interests of those nations which now possess the technological capacity to exploit them. Such an arrangement is both fair and practical. For these resources are a common heritage of mankind, and their benefits should be shared by all. And the world is unlikely to give its sanction to arrangements which do not ensure a wide sharing of those benefits. The mineral royalties involved will eventually be very large. Earmarking them for international purposes—particularly the development of the poorer nations—could be a tremendous step forward toward a solution to one of the world's most grievous problems.

On the territorial seas issue, we have proposed a new law of the sea treaty, which would establish a twelve-mile limit for territorial seas adjacent to a nation's coasts and would provide for free transit through and over international straits. It would also provide for conservation of the living resources of the high seas and recognition of the special interests of the coastal states over these resources.

These ideas were extensively discussed at the UN last fall. The U.S. initiative was widely welcomed as a step toward organizing necessary international negotiations. In December, the General Assembly passed a constructive series of resolutions on the oceans. Most important of all, the General Assembly called for an international conference on the law of the sea to be held in 1973.

At that conference, the world will have an historic opportunity. Resources of enormous potential value can be placed under an in-

ternational authority to be used for the benefit of all mankind. And three problems heavy with the possibility of conflict among nations—differing national claims to the ocean's surface, the seabeds, and fishing rights—can be resolved to the benefit of all.

We recognize the difficult and complex issues involved, but we are determined to make every effort to ensure the success of the 1973 Conference. That success would represent a signal victory for the world interest, and a convincing demonstration of the ability of the world community to meet its common problems.

[From the New York Times editorial,
Jan. 22, 1971]

OF FISH, OIL, AND OCEANS

The latest tiff between the United States and Ecuador over the seizing of American tuna boats underscores again the imperative need for an international regime to govern the orderly development of oceanic resources for all countries. There is no practical alternative to international authority, preferably exercised under the United Nations. At stake among other considerations is the ancient and precious doctrine of freedom of the seas.

Of course it is far-fetched for Ecuador and other Latin American countries to claim territorial waters—and therefore exclusive fishing jurisdiction—out to 200 miles. But the United States invited this situation—almost insured it—when President Truman in 1945 claimed the natural resources in the seabed of the "continental shelf" off American coasts for exclusive United States "jurisdiction and control."

Despite assurances to the contrary, this doctrine chipped away at the freedom-of-the-seas principle and diluted the traditional American stand for a three-mile limit to territorial waters. It met little opposition, however, and was codified in a Geneva Convention of 1958. Mr. Truman acted primarily at the behest of the oil industry, which continues to interpret the Convention liberally and to lobby for an even greater extension of offshore sovereignty.

It was logical that other coastal nations would also claim their offshore resources. Poor countries with no significant continental shelf and no proven mineral wealth covered by the Geneva Convention simply made their claims on the ocean itself and the fish it contained. Ecuador, Peru and Chile extended territorial waters to 200 miles. Fourteen Latin American countries last year proclaimed their right to as much of the sea and seabed as might be necessary to protect their offshore wealth.

The State Department is bound by ill-conceived laws to cut off arms sales and credits and possibly economic aid to Ecuador in retaliation for the tuna boat seizures. This will only arouse much of Latin America against the United States, seen as a bully unwilling to grant poor countries offshore rights comparable to those it claims for itself.

Actually, Washington worked hard last year for a resolution adopted overwhelmingly by the United Nations General Assembly that declares oceanic resources "the common heritage of mankind," to be governed by an international regime that will be established by a U.N. conference in 1973. But 1973 is a long way off, as the unfortunate quarrel with Ecuador reminds us.

About all the United States can do in the interim is to exercise as much patience and restraint in incidents such as that of the tuna boats as the laws allow. That low-key stance may help deter additional attempts to extend sovereignty over oceanic resources that 108 nations agreed last month could be developed rationally and safely only under international authority.

LETTER BY DR. WOLFGANG FRIEDMANN, PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1971]

AUTHORITY OVER SEABED

TO THE EDITOR: Your Jan. 22 editorial rightly stresses the connection between the extravagant claims of most Latin-American countries to exclusive jurisdiction over 200-mile zones from their coasts, and the expanding claims of the technologically advanced countries to appropriation of the oceanbed resources.

Owing to a disastrous clause in the Geneva Convention of 1958—which expands the Truman Proclamation limit of 200 meters depth to "where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources" of areas adjacent to the coast—industrial interests are pushing governments to extend national claims further and further outward, to the edge of the continental margin (roughly 4,000 meters depth).

Inevitably, exploration of the oceanbed affects fishing and navigation. Already there are shipping lanes in the Gulf of Mexico. And Canada, which recently proclaimed exclusive pollution control over a hundred-mile Arctic zone, has simultaneously reserved rights to control fishing and navigation in that area.

The combined result of all these moves and countermoves will be—within this decade—the partition of large parts of the oceans, and the gradual destruction of the freedom of the seas. The most constructive move to stem this ominous tide has been the U.S. State Department-sponsored proposal to confine the continental shelf again strictly to 200 meters depth, to establish an international seabed authority, and to give the coastal states the right to administer "an intermediate zone." For this zone they will be responsible to the international authority with regard to safety, pollution and technical standards, and they will hand over at least 50 per cent of the revenue from licensing and royalties to the international seabed authority for development aid.

The United Nations December resolution approves an international regime in principle but leaves "the limits of national jurisdiction" undefined. By the time the Sea Law Conference convenes in 1973, thousands more miles of oceanbed resources will have been appropriated and more states may have followed the example of the Latin Americans in appropriating part of the seas—a return to the "closed seas" doctrine of 350 years ago.

The only sane alternative is the establishment of international jurisdiction and standards with regard to fisheries, shipping, pollution and oceanbed resources and the promotion of multinational joint ventures in which developed and undeveloped countries, maritime and landlocked states, can jointly explore the resources of the oceans and thus share technology as well as the unexplored wealth of the oceans for the common benefit.

The present trend will only aggravate existing inequalities, encourage overfishing, increase the dangers of pollution and extend the confrontation of the major powers to the bottom of the oceans.

WOLFGANG FRIEDMANN.

[By Anthony Wayne Smith, National Parks and Conservation Magazine, August 1970]

AN OCEANS TREATY

President Nixon is to be commended on his recent proposal for a protective treaty for the oceans and seabeds. The adoption of such a treaty by the nations of the world would strengthen the forces of conservation immeasurably everywhere. It would also further

the emergence of planetary social and political order generally.

The key proposal is that the nations renounce all national claims over the natural resources of the seabed beyond the 200-meter depth. Beyond that line the resources of the seabed would be regarded as the common heritage of mankind.

An international agency, referred to as a regime, would be established for the management of seabed resources beyond this limit. The regime would have the power to promulgate regulations to protect the oceans from pollution, among other abuses. Machinery would be established for the peaceful and compulsory settlement of disputes; the word *compulsory* should be noted.

Sharing the authority of the world regime in part, coastal nations would act as trustees for a marginal area of the world heritage zone, consisting of the continental margins beyond the 200-meter depth line. The continental margins contain the continental shelf, falling away gradually from the shoreline; the continental slope, which plunges more precipitously into the depths; and the continental rise, which is the talus area at the foot of the slope, its toe touching the deep seabed.

Revenues from the common heritage zone would accrue to the world regime for use in economic assistance to developing countries. Each coastal state would receive a share of the world revenues from its trust zone and could impose additional taxes.

We have certain doubts about the desirability of the trusteeship arrangement. The attractive aspect of the plan as a whole is the common heritage idea. But we are well aware of the practical difficulties of moving even as far as the President has proposed. Most conservationists, in our judgment, would support broader authority for the proposed ocean regime. Moreover, a more generous boundary than the 200-meter line might be in order for the heritage zone.

Of greater significance is the proposal that agreed international machinery be developed to authorize and regulate exploration and exploitation of seabed resources beyond the continental margins. This authority, in our judgment, should extend to the 200-meter depth line, or even closer to the shores. Trust arrangements in the trusteeship zone should be subject to determination by the world agency.

But it is the proposed regulatory power which is of immediate interest. The treaty would set up a regulatory agency with jurisdiction to enact binding rules in the nature of world statutory law. This is the general course the nations must follow if a democratic world order is to replace the present widespread world chaos.

Implicit in the proposal for regulation is the necessity for the creation of judicial institutions to interpret the regulations. The procedures should include final adjudication on a compulsory basis by the International Court of Justice.

Realism in these matters also demands the establishment of police authority to enforce the regulations. The regime must obviously have the essential administrative equipment: survey, research, and management powers, among others. But it must also have powers of inspection, patrol, arrest, and penalty; there are many ways to work out such enforcement authority, but the authority must be clear.

As institutions of this kind are developed in various fields, the protection of the oceans and seabeds being but one, the domain of democratic law and order may spread gradually around the globe.

Essential to the substantive powers of a world regime for the oceans and seabeds is a mandate to preserve the entire marine ecosystem. The proposed licensing power, presumably intended to conserve mineral re-

sources and mitigate disputes over their discovery and exploitation, will be excellent. But the grave danger to human life on the planet, and much other life as well, presented by current exploration, is the all-too-familiar progressive destruction of the environment.

The oceans and seabeds regime, in our opinion, should have authority, for example, among others, the whales. Such a proposal would test the sincerity of many prospective participants in the convention.

True, world institutions for such purposes could be established by the amendment of existing conventions; but a more imaginative plan may be essential to get the necessary improvements. True, also, Congress has instructed the Administration to seek to convene a ministerial conference on an international convention to protect endangered species; but everyone is dragging his feet. Action of some kind is needed.

We proposed in these pages last month that environmentalists work to set up an Environmental and Population Organization within the structure of the United Nations, open to nonmembers. An EPO would shoulder responsibility for aiding education in problems of environment and population everywhere and for helping the development of world law in these fields.

If some of these responsibilities can be assumed by the oceans regime the President proposes, well and good, and progress may possibly be faster; but in the end a top-level worldwide Organization with comprehensive powers will be needed.

The President announced that the United States would introduce specific proposals at the next meeting of the United Nations Seabeds Committee. He noted that the adoption of the treaty he proposed, and related international agreements, would be a fitting achievement to mark the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. Thus, acceptance of the aegis of the United Nations appears to be an essential part of the President's plan; we trust that participation will be open to nonmembers as well.

The cutting edge of modern technology presses rapidly into the deep seas. Men have learned to their horror that this technology, once thought naively to be always beneficial, carries too large a measure of death and destruction with it wherever it goes. The beneficence of applied science will be questioned increasingly by more and more people until effective public and private institutions can be established with power to direct scientific knowledge into socially, ecologically, and economically viable collective policies.

The President's plan is a new bit of hope, a promise of some better things, a lamp against the darkness. Environmentalists and humanitarians all around the globe should lend their help, through their private organizations and their governments, toward the realization, in general outline, of the program the President has proposed.

[From the Washington Post Editorial,
Aug. 5, 1970]

A FINE SEABED PROPOSAL IS LAUNCHED

The Nixon administration can be proud of the draft of a proposed international seabed treaty which it submitted at Geneva Monday. The draft bears out, and in some respect embellishes, the imaginative and generous prospect the President opened up last May when he first proposed a treaty. His promise then was to protect and regulate the immense spaces—three fourths of the world's total area—at the bottom of the seas, which are now unprotected and unregulated; and also to provide for exploiting their economic resources and for sharing the expected billions of dollars in seabed revenues among all the peoples of the world.

The essence of the administration proposal—and the main source of domestic opposition to it is to limit each state's coastal-shelf sovereignty to waters no deeper than 200 meters. Beyond, the coastal state would act as an international trustee, administering the seabed and keeping for itself a third to a half of the revenues from exploitation while turning over the rest to a new international authority which would manage the resources (pollution control, marine parks, etc.) and finance economic development in developing countries.

It was courageous as well as enlightened for Mr. Nixon to fix a narrow national shelf, knowing that American oil companies favor a wider shelf and that they regard a narrow one as a "giveaway." But the United States has many oceanic interests—navigation, defense, research, fishing and so on—which it pursues not only off its own coast but off the coasts of a hundred other countries. Since seabed claims tend to harden into claims on the water and air "columns" above, an American assertion of a wide shelf would inevitably inspire similar if not broader claims by other coastal states. The result would be a net loss of the freedom of the seas which this country's varied interests require. Law School Professor Louis Henkin, believes that a narrow shelf—far from hurting American companies—"may even give them access to more minerals than would a system in which the coastal nations of the world can grab large areas of seabed."

The companies' real objection, Mr. Henkin suggested to Congress last year, is that oil and gas taken from areas beyond 200 meters might receive unfavorable tariff and tax treatment. "Surely the legitimate needs of the oil companies can be attended to by Congress, within the national family," he argued. "Surely such considerations should not determine the national policy in regard to mineral resources of the seabed; even less should they enjoin a national policy that would jeopardize other interests in the seabed and in the sea as a whole." This is the appropriate perspective in which to view the President's seabed proposal, and the opposition to it.

[From the New York Times Editorial, May 27,
1970]

MAN'S OCEAN HERITAGE

President Nixon's proposal to declare the ocean floor beyond the depth of 200 meters (660 feet) "the common heritage of mankind" marks a significant advance in United States policy toward a more responsible role in promoting international law, cooperation and development.

The Administration's decision to press for the relatively narrow 200-meter depth limit on national sovereignty over the continental shelf, instead of the much wider area allowed under the existing "exploitability" clause, should spur United Nations efforts to convene a new international conference to update the laws of the sea. These efforts will also be helped by an earlier United States decision to accept the 12-mile limit for territorial seas which is favored by a majority of other nations.

The President's forthright support for the idea of an international regime to regulate the exploitation of the seabed will give fresh impetus to efforts already under way in the U.N.'s Seabed Committee to define the nature and duties of such an agency which would break new ground in international cooperation.

Mr. Nixon's suggestion that royalties collected on ocean floor minerals "be used for international community purposes, particularly economic assistance to developing countries," should stimulate planning for the U.N.'s Second Development Decade, if of-

fers a promising new source of development funds which may reach substantial proportions before the end of the seventies.

Although the United States had already endorsed in general terms the idea of international sharing of the wealth of the ocean floor, the President's statement commits this country more explicitly than ever before to the principles of international control first set forth by the Maltese representative at the U.N. three years ago. It ends a period of frustrating ambiguity during which the United States impeded international action because of internal differences over the limits which should be placed on national sovereignty.

President Nixon's statement does not in itself clear up all the ambiguities. For example, his proposal for an international trusteeship administered by each coastal state over the "continental margins" beyond the 200-meter depth is unclear about the degree of national control over this intermediate and undefined seabed area.

Furthermore, the 200-meter definition as it stands is clearly not going to be acceptable to coastal states which have narrow continental shelves, or no shelves at all, as is the case on the West Coast of Latin America. Some adjustment will be necessary to win their support, such as the 50-mile alternative proposed by the United States Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources.

In spite of these and other questions that surely will be raised, the Nixon proposals offer an important, positive contribution to the international effort to insure that, in the President's words, "the oceans will be used rationally and equitably and for the benefit of mankind."

[From the New York Times Editorial,
Aug. 7, 1970]

PROTECTION FOR THE SEABED . . .

United States proposals for an international authority to control exploitation of the ocean floor—submitted to the United Nations Seabed Committee now meeting at Geneva—substantially fulfill President Nixon's recent promise that the riches of the ocean floor "should be the common heritage of mankind."

The American draft convention has been downgraded to a "working paper"; it has also been somewhat modified in response to vehement objections from representatives of domestic oil and other mineral interests. But the document retains the essential elements in Mr. Nixon's May 23 call for international machinery to regulate exploitation of the ocean floor beyond the 200 meter depth line and for the collection of mineral royalties to be used for international community purposes.

Senator Claiborne Pell, the Rhode Island Democrat who has been a long-time advocate of international action to police the seabed, considers the proposal an "excellent" one. We share his enthusiasm.

If adopted; the plan would avert a potentially dangerous race for control of unexploited wealth on the ocean floor. It could, in time, generate substantial sums to support a perilously lagging international development effort.

The proposed international agency would not, as has been charged, deny to Americans their fair share of seabed resources. Rather it would provide a more stable regime under which American entrepreneurs, with their superior technology, could operate for reasonable private gain and for the benefit of mankind.

President Nixon deserves strong public support for this promising initiative. It puts the United States once again in the forefront of efforts to promote a more orderly and just international community.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 20, 1970]
U.N. PROGRESS IN SEA AND AIR

Despite the gloom that marked the official twenty-fifth birthday observance in October, the United Nations General Assembly has completed a surprisingly productive and constructive session.

In spite of its built-in pro-Arab majority, the Assembly debated the Middle East with greater responsibility than many diplomats had expected. In doing so it may have given a marginal push for resumption of peace talks.

The most solid achievement came in a series of actions to protect the security of the international seabed and to develop its resources under international authority for the benefit of all countries including the landlocked. A treaty to ban nuclear weapons from the seabed outside any nation's 12-mile limit was overwhelmingly approved. The Assembly also declared that the resources of the international seabed, ocean floor and subsoil were "the common heritage of mankind," and that all activities with regard to them should be governed by an international regime. The Assembly will convene a conference in 1973 to establish this authority.

A strongly worded resolution against aerial hijacking passed the Assembly without a negative vote, and gave a powerful impetus for the tough international convention signed by fifty nations at The Hague. The convention follows the spirit of the Assembly resolution in making hijacking a crime and requiring participating nations to punish offenders severely.

The Assembly established a goal for the second United Nations Development Decade that included a United States pledge to try to provide one per cent of its Gross National Product for development aid by 1975. It struck a blow for universality by mustering a narrow majority for the first time for an abortive motion to admit Communist China.

Though far from the "town meeting of the world" that the late Senator Vandenberg envisioned, the General Assembly has again proved itself a useful agency. It might yet develop into an indispensable one.

RESPECTED CIVIC AND BUSINESS LEADERS MALIGNED IN NEWS ARTICLE

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, I was surprised to see that two highly respected civic and business leaders in my home district maligned in a newspaper article which was inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the March 4, 1971, RECORD on page 5220, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER), inserted an article entitled "Banker's Ordeal—Run Over by Government, He Fights On," printed in the Los Angeles Times.

The two men, Messrs. Robert and Donald Levenson, have been highly respected members of the Wheeling business and civic community for years, and it is grossly unfair to them that they should be exposed to the one-sided news reporting that occurred in the Los Angeles Times.

In business affairs, men find themselves at differences, and those differences are sometimes resolved in the courts of law. That is the situation here. There are suits in process, and I have no intention to step beyond the bounds of propriety to comment on the case. I am confident that the courts will come to a proper settlement.

In the meantime, however, it is only simple fairness that the public be given some balance in the information in this matter. I have no intention of letting two fine men be maligned without cause. The following is a letter from the counsel of the Bank of Wheeling to Mr. Robert Nelson, the executive vice president and general manager of the Los Angeles Times, which sets out the facts involved in this situation:

PINSKY, MAHAN, BARNES,
WATSON, CUOMO & HINERMAN,
Wellsburg, W. Va., March 12, 1971.

MR. ROBERT D. NELSON,
Executive Vice President and General Manager,
Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles,
Calif.

DEAR MR. NELSON: Your Friday morning, February 26, 1971 issue carried an article captioned "Banker's Ordeal—Run over by Government, He Fights On" with the by-line of Al Delugach, Times Staff Writer.

Among other things, you stated that Molever was run over by the government machine; that the F.D.I.C. came up with long existing evidence and cleared Molever which was kept secret until Molever forced it open last summer in legal proceedings; that meanwhile to get the bank going again, the F.D.I.C. chose a couple of the bank directors, wealthy brothers of Wheeling; that one Noel in a letter of resignation assumed all blame and responsibility for the automobile loans and that Noel had deceived Molever about the automobile loans.

The above are some of the highlights of this article which has among its purposes to recoup and recover the image of Mr. Molever as a thoroughly honest banker whose reputation in some fashion was destroyed by a government agency. This article, misleading, inaccurate, false and distorted in many respects, disclosing biased and slanted interpretations and completely devoid of the objective truth, was circulated not only by your publication of it on February 26, 1971, but through your agency of the L. A. Times service and the Washington Post—L. A. Times, as witness the caption in the Arizona Republic of Phoenix, Arizona of March 1, 1971 "Ex-Banker, FDIC Casualty, Gains in Fight To Clear Himself by Al Delugach, Los Angeles Times Service". In this vein, it attained circulation through your news service or that of the Washington Post—L. A. Times news service throughout the country.

On February 27, 1971, I talked to both Mr. Stanley Bibbero of the City Editor's desk of your paper and later to Mr. Michael Hubler, through Mr. Bibbero, of the L. A. Times—Post. I advised both of these gentlemen of the misleading, inaccurate and distorted aspects of your story. Mr. Delugach, its professed author, called me on the afternoon of March 1, 1971 at which time I told him that I could not understand your newspaper and service publishing such an article without trying to vouch for the other side. At that time, he stated he would be interested in knowing the real facts from me. I told him it was too late for that; that I am an attorney engaged by The Bank of Wheeling in the Molever litigation and I would not try my cases in the newspapers but the objective facts were here in West Virginia in the various court files in these cases and they were open to him; that if he had been interested

in a candid search for the truth, it was easily available and not from two thousand miles away. I further stated that with the libel laws such as they are, I would think that you would have been more faithful to your reportorial responsibility.

It seems to me that the article reflects the litany of Molever in defense of his administration of The Bank of Wheeling while he was its president and chief executive officer for some sixteen months. It was under his tenure that the bank's total book capital of some \$493,000 was impaired to the amount of some \$480,000. This impairment was chiefly caused by a large concentration of loans on used car conditional sales contracts for approximately one million dollars.

The mission of your article, it seems, has for its purpose to extol and re-establish Mr. Molever who was charged with the responsibility of the operation of the bank and who, since his resignation, has vowed to destroy the institution that he headed.

Had you been concerned with an objective and candid search of the facts, you would have readily found evidence in the court proceedings pending in the West Virginia courts, both state and federal, indicating that your informant, Molever, had:

(1) Obtained the charter of the bank under extremely questionable circumstances in which a check of \$25,000 featured, drawn on a business of which Mr. Molever was the owner and which charter was obtained in an administration of the State of West Virginia, some of whose principal officers are now sentenced or under indictment for wrong-doing;

(2) While president and chief executive officer of the bank, issued false reports of the bank's condition;

(3) While president and chief executive officer, diverted one-half of the proceeds of a loan of \$45,000 to a third party to his own use and benefit;

(4) While president and chief executive officer of the bank, secured an over-subscription of the bank's original stock keeping several thousand dollars of the proceeds of such over-subscription in his own personal account and manipulated the issuance of the stock certificates to conform to his wrong-doings;

(5) While president and chief executive officer of the bank, used funds of the bank on deposit in a Pittsburgh correspondent bank for his own personal use; and,

(6) While president and chief executive officer, he threatened his cashier and vice president, Jay O. Noel, with exposure of extra-marital activities and affairs, to secure an exoneration of himself for the plight of the bank and total incrimination of Mr. Noel.

It is suggested that you should have investigated the matters contained in a law suit filed in the Court of Common Pleas of Belmont County, Ohio against I. M. Molever, defendant, in Case No. 24148, wherein a judgment of \$9,000 was rendered against him arising on a promissory note of June 14, 1966 in that amount and the circumstances surrounding the same. The judgment remains unsatisfied. In June 1966, Mr. Molever was still the president and chief executive officer of The Bank of Wheeling.

Your article commends the happy home-life of the marriage of your informant. No mention is made of a divorce proceedings filed in the Arizona Superior Court, Maricopa County, Arizona, Action No. D-118374, on the 24th of June, 1970, by his wife.

As a result of an investigation made by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, a finding of unsafe and unsound practices and order of correction was issued by it on the 25th of August, 1966, which among other things, contained the following:

"(1) That I. M. Molever be removed from any and all connection with the active management of the bank as director, officer or employee, and that there be taken all action

necessary to assure the permanent and absolute elimination of the said I. M. Molever from directly or indirectly participating in or influencing the policies, direction, management, operation or practices of the bank;".

Sometime in December 1966, the court files will show, he attempted to secure the bank minutes of the bank to be illegally taken from the bank's premises to a business conducted by him in Wheeling.

You premised your article and the central theme is on a floor plan arrangement of the Reichart Furniture Company of which the Messrs. Levenson are officers and who are also directors of the bank, with The Bank of Wheeling which you have expanded and distorted. Had you employed genuine concern about this, the court files would have disclosed that this floor plan arrangement has been indulged in by reputable banks for their customers; that The Bank of Wheeling at no time lost anything whatever on this account; that the floor plan arrangement of which you have made so much about, did not contribute one job or tittle to the impairment of the bank's capital of \$480,000. That the floor plan matter was thoroughly investigated by the F.B.I. at the instance of the F.D.I.C. without adverse findings; that Mr. Molever who professed ignorance of the arrangement the court files will show was thoroughly aware of it from its inception and when the bank's condition surfaced in April 1966, he attempted to use it as an instrumentality against the Levensons to extract him from the consequences of his administration as the bank's president and chief executive officer.

Yet you give slight heed in your article to the chief and central cause of the bank's plight under Molever's tenure, the loans on used cars, all of which arose during his official head of the bank.

An honest pursuit of the facts on your part of the court files in West Virginia would have revealed that although your informant, Molever, maintained his ignorance of these loans, which were some four hundred, yet he himself participated in many of them. The procedures in effecting these loans and the supporting papers in connection with them, a check on your part would have disclosed, demonstrates an incredible lack even of the most rudiment knowledge of simple lending safeguards for the bank which he headed, and he, at the time, and had been for several years, a certified public accountant.

You have ignored the fact that when the crisis of the bank reached its climax in August 1966, Mr. Molever contributed absolutely nothing to re-establish it, while the court records will show that the main contribution for the re-establishment of the bank from the effects of Molever's tenure as chief executive officer and president came from the Messrs. Levenson, whom your article attacks, despite Mr. Molever's unqualified right to participate in such contribution.

All of this could have been ascertained by you or your staff in the West Virginia court proceedings, yet you chose to accept slanted, distorted, inaccurate and false statements from an informant some two thousand miles away from the scene. You have done irreparable harm to The Bank of Wheeling, its stockholders and depositors, for the bank, since the exodus of Molever has been doing an outstanding service in the community despite his campaign of litigation to destroy it. You have lent yourself to a violation of a West Virginia statute about false statements concerning banking institutions. It is incredible that what is considered a responsible news media should indulge in this sort of reporting.

Your article has exalted the one whose misfeasance and nonfeasance brought the bank to its condition reflected in the examination in April 1966 and has deprecated those

who salvaged it from the consequences of such mismanagement.

The exercise of responsible journalism should have prompted a circumspect and candid search of the facts, especially in the sensitive area of banking where such statutory prohibition exists.

You may treat this letter as part of the record of the story you published on February 26, 1971, and disseminated through your services throughout the United States.

Very truly yours,

ABRAHAM PINSKY,
Counsel for the Bank of Wheeling.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR SKI TRIPS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner of March 26 included an excellent editorial on the subject of Federal funds for ski trips.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Frisivolous Welfare Waste an Abuse of Trust," be printed in the Extension of Remarks. The editor of the Nashville Banner is Alvand C. Dunkelberger.

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

FRIVOLOUS WELFARE WASTE AN ABUSE OF TRUST

Virginia Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., does not speak for himself alone in condemning the incident reported in these words: "It has come to my attention that a number of welfare recipients in New York City have been sent on ski trips to Massachusetts, Vermont and Upstate New York."

The Virginia lawmaker puts the onus where it belongs—not on an outing of that kind, nor on anyone's right to enjoy such; but on the reported financing of it with funds provided by the Bronx Model Cities program . . . funds assessed from hard-working U.S. taxpayers.

It was precisely that kind of frivolous mistreatment of supervisory responsibility that resulted in the other case, recently disclosed of a welfare family lodged in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel at public expense.

These might be termed exaggerated instances of abuse; but the very fact that they could happen illustrates the laxity that has compounded this program into what President Nixon rightly has called "a monstrous consuming outrage." The very fact that they can happen—and inside the state of which he is the Chief Executive—undoubtedly explains the concern of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller for a real reform movement, to take the frivolity out of the welfare program.

The sentiment for that—yes, the demand for it—is shared coast to coast, for it was on the West Coast that Gov. Ronald Reagan initiated the action for a real overhaul of the program. The proposal is not to provide free ski outings for the relief clientele, but to provide work—the acceptance of which would be mandatory for the able-bodied among them.

Senator Byrd accents, as he should, the fact that conscience recognizes the obligation of the government toward those who are physically or mentally incapable of earning a living; but he also stresses that "Officials in charge of all social welfare programs should keep constantly in mind that their mission is to help those who truly need help."

"I think," he said in a speech Thursday on the Senate floor, "that the American people are getting fed up with this kind of abuse of trust by public officials—for it is an abuse of trust when officials permit the waste of tax dollars."

The case reported speaks for itself as an allegation of outrageous abuse—and the necessity for the reform which concerned taxpayers and officials on both sides of the party aisle are demanding.

MANPOWER SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1971

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am submitting for the RECORD the third research report of the Conference of Mayors, League of Cities, series on the Nixon administration's approach to the urban areas. This report documents what are called serious flaws in the administration's approach to manpower problems.

The report follows:

MANPOWER SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1971 BACKGROUND

The closing days of the 91st Congress witnessed considerable debate over reform of the nation's manpower programs. The President's veto of the Employment and Manpower Act of 1970 (EMA), the product of a House-Senate Conference, only temporarily halted the debate. Several measures were quickly introduced during the opening days of the 92nd Congress (H.R. 17—Perkins; H.R. 29—O'Hara; H.R. 3613—Daniels; S. 31—Nelson). On March 16, the Administration's own proposal—The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971—was introduced in the Congress.

In explaining his veto, the President indicated that the EMA did "not achieve the reform necessary to establish a manpower program that will serve the nation or the individual job seeker." He cited the Administration's own manpower reform proposal, sent to Congress in August of 1969, as "one of the three key parts in a program of fundamental reform." (The other two were revenue sharing and reform of the welfare system.)

From a city perspective the Administration's 1970 manpower bill contained some serious flaws. For example, while it offered to decentralize control over manpower program planning and administration, it funneled funds through a state planning mechanism. Also, while it gave ultimate responsibility to a local government, it held it accountable for planning on an SMSA-wide basis, well beyond its jurisdiction. Finally, the Administration proposal contained no provision for a public service employment program.

In the interim, between the introduction of the Administration's bill and the veto of the EMA, a gradual change became evident in the Administration's position on manpower reform. It supported the House-passed Comprehensive Manpower Act (CMA), the President considering it to have included "many of the structural reform features [he] felt

to be essential." For example, the CMA consolidated legislative authority for manpower programs by replacing the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and substantially amending Title I-A of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It decategorized many of the existing manpower programs and provided authority for comprehensive manpower programs under the prime sponsorship of local general government. It gave local government preference over state government when both applied for prime sponsorship over the same geographic area. It gave local general governments with a population of 100,000 or more eligibility for prime sponsorship. Finally, it provided for a considerable public service employment program effective at the beginning of FY '72.

Hence, a basic question to be considered in analyzing the Administration's latest proposal is the extent to which it maintains the positions supported in the CMA of manpower reform, direct funding to cities for prime sponsorship of comprehensive manpower programs and a clear recognition of the need to include a public service employment option in comprehensive manpower reform.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S 1971 BILL

The Administration bill (H.R. 6181, S. 1243) intends to reorganize the delivery systems of manpower training, related and supportive services. By repealing the MDTA of 1962 as amended and Title I A, B, & E of EOA of 1964, it decentralizes and decategorizes manpower planning and services to local eligible jurisdictions. While the President in his accompanying manpower message to Congress and in his FY 1972 budget calls for \$2 billion, no dollar amount is cited in the bill. With 85% of whatever monies available going to eligible sponsors and 15% for activities carried out by the Secretary of Labor, the bill provides broad discretion as to the various uses of the shared revenues provided that they adhere to the Administration's general philosophy that manpower programs are a transitional process for unemployed and underemployed in security self-sustaining public and private employment. Although there is no ceiling on wages, benefits may be paid to each participant for only 104 weeks.

ELIGIBILITY

Eligible prime sponsors include:

1. States, for those areas of the state not within the jurisdiction of local sponsors;
2. Units of local government with a population of 100,000 or more persons which are cities or counties (population exclusive of eligible cities) or other units of government with powers similar to a city;
3. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in which no single unit of government is eligible and in which 75% of the combined populations form a consortium;
4. Combinations including at least one eligible unit of local government forming a consortium.

A manpower consortium formed pursuant to example 4 (above) and constituting a defined labor market area would receive a 10% bonus of funds than normally entitled. (Note: These funds come from the 85% national allocation rather than the 15% reserved for the Secretary.) Allocations will be made on the basis of number of persons in the labor force, or unemployed, and of low income residents over 16 years of age as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Until such time as a local unit is eligible or if a unit refuses funds under this bill the moneys would be added to the state share for discretionary use in manpower programs.

COORDINATION

While no one local unit is mandated as the coordinating agent the bill requires:

A mutual exchange of state and local plans two months prior to the fiscal year, and an exchange of comments on the plans one month prior to the fiscal year.

Recipients to coordinate to the fullest extent possible with similar services provided by other public or private agencies under other statutory authority to develop a comprehensive manpower program in a shared jurisdiction.

ANALYSIS OF LOCAL IMPACT

The bill does not categorize any function or program and leaves it up to the local jurisdiction to articulate its own priorities. Given the opportunity to develop expertise in those areas previously monopolized by State Employment Services, the local prime sponsors appear to have considerable autonomy. Indeed, in briefing sessions, responsible spokesmen for the Administration have asserted forthrightly that the local plan will prevail with or without concurrence by state or federal authorities. However, given the requirements to coordinate (mentioned above) and particularly the stipulation that state agencies shall comment and make recommendations about duplication of services, capacity, coordination, and integration with state provided employment and manpower services, the question of an indirect state veto over local activities becomes a possibility at least until the Administration makes clear its intention to permit local plans to prevail. If this becomes firm, the desirability of this aspect of the bill for local government is evident and constitutes a radical and satisfying change from past practice.

While the \$2 billion figure has been articulated, a reliable determination of the applicable resources available will not be clear until a dollar amount is appropriated for the bill. Then too, this is a calendar year bill effective January 1, 1972 with potential fiscal year linkages problems.

Revenues shared under the bill can be used for a transitional public service employment program. The monies for this transitional program would come from a city's existing allocation for ongoing programs, not from a new influx of funds as provided in the pending emergency PSE legislation (the Nelson, Perkins, O'Hara and Daniels bills discussed above). With benefits for any one public service employee limited to two years, the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971 can provide continuity for an ongoing PSE program. Funding is available for PSE slots, but an individual public service employee must be moved out of the public service position (by securing a regular government or private industry position or being terminated) after two years if the city wishes to retain federal funding for the position.

Since the Secretary determines eligibility based on evidence that a local jurisdiction is to carry out the activities provided by this Act under state or local law, conflicts may arise from conflicting state-local jurisdictional legislation. Those funds normally going to those declared ineligible or those units refusing to participate will be allotted to the state for discretionary use anywhere in the state. The state share, when not utilized, will revert to the Secretary for discretionary use anywhere in the Nation.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

The list of special activities which the Secretary of Labor is to conduct reflects the Administration's intent to reduce the federal role in establishing specific national manpower policies and to put the federal government in a supportive role *vis-a-vis* state and local manpower policies and programs.

With the exception of the establishment and operation of a national computerized job bank, the bill does not instruct the Sec-

retary to conduct any specific programs. He can, however, "establish programs designed to assure that manpower programs contribute fully to national policy objectives," including activities which the bill authorizes states and localities to conduct. Since only 15% of the manpower funds (or \$267 million if \$1.78 billion is appropriated for FY 72) would be available to the Secretary, it is unlikely that any program would be very large. If any of the activities are of a health, education or welfare character, the Secretary must obtain prior concurrence from the Secretary of HEW.

Most of the activities for which the Secretary is responsible are supportive in nature. They include: 1) providing training and technical assistance; 2) conducting manpower research and demonstration and pilot programs; 3) developing labor market information on a national, state, local or other appropriate basis; and 4) securing data to evaluate the relative and, where appropriate, comparative effectiveness of activities funded by the Act.

The Secretary is also charged with certain oversight responsibilities. The most significant one from the standpoint of the cities concerns activities under the Wagner-Peyser Act (enabling act for the state employment services). The Secretary must assure that services under the Wagner-Peyser Act "are made available in a manner that contributes, to the fullest extent possible, to the development of a comprehensive manpower program in each jurisdiction served by a recipient of funds under this Act." Although this provision is not as comprehensive as last year's Comprehensive Manpower Act, which explicitly required state plans to assure that Wagner-Peyser activities would be conducted so as to provide coordinated assistance to participants, it does provide the Secretary with a mandate to require similar assurances from the states. It would thus reduce the favored position which State Employment Services have enjoyed. The burden of coordination would be more equally distributed between states and localities.

EMERGENCY TRAINING

Concern over the unemployment rate has popularized the concept of a "trigger" mechanism which provides an increase of federal funds for manpower programs when the unemployment rate reaches a certain level. Funds made available in this fashion address the problem of cyclical rather than chronic unemployment which afflicts the disadvantaged. The Administration's original manpower bill and the bill which President Nixon vetoed last December contained such trigger provisions. There are several bills in Congress, notably Sen. Nelson's "Emergency Employment Act of 1971" (S. 31) and Rep. Carl Perkins' "Employment Act of 1971" (H.R. 17) which would provide emergency assistance.

The President's Manpower Revenue Sharing bill also includes an automatic "trigger" to be invoked when the national unemployment rate reaches 4½% or more for three consecutive months. It grants the Secretary authority to obligate up to 10% of the funds appropriated for the other activities authorized by the bill. The money would be distributed to areas of high unemployment, but there is no requirement that it be divided according to the severity of local unemployment.

Worth noting is the effective date for the trigger funds provisions: July 1, 1972. This contrasts markedly with the bills of Senator Nelson and Representative Perkins both of which would be effective immediately upon enactment.

Because the President's trigger provision would not be effective until FY '73, it is im-

possible to compute how much money would be available. However, it is instructive to compare the amount that would be available, if the trigger were effective January 1, 1972, with the amounts Senator Nelson's and Representative Perkins' bills would authorize. Using the FY '72 Budget as a source, this amount can be broken down as follows:

Titles I and II budget authority	\$1,565,000,000
New special revenue sharing request	217,000,000
Total authority proposed	1,782,000,000
Trigger	.10
Available under trigger provision	178,200,000

This amount is substantially less than the minimum amount—\$500,000,000—available for the first full year under Senator Nelson's bill and the \$1,000,000,000 available under Representative Perkins' bill.

Another significant difference between the bills in Congress and the President's bill appears in the intended uses of the trigger funds.

Both Senator Nelson's and Representative Perkins' bills earmark the trigger funds for public service employment. Thus they establish a national commitment to the concept of public service employment. They also deal with two problems at once: the high unemployment rate and the need for public service jobs at the local level. These two issues were treated separately in the Employment and Manpower Act vetoed by President Nixon last December. That bill contained a separate public service employment program with its own authorization in addition to a trigger provision which did not specify activities which trigger funds should support.

Like the Employment and Manpower Act and in line with the Administration's commitment to devolve policy decision-making upon states and local governments, President Nixon's manpower bill does not earmark the trigger funds for a particular activity i.e. public service employment. However, in his manpower message the President linked the concept of public service employment with his discussion of the trigger provision. "State and local government," he said, "might choose to use these funds to create temporary public service jobs to offset the rise in unemployment" in addition to using the regular shared revenues for that purpose. There seems little doubt that the President considers the trigger provision in his bill an alternative to the bills introduced by Sen. Nelson and Rep. Perkins.

TRANSITIONAL ACTIVITIES

At the time that the President's manpower bill would go into effect—January 1, 1972—the Manpower Development and Training Act and Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act would be repealed. Total revenues shared for the balance of FY '72 would be calculated on the basis of appropriations for the whole fiscal year under the manpower special revenue sharing act and statutes repealed by the Act. Obligations made within a local jurisdiction before December 31, 1971 would be charged against its shared revenues.

As of January 1, 1972 a locality would be able to assume responsibility for all MDTA/EOA grants within its jurisdiction. It may terminate or continue any grant it wishes. If it does not assume responsibility for a grant, the grant shall continue until it runs out, but not beyond December 31, 1972.

No advance planning funds are included in the bill to provide local governments with the capacity to evaluate the programs for which they would assume responsibility. Nor are any funds for administrative purposes

provided by the Act. Localities would have to provide the administrative capability.

MRS. SHIRLEY C. MAYBIN

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the equal rights for women amendment to the Constitution, I am pleased to call the Senate's attention to a sign of the changing times in South Carolina. Mrs. Shirley C. Maybin, of Columbia, is an auditor for the South Carolina Mental Health Commission. Mrs. Maybin received a B.S. degree in business administration from Newberry College and has been working in our State government for the past 11 years. She is presently involved in the preparation of the State budget for the mental health commission.

Mrs. Maybin is the only woman auditor working for the mental health commission, but she represents the women in our State who are able to obtain careers of distinction. Although she is just one of few women auditors in the State, women in South Carolina are productive citizens in all walks of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Financial Records Her Responsibility," which appeared in the March 26 edition of the State newspaper, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WOMAN AUDITOR: FINANCIAL RECORDS HER RESPONSIBILITY
(By Karen Metcalfe)

Mrs. Shirley C. Maybin has learned how to get along with men. She's had to, since she is one of the few, if not the only, woman auditor in the state.

Mrs. Maybin, who is an auditor for the S.C. Mental Health Commission, noted that she has not found any hidden difficulties because of her sex and the position she has.

"All the other auditors I know are men, it's true," she said sheepishly, "but I've never thought it was unusual that I was a woman auditor."

Mrs. Maybin, who works out of her office in Columbia but travels around to the state's 14 mental health centers and clinics to check their records, has been employed by the state government service for approximately 11 years, although she has only been in her present post with the state mental health commission for the past ten months.

A graduate of Newberry College with a B.S. degree in Business Administration, the brunette auditor noted that she was one of few women enrolled in the upper level business courses at the College.

But she said that she experienced no difficulty because of the absence of female classmates, and added that she "never thought it very unusual."

"There were quite a few girls in the first year courses," Mrs. Maybin said, but added that the girls were required to take the courses to get proper credit in their curriculum, especially two-year secretarial course.

"I started out in that two-year course, but got interested in the accounting procedures and decided to go ahead and get my four year degree," she added.

Mrs. Maybin accomplished her goal, which few other females have chosen as theirs.

"I've never met another woman auditor," Mrs. Maybin admits, "but I'm sure there are some."

"I thoroughly enjoy my work with the mental health people and I've recently become involved in working up the 1970-71 budget for the Mental Health Department," she said.

Mrs. Maybin said that she has received some of the cuff comments about her being an auditor.

"Sometimes people are surprised when they meet me, but they usually just joke about me being the best looking auditor they've ever had, or something like that," she said.

OUTLINE OF GROWTH OF THE ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at each session of Congress since 1949, the Atlantic Union Resolution has been introduced. When it was first introduced in 1949, only five Members of the House of Representatives initially cosponsored. Since then, support has grown substantially to the point where today more than one-fourth of the entire House have sponsored it. In the following article, Clarence Streit outlines the growth of support for the Atlantic Union Resolution. Then, with an ironical touch, Mr. Streit speculates about the reasons which have caused the Western world to shy away from the federation approach to international problems and to take the more difficult paths which have too often led to war and economic collapse. I commend these two articles to you for your reading:

ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION SCALES HIGH NEW PEAK IN HOUSE AS 112 RENEW IT—SPONSORS EXPECT EARLY HEARINGS

The Atlantic Union Resolution reintroduced in the House on Feb. 17 had 71 cosponsors—the most ever on the first day. Only a month later they had increased by more than 50 per cent to a much greater record-breaking total—112.

The records broken were set in the previous Congress. There the same resolution was introduced on June 5—much later in the session—by 70 cosponsors. They rose to 91 before it ended.

The first Atlantic Union Resolution, which Senator Estes Kefauver led in introducing in Congress July 26, 1949, had 20 sponsors in the Senate and five in the House. The only one of the five still in the House is Hale Boggs (D., La.), who is now the Majority Leader. By the end of that Congress the five had risen to 67 "supporters;" these included 62 more who had announced that they would vote for it. One of them is now the Speaker of the House, Carl Albert.

The same text was re-introduced Jan. 15, 1951, this time with nine cosponsors in the House. The chief sponsors again included Rep. Boggs; two others were Mike Mansfield,

now Senate Majority Leader, and Christian Herter, later Secretary of State. Before that Congress ended, 102 other Congressmen had announced their support of the bill; Rep. Albert was again among them.

These figures—and the footnote which explains the difference between "cosponsorship" and "support"—indicate how impressive the present number of cosponsors is. The proposal's phenomenal gain in strength this year is even more impressive when one digs deeper. For one thing, 15 of the previous list are no longer in the House: some have gone to other positions, a few retired, and the rest lost in the election (though none was attacked for supporting this bill). Since the present text was introduced in 1965, 35 more have left the House—a total of 50 who have had to be replaced since 1965 by new supporters, plus still more to reach the present record total.

Only a fifth of the new cosponsors are freshmen. The others include nine who have been elected to six or more terms. The seniors among them are Edward Garmatz (D., Md.), who is in his 13th term; Mrs. Edith Green (D., Ore.) and Charles Vanik (D., Ohio), both in their 9th term; Mrs. Florence Dwyer (R., N.J.) 8th term; and Cornelius Gallagher (D., N.J.) and Alexander Pirnie (R., N.Y.), 7th term. Including previous cosponsors, there are now 56 who have been elected from six to 14 times.

Power goes with seniority in Congress—and so the resolution is now stronger not only in the number of cosponsors but in the positions, experience and influence they have. They include the chairmen of six House Committees. All, of course, are Democrats, since their party controls Congress. Here they are:

Chet Hollifield (California), and Melvin Price (Illinois), Congressmen since 1943 and 1945, have both backed the Atlantic Union resolution since 1949—hence the three diamonds after their names in our cover's Golden Book. Rep. Hollifield heads the Committee on Government Operations, to which President Nixon's plan for basic re-structuring of the Cabinet has been referred. On becoming its chairman this year he resigned as House Chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee; Rep. Price has succeeded him in this post. He also heads the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and is No. 2 Democrat on the Armed Services Committee.

Rep. Garmatz heads the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

John Blatnik (Minnesota), who has backed the resolution since 1955—hence the diamond after his name in the Golden Book—chairs Public Works.

Thaddeus Dulski (New York) heads the Post Office Committee.

Claude Pepper (Florida) chairs the Select Committee on Crime. Although not among the "diamond" cosponsors he is, in a way, the "daddy of them all." He urged Atlantic Union as early as 1944, when a Senator, speaking then at the Federal Union convention. He lost his Senate seat in 1950 on other issues, and was later elected to the House. He is also a member of its Rules Committee.

For the minority, the most powerful committee post is that of "ranking" Republican—the one who would be chairman if his party won the House in the 1972 election. Four of the sponsors have this seat of power: Mrs. Dwyer is Chairman Hollifield's opposite number, and Robert Corbett (Pennsylvania) is Chairman Dulski's. Albert Quie (Minnesota) is top Republican in the Committee on Education and Labor as are James Fulton (Pennsylvania) in the Science and Aeronautics Committee and Charles Teague (California) in Veterans' Affairs.

A number of Democratic sponsors rank next to their committee chairman. The most important of these, from the standpoint of the resolution, is Clement J. Zablocki (Wisconsin), who has this seat in the Foreign Affairs Committee, to which it has been referred. His active support of the bill goes back to 1955.

Ten more of this committee's 38 members are sponsors of the bill: Democrats Fascell, Fraser (a chief sponsor), Diggs, Gallagher and Nix; Republicans Findley and Morse (chief sponsors), Broomfield, Fulton and Halpern.

The Committee's chairman, Dr. Thomas E. Morgan (Pennsylvania) has promised to hold hearings early this year, according to a chief sponsor. To expedite action, these will probably be held by a subcommittee. The proposal has had full committee hearings in previous sessions, making most members familiar with it, and subcommittee hearings would keep it from being delayed by the Foreign Aid bill too long for action—as happened in the previous Congress. The present delay results from the fact that the committee hasn't yet fully organized its 10 subcommittees. Their chairmen were recently named, but their members are not expected to be chosen before April. The sponsors hope for hearings later that month—another record.

The sponsors form more than one-fourth of the House—30 per cent of its Democrats and 20 per cent of its Republicans.

They come from 28 states—from Alaska to Florida, and Maine to California. New York leads with 19 of its 41, California is second with 15 out of 38, and Michigan, which last year had only five of its 19, now ranks third with 12. There follow Pennsylvania, with 9 of its 27; New Jersey, 8 of 15; Massachusetts, 7 of 12; and Minnesota, 6 of 8.

Re-introduction of the bill in the Senate is expected later.

WHY DO JOHN Q., CONGRESS & NIXON KEEP TRYING THE HARDEST WAYS FIRST?

The question posed above keeps pestering me, day after day, month after month, year after year. I still don't know the answer. And so I ask you:

Why is it that so many of us—high, low and in between—when facing a vital problem, start so often by brushing aside the safer, saner, easier, solution and plunge for one that is obviously riskier, costlier, harder?

Why do people reject the way that has successfully stood stiff tests, and try one that often ended in disaster?

Why do they shy, like a horse at a fluttering paper, from the approach that costs virtually nothing in gold and grief, and go for one that clearly will cost incalculably?

Why, why, why do they—especially those elected to positions of high responsibility for, and to, their fellow-citizens—take, when faced with a major yet simple choice, take the worst way first, and rarely try for the best one until disasters drive them (O paradox!) "out of their minds"?

Three Current Examples of this Folly. Do you think these questions absurd—at least as regards the great men?

Man calls even the lowliest of men, "*homo sapiens*." For the most sapient of our species to make such absurd choices on the most vital matters, and do this repeatedly, must seem to the sane too crazy to be true. Yet I have seen this folly often in the greatest affairs of state in the past half century—ever since I was old enough to get a news reporter's job. I sometimes wonder if it isn't a Law of Nature, something it's hopeless to alter. But I can't believe that, for—as even the most man-polluted stream knows—the Law of Nature is to follow the course of least resistance.

An event we report in the next 10 pages will help me give three current examples of *homo sapiens'* unsapient unnatural penchant for taking the most resistant course.

1. The Ho (and Woe) Gee, Men! Trail to Freedom & Peace. My first example is of course in Southeast Asia. In 1954, 1962, 1965, 1969 and 1971 (and the years in between) the U.S. people and their Congress and Presidents have had the choice between two ways to give freedom and peace the moral and material power they need to endure.

One was the Old World way of seeking this strength from use of armed force. Whether tried by autocrats of Japan, Germany and Russia, or by democratic governments in Britain and France, it invariably led in the end ruin.

The other choice was the bloodless yet revolutionary New World way of gaining this strength by peaceful, mutually agreed Federation of Free Peoples. In other terms, it was between the way of the absolute sovereign, whether potentate or democratic nation, or the way that makes the citizen the sovereign, both within and between democracies—the federal way that unites the citizens, by state and inter-state government, dividing power between them in whichever way will best assure the citizen's life and liberty.

Clearly a Federal Union of the democracies of the Atlantic community would put immensely greater power behind freedom and peace than would anything that the U.S. could by armed force in Southeast Asia. A proposal for a convention to explore this federal way was offered President, Congress and People before 1954, and ever since.

General Eisenhower told me in 1951 such a Union would let us out our defense costs "by half." Senator Lyndon B. Johnson once told me that, although he couldn't join its cosponsors, for certain Texas reasons, I "could be sure" he "would be there when it" came to voting. Senator Nixon cosponsored the 1951 resolution; he strongly urged Congress to approve the 1966 one.

Yet the choice taken was for the Vietnam way to safeguard freedom and peace—taken with the approval of many Senators who now urge, "Turn back!"—but do not yet with such passion urge turning to Atlantic Union.

Obviously, U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam—whether at Nixon or at Hatfield-McGovern tempo—involves risk of gravely weakening the psychological strength freedom needs to preserve itself and peace. Renewed bitter division in the U.S., or debacle and bloodbath in Southeast Asia could encourage Moscow to advance in the Mideast, even to nuclear showdown. Both the President and his Senate opponents could lessen greatly the risks in their Vietnam policy, and win wider public backing, by supplementing it with a move to speed approval of the resolution to explore the hope of giving liberty Federation of the Free's decisive power.

Instead of urging this constructive, riskless move, the President and his opposition have thus far chosen to run the grim risks inherent in the former's Cambodian-Laotian incursions and in the latter's insistence on an early withdrawal date, unsafeguarded against debacle in the Far East and nuclear confrontation in the Mideast. Yet the Atlantic Union bill, which Vietnam now leads both sides to ignore, has long been backed by both; they could easily unite on it.

2. Curbing Inflation . . . 3. Preventing a Crash. I have no space for these examples of the current folly—but happily Rep. Findley, in introducing the Atlantic Union resolution dealt fully with No. 2, and to some extent with No. 3. I warmly recommend that you read his speech (p. 4)—especially the part on inflation (p. 6). It tells why the remedies chosen are worsening it, and how Federation of the Free turned dangerous inflation into enduring prosperity for the 13 States—and can do this for us and all NATO.

Why Risk Wolsey's Lament? Cardinal Wolsey also began by choosing the riskiest road. It left him in his old age naked to his enemies . . . remembered now mainly for his dying lament: "Had I but served my God with half the zeal I served my King . . . !"

As a friend, I hope that President Nixon and Senators Church, Cooper, Fulbright, Hatfield, McGovern and Mansfield—to name no more—will never come to some paraphrase of the Wolsey lament. Whatever risk they may see in shifting part of their weight from their divergent Vietnam policies back to their Atlantic Union approach, they can run this risk, I think, with no fear of remorse later. Can any satisfaction they gain via Vietnam possibly be half as lasting as they'll win by helping federate the free?

On our cover we give the names of the great company of House Sponsors of the 1971 Atlantic Union Resolution . . . in a Golden Book. In so doing, I venture to say that we give on the spot the verdict of posterity.

PRESIDENT URGED TO RESTORE MASS TRANSIT FUNDS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, last week 63 colleagues joined me in writing to the President urging that he restore the \$200 million cut from this year's urban mass transportation program's budget. Subsequent to my remarks of March 25 announcing this, an additional six colleagues have joined in signing the letter.

Therefore, I ask permission that our letter be reprinted at this time with the full list of 70 signatories.

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

RICHARD NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge that you restore the \$200 million cut from the Urban Mass Transportation program's budget for this fiscal year.

The cutback in mass transit funds comes at a most critical time when we should be intensifying our efforts to revitalize mass transit systems, not reducing them. Last year the Congress, with your support, passed the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act which, as you stated last week in your Transportation message, "helped to create a significant momentum for the rejuvenation of public transit systems." The most important aspect of this Act is the new authority it gives the Department of Transportation to enter into long term obligations that will be met with cash in later years. It is this level of commitment (not the cash flow from the Treasury this year) that is at stake in the cutback. Our cities are in critical need of these commitments so they can get underway with necessary transit development. Many localities already have secured the local commitment necessary to begin, but have been unable to move forward because of the lack of federal funds.

Now, in the program's very first year when we should be expending every effort to get those projects started, we find federal commitments being cut back by one-third. What your cutback means is that \$200 million worth of projects will once again be delayed in the face of construction costs mounting at a rate of 10% a year. It means the "momentum" catalyzed by the passage of the Urban Mass Transportation Act will be stalled.

Presently, the Urban Mass Transportation

Administration has \$2.7 billion worth of applications pending. Last year, UMTA Administrator Carlos Villarreal came before the Appropriations Committees and stated that as of April 1970 he had \$1 billion worth of applications pending and that in FY 1971 he would be in a position to commit \$850 million. Applications have increased almost three-fold in the past year making it even more essential that \$600 million in commitments be made so we don't get any further behind in meeting our transit needs.

One final thought, and this centers on the concern we all share for the high unemployment and under-utilization of capital investment in the aerospace industry. We would suggest that the mass transit industry is closely related to the aviation industry—that it is a field into which some of the aviation industry's unused resources could be directed. Furthermore, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1970 instructed the Secretary of Transportation to encourage industries adversely affected by reduction in federal government spending on space, military, and other federal projects to compete for mass transit contracts. But of course, the federal commitments first have to be made to expand mass transit development.

Sincerely,

Edward I. Koch, Leonor K. Sullivan, Henry S. Reuss, Thomas L. Ashley, William S. Moorhead, Fernand St Germain, Henry B. Gonzalez, Richard T. Hanna, Frank Annunzio.

Thomas M. Rees, Frank Brasco, Parren J. Mitchell, Dan Rostenkowski, Thomas O'Neill, James A. Burke, Charles Vanik, Donald Fraser, Bradford Morse, Seymour Halpern, Don Edwards, Lionel Van Deerlin, Hugh Carey, John Moss, Peter Rodino, James Fulton, Frank Thompson, John Brademas.

Alphonzo Bell, Charles Wilson, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Joseph Addabbo, James Howard, James Scheuer, Robert Tierman, Phillip Burton, Claude Pepper, Earle Cabell, William J. Green, Ralph H. Metcalfe, Andrew Jacobs, Joshua Ellberg, John Dingell, Ray Madden, Robert Nix, Bertram Podell, Patsy Mink, Jonathan Bingham, Lester Wolff, William Hathaway, William F. Ryan, Louis Stokes, James Symington, Abner Mikva, Mario Biaggi.

William Clay, Shirley Chisholm, Robert A. Roe, Michael Harrington, John Dow, Bella Abzug, Louise Day Hicks, Herman Badillo, Ella Grasso, Ronald V. Dellums, Charles Rangel, Nick Begich, Stewart McKinney, Robert Drinan, Paul S. Sarbanes, William Cotter.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, we all are concerned about the treatment of our men who are being held prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.

The American people and their representatives in government are rightly disturbed about this situation and anxious that it be corrected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a proclamation recently signed by the Honorable Russell W. Peterson, Governor of the State of Delaware, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR RUSSELL W. PETERSON, IN OBSERVANCE OF PRISONERS OF WAR DAY

International concern can exert a powerful influence over the conduct of nations. Such an example is the mobilization of public opinion over the plight of Soviet Jews, which was effective in saving the lives of countless Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union.

A non-partisan, national program is being organized to express concern over American Prisoners of War, whose fate has remained ambiguous in spite of the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

Accordingly, as Governor of the State of Delaware, I designate April 28, 1971, as Prisoners of War Day in Delaware, and urge residents of the First State to join in expressing concern for the fate of their fellow Americans.

RUSSELL W. PETERSON,
Governor.

SCHENLEY HIGH SCHOOL, WINNER OF STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP, LAUDED BY REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I take this opportunity to acclaim the outstanding team victory of the Schenley High School Spartans in the Pennsylvania State High School Basketball Championship, last weekend in Pittsburgh.

Under the superb tutelage of Spencer Watkins, the Schenley team defeated a fine Norristown, Pa., squad.

Schenley High School is in my district and I have watched with interest the building of the basketball dynasty that has taken place there during the past years. Schenley has won the State championship 2 of the last 4 years and came very close in the years that they did not sweep the title.

Young men like Maurice Lucas, Ricky Coleman, Jeffrey Matthews and a host of other fine athletes are the reasons that Schenley's principal, Mr. Arthur Outen, head coach, Mr. Watkins, the student body, and the entire city of Pittsburgh can be so proud.

I look forward in the coming days to presenting to the Schenley team a 25-pound turkey which I won on a wager with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN) in whose district Norristown is located.

This is one case when I do not mind getting the bird.

I want to urge my colleagues to watch their local sports pages, especially if there is a college in their area where good basketball is played.

I am sure in the coming years you will be hearing from those Schenley High School boys, most likely when the colleges and universities, which they choose to attend, begin making annual trips to the NCAA and NIT Basketball Championships.

Schenley High, I salute you as the high school basketball champions of Pennsylvania.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have an opportunity today to participate in this special order to commemorate Greek Independence Day and the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which overthrew four centuries of Ottoman rule.

I am deeply saddened, however, by the knowledge that our good friends in Greece cannot celebrate this day of freedom. I am dismayed and shamed by the knowledge that our Government bolsters the oppressors of this great Nation and its courageous people.

Seeking congressional aid for Greece in 1947, President Truman declared that the United States should support efforts to preserve:

A way of life . . . based on the will of the majority and . . . distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

However, democracy in Greece and the U.S. Government's commitment to preservation of this system of governance have since turned into empty illusions, perpetuated for reasons of self-interest.

A military junta of officers, trained by American military missions, used American-supplied weapons to seize power in April 1967. At the time of the takeover, the United States saw itself as faced with a dilemma. Would it support this dictatorship which denied the Greek people freedoms which are most sacred to us and to them, or would it refuse support and thereby, it was felt, possibly jeopardize the balance of power in Europe and the Middle East? We clearly chose the former path. In the words of then Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford:

The obligations imposed on us by the NATO alliance are far more important than the kind of government they have in Greece or what we think of it.

We do not seriously debate whether or not we favor, in principle, the regime in Greece. It is clearly anathema to our ideals. The question, rather, is whether or not our national interest and the security of Europe and the Middle East necessitate our support.

Clearly our commitment to the NATO alliance and to the solution of the Middle East crisis are essential and desirable. But is this commitment necessarily predicated on support of the Greek military junta? Is the junta a reliable ally? There seems to be disagreement on these questions.

First, with regard to NATO, our European allies seem to differ with our conclusions regarding support of the Greek Government. The United States is currently the only NATO Government granting the junta military aid, although the alliance does not restrict commercial sales to Greece. Second, is our commitment to Israel, and to peace in the Mid-

dle East a justification for our policy toward Greece? Reports in the recently issued Senate Foreign Relations Committee Staff Report on Greece raised questions in this regard:

Some question whether Greece's willingness to allow its territory to be used in connection with possible direct U.S. involvement in the Middle East can be taken for granted. They note that while providing a safe haven for American civilians does not jeopardize Greek interests in the Arab world, any proposal to use bases in Greece as a staging area for direct intervention could involve risks which no Greek government might consider worth taking. They refer, for example, to the presence of some 25,000 to 50,000 Greek nationals in Arab countries and to Greece's interest in those countries as an outlet for exports. As an illustration of Greek sensitivity to such considerations, it was pointed out to us that although Greek-Israeli relations are friendly, and there is a Greek representative with the personal rank of Ambassador in Israel, out of deference to Arab countries Greece does not maintain an Embassy in Israel.

It appears clear that the Greek Government's interests in the Middle East lie with the Arab Nations. Our reliance on the junta to provide a basis of support seems highly speculative and deserves serious consideration.

Although we clearly support the junta for military reasons, whatever the validity might be, we are unable to be totally honest with ourselves. We continue to make feeble attempts to encourage a liberalization of the Greek regime in order to ease our national conscience. Our efforts, however, have been pro forma, and predictably the results have been nil.

At the time of the takeover, the United States reacted by imposing a selective embargo on the delivery of heavy military equipment. Nevertheless, during the subsequent 3-year period military shipments averaged \$106.9 million per year as opposed to \$95.2 million in the 3 preceding years. Increased delivery of excess Defense articles and foreign military sales is cited as the explanation of this seeming anomaly.

Last fall we again attempted to bargain with the junta. We agreed to lift the military embargo in self-deluded anticipation of a softening of military rule. Nothing has changed. The Greek junta continues the same repressive policy of martial law and political arrests. There is scant indication of the implementation of the promised new Constitution or the institution of elections in the near future. In fact, Prime Minister Papadopoulos indicated last year in his state of the Nation address that martial law would be retained and that full implementation of the Constitution would only take place:

When I, bearer of the Greek people's mandate and of historic responsibilities, think the situation is secure both for the Nation and for the new society that will follow.

Such rhetoric, and the accompanying American acquiescence and support for such deeds, bear remarkable similarities to our predicament in Southeast Asia, and to our past involvements in Asia and in other parts of the world. In the name of furthering the cause of democracy and the cherished principles that are a part

of our heritage, we reinforce and promote the growth of a system of repression and military dictatorship.

Our long-term objectives should be a reassessment of our overall foreign policy goals. In the immediate sense, however, we must not allow our hypocritical policy toward Greece to continue. We must demonstrate our firm opposition to the course of events by terminating military aid to the junta until a representative form of Government is established. Until then, recognition should be de facto instead of de jure. We can change our priorities so that humanitarian and democratic ideals do take precedence over transient military goals of questionable viability. However, this change can come about only if we exhibit our commitment to our ideals in fact, not merely in words. We must act in a way which proves our friendship to the Greek people and our honor for their country, the birthplace of democracy.

OLD GRUMPY FROM GRUNDY TRIBUTE TO HAROLD O. FISHER

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding example of a dedicated public servant in our Nation's State legislatures is Iowa State Representative Harold O. Fischer. "Grumpy," as he is best known to those of us who have served with him, has conscientiously worked for the last 12 years to support fiscally sound and commonsense programs for Iowa. A recent editorial from the Cedar Valley (Iowa) Daily Times on "Grumpy" is inserted in the RECORD at this point:

OLD GRUMPY FROM GRUNDY

Modern politicians for the most part lack the color that was sometimes found in political leaders of earlier days. Fellows like "Alfalfa Bill" Murray of Oklahoma, old Bob LaFollette of Wisconsin, Al Smith of New York, and even Smith Brookhart of Iowa, are seldom around anymore. Voters today seem to prefer the "Madison Avenue" type of glamorous candidate, young, good-looking, and able to come across well on television.

We don't want to compare State Representative Harold Fischer of Wellsburg with some of the men referred to above because such a comparison would not necessarily be a compliment.

We do feel, however, that old "Grumpy from Grundy" as he is affectionately known, is far and away the most colorful man in the present Iowa legislature. More than that, he is a political power to be reckoned with far beyond the confines of Grundy County, where he has a very loyal following.

So when it becomes an open secret that "Old Grumpy" no longer has a warm spot in his heart for Governor Robert Ray, it suggests trouble for the Republican party in Iowa. The dislike for some of Governor Ray's liberal policies on the part of Republican conservatives like Harold Fischer, is coming to the surface. Most of the conservatives seem attracted to the Iowa Lieutenant Governor, Roger Jepsen, and it appears almost certain that a determined move will be made to nominate Jepsen for Governor next year.

If the Vietnam war, or at least America's participation in it, hasn't ended by this time

next year, the Republican party will be in deep trouble nationally. The present situation in Iowa being what it is, it will take all the unity the Republicans can glue together to save the governorship in 1972.

A focal point of conflict between Iowa conservatives like State Representative Harold Fischer and Governor Ray is the refusal of the Governor to support a wiretap bill. Conservatives want such a bill enough that Governor Robert Ray may very well pay the supreme price and fail to survive politically if he maintains his present stance on this measure.

We want to say in conclusion that regardless of how you may feel about legalizing wire-tapping, we believe the state of Iowa is fortunate to have a man of the character, reputation for honesty, and devotion to his job displayed all these years by old "Grumpy from Grundy."

FRADULENT RETAIL CREDIT REPORT CREATING INTERNATIONAL INCIDENT

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1968, the Privacy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations held a hearing on Retail Credit Co., of Atlanta, Ga. This hearing was a continuation of the searching look we initiated into the activities of private intelligence-gathering organizations. While the subject of invasion of privacy by Federal agencies, relying largely on computer technology, is now the subject of great national interest because of the splendid series of hearings recently held by Senator SAM ERVIN and which indisputably confirmed the basic insights the Privacy Subcommittee developed in 1966, little attention is being paid to the perhaps more dangerous activities of private firms. I say this with full knowledge that the Fair Credit Reporting Act becomes law on April 25, 1971 which deals with many of the abuses we uncovered in 1968. The act provides an excellent beginning for it gives the individual the absolutely essential right to know what is in his file at credit bureaus and credit reporting agencies; but it certainly does not eliminate all the threats to privacy and human values in the data-gathering and data-exchanging industry.

One particularly relevant example may be found in the activities of Retail Credit Co. A wholly owned subsidiary has recently purchased the District of Columbia Credit Bureau, in keeping with Retail Credit's policy of aggressive expansion. While they owned 63 credit bureaus at the time of our hearing, they now own over 100 and, in addition, they have assimilated into their corporate structure many insurance adjusting firms. This creates a considerably greater data bank under the control of Retail Credit, than their files on 45 million Americans in 1968.

In addition, they have just been fined \$4,000 for bribing a New York City police officer in order to gain information from police files in that city.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to be unnecessarily harsh about Retail Credit Co., for its officials are unflinchingly courteous and they did make a change in their basic contract. During our hearing we focused on the phrase that forbade an insurance company or a potential employer from disclosing Retail Credit's identity as the source which generated unfavorable data. Shortly after our hearing, they eliminated that phrase from the contract, although subsequent testimony before Senator PROXMIERE disclosed a letter sent to all their customers which has been interpreted as saying that things should stay as they were before the phrase was deleted.

All throughout our investigation, we heard from users of Retail Credit Co. reports that they were not the final answer on many individual refusals. Many people told us that they regarded them as something of a necessary evil, a check which must be made in order to possibly develop information which might be used to deny a man deserved employment or adequate insurance coverage. This is not to say that an erroneous report was not damaging for, particularly when the job was not a high paying one or where the insurance coverage was not high, the report often was the last word on an individual's qualifications. But there was considerable doubt about the perpetual accuracy of the reports.

This is why a story in the Miami Herald in March of this year was of such great interest to me. It appears that the Communists have absolute faith in Retail Credit, while many capitalists express reservations.

Mr. Speaker, I insert two news stories from the Miami Herald at this point in the RECORD, as well as the press release I issued:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald,
Mar. 11, 1971]

CHILE JAILS MIAMI PROBE FIGURE: COPPER PRICE CONSPIRACY CHARGED

(By William Montalbano and James Savage)

South Florida's own Howard Edwards erstwhile minister, physician, financier and man of the world, is in hot water again—this time in Chile as part of a supposed international conspiracy against the Marxist-led government of President Salvador Allende.

The man who once enlivened a local political campaign by accusing State Attorney Richard Gerstein of accepting a bribe is now making headlines throughout Latin America from a Santiago jail cell.

Edwards stands accused by Chile's Communist press of being one of seven speculators from Zurich who sought to drive down the international price of copper.

According to the Communist newspaper El Siglo, the conspiracy was part of a U.S. plot against Chile.

Edwards is portrayed by El Siglo as a CIA provocateur, a former Air Force physician whose previous exploits include clandestine participation at the Bay of Pigs and a role as agent-agitator in Czechoslovakia during the 1968 Russian invasion.

Gerstein, Edwards' arch foe, dissolved in laughter when told Tuesday of the Chilean press report:

"Howard Edwards couldn't effectively spy for a Boy Scout troop," he said. "He is a total and complete fraud."

Although the Communist Party forms the most powerful single element in Allende's

coalition, the government itself has been more restrained in its accusations so far.

Edwards and his pals—two Chileans, two Argentines, a Uruguayan and a Swiss—purportedly represented a Swiss investment firm seeking to buy nearly a million tons of Chilean copper over the next 10 years.

According to the government, the purchase offer, made at low prices, "tended to depress the market and give the impression of great disorder."

Edwards and friends have been held incommunicado this week under provisions of Chile's Internal Security Act pending further investigation.

Mining Minister Orlando Cantuarias has accused the men of participating in a "well-coordinated plan to sabotage the process of nationalizing our fundamental wealth." (A government proposal to nationalize copper awaits final congressional approval in Santiago.)

Edwards' latest adventure could have serious international overtones.

Some of Allende's more extreme allies would like to find a provocation that could be manipulated to worsen relations between Chile and the United States. These same leftist extremists, with gentle direction from Cuban friends, are prepared to find CIA agents under every manhole cover in Chile.

In his first months as president, Allende has gone out of his way to avoid damaging relations with the United States. The Nixon Administration has followed suit, adopting a "correct" policy toward the Allende government.

Now the Chileans have information that has aroused their suspicions of possible ties between Edwards and the U.S. intelligence establishment.

There is a fine irony here. For at one point in his checkered career, Edwards sat in the living room of his Broward County home and coolly invented a life history of himself as part of a bogus credit company report he engineered.

In the life history, Edwards modestly claimed to be worth \$9 million. He also claimed to be a retired U.S. Air Force intelligence officer-physician who was shot down at the Bay of Pigs.

Edwards is known to have used the report in business dealings in the past, and perhaps he carried a copy of it to Chile with him.

In any event, the Chileans have a copy of the report and the Communist press at least seems to have accepted Edwards' fabrication of an intelligence career as truth.

On Tuesday, *El Siglo* published a copy of the report, under a story headlined: "Here is the proof. Yanqui document reveals Edwards is an agent of the CIA."

If the government lends the same credence to the report, Howard Edwards may become a victim of his own fertile imagination.

It was during the Gerstein furor that investigators uncovered Edwards' invented career as an Air Force officer. The documentation has lain in Edwards' bulky file in the state attorney's office until now and has never been fully brought to light.

According to this material, Edwards cultivated the friendship of John Hollihan, then an employe of the Retail Credit Co., in early 1968.

In a formal statement to Martin Dardis, one of Gerstein's investigators, Hollihan said he removed reports on Edwards from the company's files in the spring of 1968.

Asked if the credit reports were detrimental to Edwards, Hollihan replied: "They were detrimental and I would say they were pretty bad."

Hollihan said he replaced the missing reports with three others that Edwards dictated to him, inventing as he went along.

"I took blank forms from our officers. He sat down in one chair and I sat in the other,

and he told me exactly what to type," Hollihan told Dardis.

The character-financial report, which is also in the state attorney's files, is an audacious masterpiece of invention.

In it, the Howard E. Edwards that the credit company found a surpassing bad risk disappears.

In his stead there appears a distinguished multi-millionaire, one Dr. Howard C. Edwards, "a retired medical doctor from the United States Intelligence Corps," principal stockholder in a Bahamas-based insurance company worth \$36 million.

There is also this breathless revelation: "Through confidential sources it was verified that the subject was most recently involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion in which the present regime took control of the government in Cuba (sic)."

"The applicant was in fact shot down by Cuban military forces and walked some 22 miles to the beach so as to avoid capture and as a result suffered a Coronary Heart Attack."

According to Hollihan, who was close to Edwards at the time and was promised stock in a Bahamas high-rise in exchange for his cooperation on the phony report, Edwards has never served in the armed forces. And in July 1961, three months after the Bay of Pigs, Edwards appeared in a Broward County court to face the grand larceny charge, displaying no aftereffects of the Cuban adventure he later created for himself.

In this same credit report, Edwards listed his net worth as \$9 million in "cash, investments, real estate and personal property."

Hollihan said Edwards took the false report with him to Europe in the summer of 1968 in an attempt to borrow money for the Bahamian high-rise.

According to Hollihan, Edwards was accompanied by his wife, Josephine, and a fellow speculator named Frank Williamson on the trip to Europe. One of the places they went was Zurich.

Hollihan said Williamson, also a bad credit risk, paid him \$500 to remove his damaging file from the company's records. Hollihan said he paid half of that, \$250, to Edwards.

Williamson returned from Europe alone, according to Hollihan, while Edwards and his wife vacationed briefly in Czechoslovakia, where Mrs. Edwards, who is of Czech descent, has relatives.

During the Gerstein investigation, Edwards was to claim he suffered another coronary attack while in Czechoslovakia during the Russian invasion.

Positive identification of Edwards as the American arrested in Chile was delayed by Edwards' penchant for rewriting his autobiography.

In the course of a long afternoon in Santiago last week during which he consumed a quart of whiskey, Edwards delivered himself of a monologue so contorted and contradictory that one witness came away convinced Edwards was "mentally disturbed."

At one point he claimed to have been "run out of Florida by Dick Gerstein . . . who's trying to kill me." A little later, Edwards claimed to have lived in Switzerland for the past seven years, and in Michigan and Florida before that.

Edwards claimed to own a hospital and to have gone to Chile to see an ex-wife, who is Chilean and by whom he had a son. That same afternoon a Chilean woman did appear at the hotel with a seven-year-old boy.

A Dade County investigator who has tried to compile Edwards' biography laughed when he was told Edwards is currently in a Chilean jail.

"That guy Edwards is fantastic. The deals he's been mixed up with are unbelievable. If you look at what he's done in the past

it's not hard to believe he could cause an international incident," the investigator said.

Edwards' background became a key issue here in the fall of 1968 after Shelby Highsmith, a candidate for Dade state attorney, said he had found two men who swore they had bribed Gerstein.

The two men were Howard Edwards and his friend Max Diamond, a Broward County gas station operator.

Edwards and Diamond swore they had paid Gerstein \$1,500 in a bar in Miami Springs in 1960 or 1961 "to take care of" criminal charges pending against Edwards.

Gerstein denied the bribery allegations and after a brief check on Edwards' background, labeled him a "pathological liar."

The Dade Grand Jury believed Gerstein, clearing him of the bribery allegation, and indicted Edwards and Diamond on perjury charges.

The two men were later acquitted in a jury trial of perjury.

Two weeks later they were again accused of perjury, this time in Broward County. The charges were based on statements that Edwards and Diamond had made in a civil lawsuit there.

Diamond has been acquitted on the second perjury charge, but Edwards failed to show up for his trial in Broward in January.

Edwards' Dade lawyer Hugh DuVal and his bondsman William Geronimo both told *The Herald* they believe Edwards is currently in a Canadian Hospital recovering from a coronary.

"I would be very amazed to learn Howard is in Chile," DuVal said.

Given a capsule biography of Edwards' past business dealings, it's not hard to believe he could end up eventually causing an international incident in Chile.

Edwards first came to public attention in South Florida in 1950. At that time a Miami News writer described him as the new minister of the Forest Park Christian Church, a man of "affable personality, eloquent sermons, contagious youth and humble spirit."

Soon, however, another Miami News writer compiled an investigative report on Edwards asking some pointed questions about his repeated campaigns to build a youth center.

Edwards in six years had acquired a personal fortune of \$250,000. The News reported, but the youth center was never built.

Those stories marked the beginning of the end of Edwards' career as a cleric.

From profitable preaching, Edwards moved into real estate and investments.

He was listed as secretary treasurer of a company that built an apartment house that was later the target of a prostitution raid.

A year later, Edwards acquired financial interest in a 24-bed hospital in Hollywood.

Edwards later sold the hospital to Ralph W. Davis Jr. of New Jersey who told *The Herald* the hospital sale was one of several deals he had with Edwards.

"He's done me out of thousands and thousands of dollars," Davis said.

In 1962 Edwards became involved in one of his more spectacular business deals, Tuquesa Inc.

With the help of some reports filled with technical mining jargon, Edwards convinced a number of people that he had an interest in Panamanian land worth over \$3 billion in platinum and gold.

Davis invested more than \$20,000 in Tuquesa before realizing that his money was not buying mining equipment, he told *The Herald*.

Since then, Edwards has described himself as a retired Air Force major, a doctor, a clergyman, a real estate investor, a mortgage banker, and recently a banker with interests in a Swiss investment firm.

The current Chilean adventure is shrouded in the same byzantine convolutions that

have long since become an Edwards-Ian trademark.

After telling all and sundry he was retiring to Canada, Edwards arrived in Santiago on Feb. 24 aboard a Lufthansa flight he said he boarded in Zurich. He was accompanied by Alfred Koenig, who was described as an officer of a Swiss commodity brokerage firm in Zurich. Koenig is one of those jailed.

Edwards and friends claimed to represent a Swiss firm called Internordia Finance of Zurich. According to the Chilean press, Internordia was described as being backed by the Trans World Insurance Company, the Bahamian firm in which Edwards is listed on the phony credit report as the principal stockholder.

Internordia, according to Chilean newspapers, offered to purchase 960,000 tons of electrolytic copper from the Chilean government over the next 10 years.

Full details have not emerged.

At any rate, Edwards and Koenig apparently were under suspicion from the moment they arrived in Chile. They were met at the airport, detained unofficially and their passports picked up.

They were released briefly and then re-arrested last Sunday as Chilean officials sought to unravel the strange affair and the Communist press began laying the blame on the United States.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 19, 1971]
CHILE PANEL TO INVESTIGATE "COPPER PLOT"

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—A special commission has been named by the Chilean Congress to investigate an alleged plot to drive down the price of Chilean copper on the international market. Seven persons are in jail here in connection with the affair, including Howard C. Edwards, 48, a controversial figure from Hollywood, Fla.

Edwards, being treated for a heart disorder along with two of the other seven at the Santiago jail infirmary, was accused by some here of being a CIA agent, apparently on the basis of a phony credit report found on him when arrested.

President Salvador Allende's Marxist government claims the seven worked for a Swiss firm, Internordia Finance of Zurich, which tried to buy 960,000 tons of copper from Chile over a 10-year period in a "fraudulent deal."

The deal would have forced the price of copper to plummet on the world market, costing Chile millions of dollars for every one-cent drop, officials claim.

Chile is the world's largest exporter of copper and depends heavily on it for revenue. Meanwhile, the "copper affair" has become a political football, destined to play a key role in forthcoming April 4 municipal elections. The elections are generally considered a plebiscite on popular support of Allende's government after five months in office.

Allende has linked the elections with the copper affair and what he terms "a national and international campaign against Chile."

His claims have brought counter-charges from the opposition that Allende officials were involved in a related scheme with Internordia.

The political coalition supporting Allende accused the opposition of "irresponsibility" for bringing the charges without filing formal accusations against the government officials allegedly involved.

RETAIL CREDIT COMPANY REPORTS MORE CONVINCING TO COMMUNISTS THAN THEY ARE TO MOST CAPITALISTS, GALLAGHER SAYS—CITES JAILING OF FLORIDA MAN IN CHILE BASED ON FRAUDULENT RETAIL CREDIT COMPANY REPORT

Howard Edwards has been jailed by the government of Chile because of a Retail Credit Company report which stated he worked with the free Cubans during the Bay of Pigs and was a member of the CIA. The Retail

Credit Company report was dictated by Edwards to a former "inspector" for the Atlanta based intelligence gathering firm. According to the Miami Herald of March 11, 1971, the inspector said, "I took blank forms from our offices. He sat down in one chair and I sat in the other and he told me exactly what to type."

Gallagher's Privacy Subcommittee held a hearing on Retail Credit on May 16, 1968, and learned that Retail Credit produces more than 35 million reports each year and has files on over 45 million Americans. Reports are for employment and insurance coverage in the main, and another aspect of the company's data gathering procedures was disclosed when they were fined \$4,000 for bribing a New York City police officer in order to gain confidential police files.

"During our investigation and our hearing, Retail Credit's veracity and accuracy were strongly questioned and it is not surprising to me that one of their reports is in the process of creating an international incident," Gallagher said.

El Siglo, a communist newspaper in Chile headlined the case, "Yanqui document reveals Edwards is an agent of the CIA." Pointing out that the report in Edwards' possession totally falsified his past achievements and record, Gallagher said, "What is surprising to me is that the communists believe reports which most capitalists regard as a necessary evil and which they express little confidence in."

A SALUTE TO VAVS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, over 1,000 volunteers from all over the United States are in Washington this week attending the Veterans' Administration voluntary services meeting in observance of the 25th anniversary of the National Advisory Committee. Over 110,000 volunteers from all walks of life gave over 9 million hours last year assisting our veteran patients.

It was soon apparent at the end of World War II when America's attention turned to its returning disabled veterans, that a central, coordinated program was needed to provide the most meaningful use of volunteers. In April 1946, at the invitation of the Administrator of Veteran Affairs, representatives of interested veterans and welfare organizations met with VA central office staff to lay the foundation for a master plan for action to help hospitalized veterans. From these meetings the VAVS was born and the National Advisory Committee was constituted with Gen. F. R. Kerr, Assistant Administrator for Special Services, as its first chairman.

Within a year the program came of age as volunteer assistance in the hospitals was extended to nursing, physical medicine, social work, and all ancillary services expressing need.

Each of the 165 VA hospitals has its own VAVS advisory committee made up of two representatives of each organization having volunteers serving at the hospital. At the Castle Point, N.Y., facility there are 17 organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of For-

eign Wars, the DAV and their auxiliaries, the American Red Cross, Catholic Youth Organization, and others. Over 400 volunteers contribute thousands of hours each month working in nursing service, the various therapies, and in numerous other areas of the hospital.

I think it fitting that we add our congratulations to these dedicated citizen volunteers. The marshalling and encouragement of voluntary service is a major emphasis today, and VAVS is an example of a highly successful volunteer program.

The President in a message to those attending the meetings said:

For a quarter-century the Veterans Administration voluntary service program has carried forward the highest ideals of a great American organization and symbolized the most basic spirit of American success.

The willingness of citizens to devote their time selflessly to worthy causes continues, more than ever, to be the keystone of our progress, and a substantial measure of this progress lies in the willingness of those who take part in this program.

The monthly average of 112,000 men and women spending over 9 million hours during the past year assisting our Nation's veterans represents quite a record of achievement. And it is a splendid way to say thank you to those who were ready to sacrifice everything to preserve the freedom we cherish.

A grateful Nation salutes the dedicated volunteers who for over 25 years have advanced this program. And I urge more Americans to follow the example you have set. May your rewarding commitment bring you as much satisfaction in the years ahead as it has brought to those who have needed your help.

NEW YORK ABORTION LAW GOES TOO FAR, DOCTORS STATE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a reaffirmation of my strong feelings against the liberalization of abortion laws, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a news item that appeared in the Chicago Tribune on December 18, 1970. Entitled, "New York Abortion Law Goes too Far, Doctors State" and written by Mr. Ronald Kotulak, the article intelligently discussed those abortions which result in the birth of live babies. This is a shocking situation which should haunt the consciences of us all.

I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD for the perusal of my colleagues.

The news item follows:

NEW YORK ABORTION LAW GOES TOO FAR, DOCTORS STATE

(By Ronald Kotulak, Science Editor)

At least 26 babies have been born alive in legalized abortion procedures in New York City, the Tribune learned yesterday.

The child of one mother who was aborted on Aug. 28 survived and now is up for adoption.

The others did not fare so well. Some breathed for only a few minutes and others cried and kicked before finally dying within two days after being artificially expelled from their mothers' wombs.

DOCTOR IS SADDENED

Even hard core advocates of liberalized abortion in New York say they are saddened

by the destruction of life and that the law has gone too far.

"I'm deeply saddened by this," said Dr. Jean Pakter, director of the maternity and newborn services for the New York City Department of Health.

The Health Department played a key role in convincing the New York state legislature to liberalize the abortion statute. As a result the state, on July 1, put into effect the nation's most liberal abortion law permits abortion on demand up to 24 weeks of pregnancy.

"In many of these cases where the fetus comes out alive, it takes a gasp or two and that's it. This is not right. As a physician I don't like to see life ended or hurt in any way."

An infant who is born prematurely at 26 or 28 weeks of pregnancy without an induced abortion stands a reasonable chance of survival.

WANTS A CUTBACK

"I'm not happy with the liberal extension of the law to 24 weeks," said Dr. Pakter, who is in favor of abortion. "That's going too far. I think the time has to be cut way back."

Opponents of the abortion law have become outraged by the live abortions. They maintain that it is a clear case of murder when the baby is born alive in an abortion but dies because he is just below the threshold to sustain his own life.

"Once this law was passed the abortionists lost no time in plying their death-dealing trade," Terence Cardinal Cook, Roman Catholic archbishop of New York said in a letter read in churches last Sunday. Cardinal Cook was informed of some of the live abortions by Catholic doctors.

"Each day they grow wealthier from the killing of unborn children—some of whom have been heard to cry as they were dropped into surgical trash cans.

CARDINAL FEARS FUTURE

"The day may come when lawmakers could set standards which people must meet if they are to remain alive. Already one standard has been set. Who can say what others will come next?" the Cardinal's letter asked.

Cardinal Cook called the death of these babies an "unspeakable crime" and warned Catholics that the "church disowns by immediate excommunication anyone who has or helps anyone have an abortion."

Two of the infants who were aborted alive were rushed to the premature center at St. Vincents Hospital, where doctors did everything possible to keep them living.

One of these infants lived for two days and the other died after several hours, said Dr. Vincent Fontana, director of pediatrics at the hospital.

Both were baptized by a Catholic priest before being taken to the city morgue for an anonymous burial, he said.

"To have a woman go in for an abortion and then to have the baby born alive only to die later is tantamount to murder," Dr. Fontana said. "There's no question about it."

Doctors in New York have been thrust into a compromising situation by the new law. At 20 weeks of gestation, the unborn child's heartbeat is strong, he moves around inside his mother's womb and he is almost completely formed.

For these reasons, most gynecologists will not end a pregnancy beyond 20 weeks. In addition, an abortion performed beyond 20 weeks is more hazardous to the mother. A normal pregnancy lasts about 40 weeks.

SALTING TECHNIQUE USED

To abort a fetus after 12 weeks, doctors use a technique called "salting out." A hypodermic needle is inserted thru the mother's abdomen into the amniotic sac containing the baby.

The fluid in the sac is withdrawn and a solution containing 20 per cent salt is injected. The salt solution irritates the uterus and normally ends the life of the fetus.

The irritation causes muscle spasms similar to those during labor and the fetus is expelled.

Dr. Pakter said that the only baby who survived the "salting out" operation apparently was sufficiently developed so that the salt did not harm her.

BABY IS NOT HARMED

"She was not harmed, thank goodness. She is a fine baby and she will make some adoptive parents very happy," Dr. Pakter said.

There probably were other babies born alive during abortions who for one reason or another were not listed as live births by the doctor, Dr. Pakter said. The definition of a live birth is any evidence of a breath, pulse or movement.

In some of these cases of live births, the time of gestation may have been underestimated and the actual time may have been 26 weeks or more, she said.

Dr. Pakter said she would like to see the law changed so that legal abortions could be performed only up to the 12th week of pregnancy.

From July 1 thru Oct. 31, some 34,000 legal abortions were performed in New York, she said.

BAND OF SOUTH HAGERSTOWN HIGH SCHOOL OFF TO FLORIDA

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, South Hagerstown High School in Hagerstown, Md., has developed over the years one of the best high school marching bands in the country. This year the Rebel Band of South High has been invited to the 50th Festival of the States in St. Petersburg, Fla., as the musical representative of the State of Maryland.

Only one band is selected to represent a State, and the Rebel Band will be competing with approximately 20 other States for two National Band Championship titles. The South High musicians arrived in St. Petersburg yesterday and depart on April 3. Their activities there include participation in the Parade of States, a half time show in the Champions on Parade, a concert, and a night parade honoring bands from out of State. The money for the trip was raised by the students at South High to send the 150 band members and 14 chaperones to Florida.

The comments of Mr. Elwood E. Kinney, director of the Rebel Band, indicate the excitement surrounding the trip to Florida. Kinney said, "We are thrilled and honored by this opportunity to represent Maryland at the Festival of States. Not only has it been called the outstanding band trip in the Nation, but we will get to compete for the National Band Championship." I would like to personally acknowledge the excellence of the South High Band and to congratulate them for this opportunity to represent the Old Line State in the national band competition.

LT. WILLIAM CALLEY

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, an American Army officer, Lt. William Calley, has been tried by court martial and convicted of the premeditated murder of 22 people in the Vietnamese hamlet of Mylai. These victims, as I understand it, were mostly women and children.

In its verdict the court martial board held that in killing at least 22 civilians, Lieutenant Calley overstepped the outer limits under which any military force in the field can be permitted to operate. The dreadful aspect raised by the prosecution and conviction of one man is that there is a strong appearance that one man has been singled out to serve as a sacrificial goat to save the military's conscience for one particularly brutal incident in a peculiarly brutal type of warfare. Others were involved. Should not then all those others be brought to trial?

As any man who has served in a combat area in time of war knows, there is a broad difference between the laws of civilized society and the rules of war. No one, in a civilized context, can give an excuse or justification for the barbarity of Mylai. In a community or a nation all men are our fellow citizens, our brothers. But in war all men who are not clearly with us, tend to become the enemy. And every American who has ever gone into combat has been trained to believe that to kill the enemy is virtuous, while to spare them can be both individually deadly and destructive to the unit to which a soldier belongs.

That there is a deep understanding of these differences in the American conscience I believe is shown by the totally different public reactions to the convictions of Charles Manson for the Tate-LaBianco murders, and the conviction of Lieutenant Calley for his part in the Mylai affair. Although both trials and both sentences took place at nearly the same time, public reaction on the similar sentences was totally different. This is because the American people clearly understand that the legal and civilized framework in which the two incidents took place were totally different. The one was an insane, sporadic act of barbarity in a peaceful, civilized community, for which all the participants were brought to trial; the other was one brutal act picked from a particularly brutal war, for which one man alone was placed on trial.

And when we speak of the brutality of war, many of us think of World War II in which so many here served. Vietnam is not, and has never been, that type of war. The guerrilla warfare of Vietnam is a peculiarly brutal form of the totally brutal business called war.

This was brought home to me when I visited Vietnam in 1968, 7 months after the Tet offensive. At that time I spoke with soldiers in hospitals and in Ameri-

can fire bases. Their words, their fears, the belief that all Vietnamese were their enemy ran deep in their talk. In many ways their conversations were identical to Lieutenant Calley's testimony as given nearly 3 years later at his trial. And when we view the My Lai incident, when we consider the acts of Lieutenant Calley and his platoon, I feel we must remember that this brutal massacre occurred shortly after the brutality of the bloody Tet offensive.

It seems clear, that mistaken as he may have been, Lieutenant Calley thought he was carrying out his orders as a soldier in the service of his country—the country which has sent him to that far off land to fight those strange and to him, frightening people. I do not excuse the barbarity of My Lai, nor the viciousness of any war, but I believe I understand how in the heat of combat, following the bloody terror of Tet, Lieutenant Calley could have made such an error. It is an error any soldier might have made then or in the future.

I have called upon the President of the United States to show clemency to this man. I do this not only for Lieutenant Calley but for thousands of our fighting men who have in the past or will in the future, face the dreadful task of choosing between the morality of civilized behavior in a peaceful civilized society, and the duty to self-preservation for himself and for his command in time of war.

FOX VALLEY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS APPROVES REVENUE SHARING

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Fox Valley Council of Governments, Appleton, Wis., recently approved a resolution endorsing general and special revenue sharing.

I, too, support the concept of revenue sharing, and include as a part of my remarks, the March 19, 1971, letter from the Fox Valley Council of Governments and the resolution announcing their support for general and special revenue sharing:

FOX VALLEY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS,
Appleton, Wis., March 19, 1971.
HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress, Room 1025, Longworth
Office Building, Washington, D.C.
DEAR "BILL" STEIGER: The attached resolution endorsing special and general revenue sharing was unanimously adopted by the Fox Valley Council of Governments on March 17. Your support of the resolution is requested.
Sincerely,

EUGENE E. FRANCHETT,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION ENDORSING GENERAL AND SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

Whereas, the need for public facilities and services provided by state and local government is increasing at a rate which

exceeds the revenues generated from the available tax base to such governments; and

Whereas, the federal government, through exercising taxing powers vested in it, has substantially diminished the available revenue producing sources available to states and local governments; and

Whereas, state and local governments and their designated regional councils are facing substantial deficits unless the federal government supplements the existing grant assistance programs to such governments; and

Whereas, there appears to be a general consensus of the states and the local governments that the most advantageous method of obtaining and receiving supplemental federal funds would be through a program of general and special revenue sharing; and

Whereas, the viability and continued growth of regional councils as policy and coordinative mechanisms of state and local governments is dependent on the strength and fiscal integrity of state and local government;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Fox Valley Council of Governments that the United States Congress be urged to enact during the first session of the 92nd Congress a general revenue and special revenue sharing program to assist states, local governments and regional councils in meeting their fiscal needs.

Approved by the Fox Valley Council of Governments this 17th day of March, 1971.

GILBERT J. ANDERSON, Chairman.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was passed by the Fox Valley Council of Governments this 17th day of March, 1971.

MARCH 19, 1971.

EUGENE E. FRANCHETT,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION OPPOSING PRESIDENTIAL POLICY OF "FREEZING" FUNDS FOR PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. Speaker, I am joining the Honorable WILLIAM HUNGATE, of Missouri, in sponsoring H.R. 305, a resolution opposing the Presidential policy of "freezing" funds appropriated by Congress for public works projects. The resolution also calls for the immediate release of all funds frozen by the administration.

Congress has authorized projects and appropriated money for them, only to repeatedly discover that these projects are being delayed because the administration decides it does not want to spend the money or does not like the projects.

This policy amounts to a second veto not contemplated under the law; it usurps the powers of Congress and it is contrary to the balance of responsibilities between the executive and legislative branches of Government, for if Congress approves money for a project and the President signs the bill, he should not be permitted to remove his signature from that bill—as if it were written in invisible ink—simply by refusing to allow funds to be spent for the project.

SUMMARY OF U.S. RETIREMENT LAWS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of a district where 37 percent of my constituents are employees of the Federal Government, I have received numerous inquiries about changes in the Civil Service retirement laws.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission has prepared an excellent questions-and-answers pamphlet on this subject. As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and its Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, I have found it to be an extremely helpful summary and would like the information to be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The summary follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT MAJOR CHANGES IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT MADE BY PUBLIC LAW 91-658

Public Law 91-658, signed by President Nixon on January 8, 1971, changes the Civil Service Retirement law in 5 ways. The changes—

I. Permit a retiree who was unmarried at the time of retirement to provide a survivor annuity for a spouse whom he married after retirement.

II. Provide a survivor annuity for the "second" spouse of a retiree who elected a survivor annuity when he retired.

III. Make requirements for survivor annuity to be met by a widower of an employee the same as for a widow.

IV. Permit a reemployed annuitant to use his supplemental annuity to increase his survivor's benefit.

V. Provide service credit for certain periods of separation during which employees received Federal Employees' Compensation benefits.

Following is an explanation of the changes in question and answer form:

I. SURVIVOR ANNUITY TO SPOUSE OF RETIREE WHO WAS UNMARRIED AT TIME OF RETIREMENT

1. Q. I was unmarried when I retired and am now married. How does the new law affect me? A. It depends on whether you retired before or after April 1, 1948.

2. Q. How does it affect me if I retired before April 1, 1948. A. The new law permits a survivor annuity to be paid automatically to your wife (or husband). You need do nothing now to provide this financial protection for your wife (or husband) and there is no reduction in your annuity.

3. Q. How does the new law affect me if I retired on or after April 1, 1948? A. If you retired under a provision of the retirement law which permitted the election of a survivor annuity, the new law now gives you the chance to elect a reduced annuity for yourself with a survivor benefit to your wife (or husband).

4. Q. How do I know if I retired under a provision of the retirement law which permitted the election of a survivor annuity? A. You did retire under such a provision unless—(1) you retired on a deferred annuity (an annuity that began more than 1 month after you left the Federal service) based on a separation that occurred before October 1, 1956, or (2) you are a woman who retired between April 1, 1948, and September 29, 1949.

5. Q. When I retired I was unmarried but I elected a reduced annuity with a survivor benefit to a named person having an insurable interest. I am now married. Does the opportunity to elect a survivor benefit for my wife (or husband) apply to me? A. Yes. You may now elect to cancel your "insurable interest" election and elect a reduced annuity with a survivor benefit to your wife (or husband). Survivor annuity will then be payable to your wife (or husband).

6. Q. Is there any time limit on when I can make the election to name as a survivor annuitant my wife (or husband) whom I married her (or him) before January 8, 1971, you must make the election no later than January 7, 1972.

7. Q. I am not married now but may marry in the future. Can I elect the survivor annuity after I marry? A. Yes. If you marry on or after January 8, 1971, your election must be made within 1 year after the date of your marriage.

8. Q. Can I change the survivor annuity election after I make it? A. No. The election of a survivor annuity cannot be changed after it has been accepted by the Civil Service Commission.

9. Q. Does my wife (or husband) whom I married after retirement have to meet any

requirements to be paid the new survivor annuity benefit? A. Yes. She (or he) must have been married to you for at least 2 years immediately before your death or, if married less than 2 years, be the parent of a child born of the marriage. Also if she (or he) is entitled to any other survivor annuity from the Government (not including Social Security), she (or he) must elect one of them; she (or he) cannot receive both.

10. Q. I understand if I retired on or after April 1, 1948, and now elect a survivor annuity, that my own annuity will be reduced. By how much will my annuity be reduced if I elect the survivor annuity? A. Your current annuity will be reduced by 2 1/2% of the first \$3,600 plus 10% of any annuity in excess of \$3,600. However, you may designate an amount which is less than your full annuity to be used as the base for computing your wife's (or husband's) survivor annuity and the reduction in your annuity will be based on the amount you designate.

11. Q. Can you give examples of how to compute the reduction in my annuity? A. Yes. Here are 3 examples: (1) If annuity is \$3,000; (2) If annuity is \$5,000; (3) If annuity is \$5,000 but only half (\$2,500) is designated as a base for the survivor annuity.

Amount of yearly annuity	Designated amount for survivor annuity base	2 1/2 percent of designated annuity up to \$3,600	10 percent of amount of designated annuity in excess of \$3,600	Total reduction in yearly annuity	Amount of reduced annual annuity ¹
(1) \$3,000	All	\$75 (2 1/2 percent x \$3,000)		\$75	\$2,928 (\$244 per month)
(2) \$5,000	All	\$90 (2 1/2 percent x \$3,600)	\$140 (10 percent x \$1,400)	230	\$4,776 (\$398 per month)
(3) \$5,000	\$2,500	\$62.50 (2 1/2 percent x \$2,500)		62.50	\$3,434 (\$286 per month)

¹ Rounded to nearest dollar of monthly annuity.

12. Q. When does this reduction in my annuity begin? A. The first of the month after your election of the survivor annuity is received in the Civil Service Commission.

13. Q. How much annuity will my wife (or husband) whom I married after retirement receive if she (or he) survives me? A. That depends on many factors such as when you retired and how much annuity you are receiving and whether you want all of it to be used as the base for the survivor annuity. In general, your survivor's annuity will be in the same amount as though you had been married at the time you retired.

14. Q. Will unmarried employees who retire in the future be able to elect a survivor annuity if they marry after retirement? A. Yes.

15. Q. May the widow or widower of a deceased retiree who married after he retired but who died before January 8, 1971, qualify for a survivor annuity? A. No.

II. SURVIVOR ANNUITY TO "SECOND" SPOUSE OF RETIREE WHO WAS MARRIED AT TIME OF RETIREMENT

1. Q. I was married when I retired and my wife (or husband) is still living. Does the new law affect me in any way? A. No, with one possible exception: Your wife (or husband) is now entitled to a survivor annuity and if your marriage ends because of death or divorce and you later remarry, your new wife (or husband) could be paid the survivor annuity.

2. Q. I was married when I retired. The marriage ended and I later remarried. Is my new wife (or husband) entitled to a survivor annuity? A. The new wife (or husband) could be paid survivor annuity if you retired before April 1, 1948, or, if you retired on or after that date and at the time of retirement you elected a reduced annuity with survivor benefit.

3. Q. Does my wife (or husband) whom I married after retirement have to meet any requirements to be paid the survivor annuity?

A. Yes. Your new wife (or husband) must have been married to you for at least 2 years immediately before your death or, if married less than 2 years, be the parent of a child born of the marriage. Also, if she (or he) is entitled to any other survivor annuity from the Government (not including Social Security), she (or he) must elect one of them; she (or he) cannot receive both.

4. Q. Do I have to file an election with the Civil Service Commission to be sure that my new wife (or husband) is paid a survivor annuity?

A. No. If she (or he) survives you and meets the requirements explained in the answer to question 3, she (or he) will automatically be paid the annuity.

5. Q. How much annuity will my wife (or husband), whom I married after I retired, receive?

A. The same amount as the wife (or husband) to whom you were married when you retired would have received if she (or he) had outlived you.

6. Q. When I retired, I elected a reduced annuity with survivor benefit. If my wife (or husband) dies before me and I do not remarry, is the reduction in my annuity restored? A. No.

7. Q. When I retired I was married but elected a single life annuity payable only during my lifetime and without a survivor benefit. Can I change this election now? A. No. The new law does not authorize a change in the type of annuity you elected for the purpose of now providing a survivor benefit either for your wife (or husband) to whom you were married at the time of

your retirement or for one you may have married after retirement.

8. Q. I married my wife (or husband) after she retired. He (or she) did not elect a survivor annuity. He (or she) died before January 8, 1971. Am I now entitled to a survivor annuity? A. No. The rights of widowers (or widows) of retirees who died before January 8, 1971, are not changed by the new law.

III. WIDOWERS OF WOMEN EMPLOYEES

1. Q. What change does the new law make concerning widowers of women employees? A. It permits payment of a survivor annuity to the widower of a woman employee on the same basis as to the widow of a male employee by eliminating the requirements that a widower has to be incapable of self-support and must have received more than half-support from his deceased wife.

2. Q. What are the requirements that must now be met to qualify a widower (or widow) for a survivor annuity? A. The employee must have—(1) completed at least 18 months of Federal civilian service, and (2) died while employed subject to the Civil Service Retirement System. The widower (or widow) must—(1) have been married to the employee for at least 2 years immediately preceding her (or his) death, or (2) be the father (or mother) of a child born of the marriage with the employee.

3. Q. Does this change affect widowers of employees who died before January 8, 1971? A. No. It applies only to widowers of employees who die on or after January 8, 1971.

IV. USE OF SUPPLEMENTAL ANNUITY TO INCREASE SURVIVOR BENEFIT

1. Q. What is a supplemental annuity? A. This is an annuity earned by certain retirees who are reemployed in the Government for at least 1 year after they retire.

2. Q. How does a supplemental annuity increase the survivor benefit? A. Formerly, upon termination of the reemployment, the supplemental annuity was a single life annuity. The change in the law permits the supplemental annuity to be used as a base for additional survivor annuity if the employee had elected a reduced annuity with survivor benefit when he initially retired.

3. Q. Does a reemployed annuitant have to apply for the additional survivor annuity? A. No. The additional survivor annuity will automatically be granted when the supplemental annuity is granted unless the retiree requests otherwise.

4. Q. Is there a reduction in supplemental annuity if additional survivor annuity is payable? A. Yes. The supplemental annuity is reduced by 10%.

5. Q. How much additional survivor annuity is payable? A. The additional survivor annuity amounts to 55% of the full supplemental annuity (before the 10% reduction).

6. Q. Does this change apply to an annuitant whose reemployment ended before January 8, 1971? A. No. It applies only to an annuitant whose reemployment terminates on or after that date.

V. CREDIT FOR PERIODS OF SEPARATION DURING WHICH FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION BENEFITS WERE RECEIVED

1. Q. What change has been made in the retirement law concerning credit for periods of separation during which Federal employees' compensation benefits were received. A. An employee (or former employee) who returns to Federal employment after he has been separated is now deemed to have been on leave without pay for any part of the period of separation during which he received Federal employees' compensation as a result of illness or injury related to his Government job.

2. Q. What is the effect of this change. A. It permits full credit toward retirement for all or a portion of a separation period during

which the employee was receiving employees' compensation.

3. Q. Is this change retroactive? A. This change applies to qualifying periods of separation occurring before as well as on or after January 8, 1971.

4. Q. How can an employee who retired before January 8, 1971, obtain this retirement credit? A. Since there is no practicable way in which the Government can identify already-retired persons with periods of separation which could be counted, the new law requires that such periods be counted only upon application by the retiree.

5. Q. I am already retired and have a period of separation during which I received employees' compensation. How can I apply to have this period credited toward my annuity? A. Simply write a letter to the Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement, Insurance, and Occupational Health, 1900 E St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20415. Please be sure to give full identifying information, including your name, date of birth, and CSA claim number.

6. Q. Will the increase in my annuity that results from crediting the period of separation be retroactive? A. No, the increased annuity is payable only for the months after January 1971.

7. Q. My husband (or wife) died before January 8, 1971, and I am the survivor annuitant. Can I apply for additional credit for a period of separation during which he received employees' compensation? A. No. Only the retiree can apply for and receive the additional credit.

8. Q. Can a survivor annuitant receive the additional credit? A. Yes. The survivor of an employee who dies on or after January 8, 1971, will automatically be credited with the period of separation. Also, the survivor of an annuitant who has been allowed credit for the period of separation will receive credit for it.

SUPPORT "PEACE" MARCH? NO!

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I received recently a packet of material from something called the National Peace Action Coalition which asked for my written support of the planned April 24 demonstration in Washington.

Included with the material, on top of the stack, was the copy of a letter written on official Senate stationery and signed by a Member of the other body, which ends with the words:

I wholeheartedly endorse your program for April 24th and I will do all I can to help it succeed.

Also included were copies of statements from other Members of Congress, expressing support.

A blank form, with my name typed on it, was also provided. My reply was as follows:

I decline your invitation—and I do not decline it "respectfully" because "respect" denotes both "honor" and "esteem."

I have no "esteem" for the theory that foreign policy can and should be made by street mobs.

I do not feel "honor" is due those who encourage this, and who seem convinced that peace may be attained solely by shouting it, over and over again.

You often complain the Government will not listen to your dialogue. Your dialogue

to date has been couched in terms of the rankest, cheapest demagoguery. In it, you seek to represent that the peace which all men seek is a marketable commodity which is attainable solely by unilateral action on the part of the Government.

You have shown a readiness and willingness to barter in human lives that betrays your vaunted concern for human suffering as a shallow mockery and an outright lie. You would leave millions of South Vietnamese unprotected from the explicitly-documented savagery of the Communists and from amongst your supporters has come the incredibly brutal suggestion that our own POWs might be deserted and forgotten.

The New York Times of March 31, 1971, quotes a member of the War Resisters League about the April 24 March:

"It is time now to break relations with the Government. This time we'll stay in Washington. . . . April 24 can't be just an annual spring picnic. Those picnics were good but they aren't enough. It's no secret that this country is headed for 1984. The alternative to 1984 is 1776 and it's going to begin this spring."

As reported by the Washington Daily News of March 31, these noble thoughts will encompass such things as:

- (1) a demonstration in front of the White House, even though police permission has been refused;
- (2) "guerrilla theater" on the steps of the Supreme Court;
- (3) mass masochism over "war crimes" on the Capitol steps;
- (4) "civil disobedience" against Selective Service, Internal Revenue, HEW and Justice;
- (5) a "people's lobby" which plans to enter Federal buildings for 'dialogue' with employees;
- (6) a sit-in attempt to block one of the major bridges leading into the city;
- (7) a moratorium on "business as usual".

All in the name of peace! Such a peace, dictated by swarming mobs, would be the peace of the slave and of the tomb, not only for this Republic but for the entire Free World.

It would insure that the name of the United States of America would go down reviled, damned and cursed—not in the history books but on the lips of the poor wretches who saw it as their last hope, and saw this hope disappear when the United States gave up, as you would have it do.

No—the name would not be in the history books—for it would disappear for all time to come, from written history, erased as thoroughly and totally as the sand-covered domains of Ozymandias.

And the four-footed jackals of the desert would howl across the sands that covered the ruins, as today their two-footed ancestors howl, in hopes of bringing that ruin to pass!

TECHNOLOGY AND OUR ENVIRONMENT THE SALVATION OF MANKIND

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear to all of us that we are living in an era of great change. As a matter of fact, I think we can say that our lifetime has seen the greatest of man's innovations and achievements than any other lifespan in the history of mankind. Man's technology was a main artery of the brain behind these advancements in our way of life but there are many now

saying that the wake of our technology is now catching up with us and strangling and suffocating our environment and man's very life through its pollution of our natural resources. This does not mean that we must curtail our technology but that we must expand it or redirect it with the environmental factors having the greatest priority instead of the afterthought.

As a matter of interest to you and our colleagues here in the House, I would like to share with you a most adroit and formidable statement that was presented to the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Baltimore by a prominent member of my congressional district, the nationally distinguished Mr. Clifford D. Siverd, president and chief executive officer of the American Cyanamid Co., preeminent in world leadership in the chemical and pharmaceutical industry, on the challenge presently before all of us to reassert our mastery over technology and agree on what we want it to do if we are to achieve the society we all seek for ourselves and future generations.

His statement is as follows:

It gives me a warm inner feeling to come back to Baltimore and visit with you today. I am a Marylander, born in Cumberland, up in the mountain area west of here. My family came to Baltimore in 1918, and I went to school on Maryland and 27th Street at Sts. Philip's and James' Parochial School. Then I went to Mt. St. Joseph's to the west, in Irvington, and fortunately I was able to get one of the fine State of Maryland engineering scholarships then available at Johns Hopkins University, where I got a B.S. degree in 1935.

I have many fond memories of Baltimore of the 1930's—the double-decker buses, with their top decks loaded on summer evenings, and the Easter parades, with everyone in spring finery from the Monument to University Parkway. I even recall one memorable Sunday when there was a little rain; a friend of mine had a Model A Ford with a rumble seat, and in the course of our meandering around town I got an umbrella from home and sat in the rumble seat with the umbrella over my date and me. One roving photographer felt this was of sufficient interest to put the picture in the Baltimore Sun.

Those were the days of Cardinal Gibbons, and of Jack Dunn's Orioles in the International League; and then, as now, Johns Hopkins was dominant in medicine as well as lacrosse. Baltimore was friendly, and I enjoyed living here. Unfortunately, when I was looking for a job there were not too many anywhere, and I had to go a little farther afield in order to get located in industry.

In many ways, of course, that was a different city from the Baltimore of today. It was somewhat more leisurely, and decidedly less affluent. The downtown skyline was far less imposing. There was no Charles Center, no Hopkins Plaza, no Civic Center, no Inner Harbor development. In those days the Colts, the Bullets, and the Clippers did not even exist.

The development of modern Baltimore has been impressive. You have rebuilt the heart of the city completely. You have gone far in modernizing your port facilities. You have maintained your position among the top four seaports of the nation, you have achieved a significant shift from bulk cargo to general cargo, with important benefit to the economy of metropolitan Baltimore. Your handling of the highway problem has brought favorable notice in the February issue of *Fortune*. And your Chamber of Commerce has played an important part in shaping the Baltimore of today.

But despite all this, much remains to be done. Your purpose is to make Baltimore the model city of America—offering a clean environment, with equal opportunity for all—and to succeed, you must harness all your forces and maintain your forward drive without let-up.

The changes in Baltimore since the 1930's have been dramatic—so dramatic that they suggest the theme for this talk: *change*. What theme could be more appropriate? Change today is rampant, not just here in Baltimore but throughout the nation and around the globe. Moreover, the pace of this change is accelerating. It is taking place faster and faster with each passing decade.

Alvin Toffler has written a stimulating book called *Future Shock* in which he portrays this vividly. Modern man has existed for perhaps 50,000 years. If this 50,000-year period were divided into lifetimes of about 62 years each, man's history spans 800 such lifetimes. Let us trace the pace of change during these lifetimes:

—In the first 650 of them, things changed very little. Man spent them in caves.

—Only during the last 70 of these 800 lifetimes, with the invention of writing, has it been possible for man to communicate effectively from one lifetime to another.

—Only during the last six lifetimes did large masses of men ever see a printed word.

—Only during the last four of our 800 lifetimes has man been able to measure time with any precision.

—Only in the last two lifetimes has anyone, anywhere, used an electric motor.

—And the overwhelming majority of all the material goods we use today have been developed within the present lifetime—the 800th.

We are indeed in a world of change. The company with which I am closely associated, American Cyanamid, is 63 years old. By coincidence, this is pretty close to one of Toffler's 62-year lifetimes. During its existence, the company has gone through tremendous changes, with the changes in recent years coming faster and faster.

For the major portion of its existence, Cyanamid was in the routine chemical business, which grew at a rather steady, plodding rate. Around 1928 or '29, however, we got into the medical business by purchasing Lederle Laboratories, a small pharmaceutical company in Rockland County, New York—just over the border from New Jersey. Lederle didn't do very much for the company in earnings until the late '40's, when we were lucky enough to discover Aureomycin[®] chlorotetracycline, the first of the broad-spectrum antibiotics. These drugs were dramatic. They saved lives which could not have been saved before. They made pneumonia, for example, a disease of extremely minor consequence.

In the '50's we acquired Formica Corporation. Formica is a world-famous brand name, and the corporation is an outstanding leader in the field of laminated plastics. I trust that all of you have some Formica[®] plastic laminates in your homes or apartments.

We went a step further in the '60's, going directly into the consumer market. We purchased several companies, the most famous of which was John H. Breck, Inc., the well-known producer of hair-care products. And only a few weeks ago we purchased the Ervin Company, a well-known developer of residential communities in the Southeast.

So Cyanamid, too, went through dramatic changes in its 63-year lifetime. Those that occurred in the past decade had the greatest impact on the company, since a consumer business takes different disciplines and different management and a different philosophy from a chemical business.

Cyanamid's case is not exceptional. Almost all large companies have undergone many changes.

Let us look at the pace of change in some specific fields of human endeavor. Consider transportation. For thousands of years, man traveled on foot. Then came the camel caravan, which averaged eight miles an hour, and later the horse-drawn chariot, which could get up to 20. For thousands of years more, animals like these provided the fastest transportation available.

The first steam locomotive was not introduced until 1825, and it was actually slower than the chariot. It had a top speed of 13 miles per hour, and the sailing ships of that day averaged only half that speed. It was the 1880's before an improved locomotive could reach 100 miles per hour.

Only fifty years later, propeller-driven aircraft were doing 400 miles per hour. In 20 years more, the jets doubled that figure, and within the past few years men in space capsules have been circling the earth at 18,000 miles per hour.

If man's top speed of travel were plotted in a graph—on a scale, say of a thousand years to the inch—the curve would look strange indeed. It would go along almost level for more than four feet. It would begin to show a significant rise only in the last tenth of an inch, and then, abruptly, it would go right off the top of the chart.

So much for transportation. Baltimore is a city, an urban community, so let us turn to urbanization. In 1850, there were only four cities in the world with more than a million inhabitants. In 1900, there were 19. But by 1960, there were 141.

The urban population of the world today is growing at a rate of 6.5% per year. At this rate, it will double in the next 11 years. If all the cities of the world remained their present size, we would have to duplicate them all between now and 1981—a new Baltimore, a new Chicago, a new New York, a new London, a new Tokyo, and so on for every city around the globe.

A graph of the world's urban population would look much like that of man's speed of travel—level for more than four feet, a significant rise only in the last fraction of an inch, and then right off the top of the chart.

We could continue with many such examples. Curves showing man's range of communication, his ability to calculate, his capacity for storing and retrieving information, and many other things—all of them would end by shooting off the top of the chart.

Change today is explosive. Its pace is such that many thoughtful observers question our ability to assimilate it. They suggest that it may overwhelm us. As evidence, they point to some of the less pleasant phenomena of modern life—hippies, alienation, free-floating violence, the mounting use of drugs. Such things, they say, betoken pervasive unrest despite our attainment of the highest standard of living ever achieved by man.

In the emotional and spiritual malaise that seems to afflict too many of us, the relentlessly accelerating pace of change may indeed be a factor. And behind change, generating it, stands technology. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that there are signs of a developing disenchantment with technology. There are even those who propose—apparently with complete seriousness—that we institute a moratorium on scientific research, and that we bring the introduction of new technology to a halt.

The problem, of course, is far too complex to yield to such solutions. We need not less technology but more. We need it for the control of pollution, and for rebuilding our cities, and for improving mass transit. We need it for raising the standard of living of the underdeveloped nations, and of the underprivileged individuals in the developed nations. We need it simply to feed the rapidly expanding world population.

Granted our continuing need for technology, we still must recognize that technology has been a contributor to many of our present problems. Examples are legion. Let us look briefly at one of particular interest to a metropolitan chamber of commerce.

We must begin, paradoxically enough, on the farm. Over the past few decades, we developed better farm equipment, better seed, improved fertilizers, and more effective pesticides. The result was an amazing increase in our agricultural productivity.

We got more food at lower cost, but there was a side effect: more and more agricultural workers became surplus. The farm population of this country fell from more than a third of the total population in 1910 to about 5% today. These displaced agricultural workers migrated to the cities in droves, as you in Baltimore are well aware. They came, many of them, unprepared for urban life, and lacking the skills needed to earn a living in a complex industrial economy. Too many of them became public charges. There was a rapid increase in the demands on local governments for welfare, health care, and the like.

But there is more to the story. While agricultural technologists were boosting farm productivity, highway engineers were developing better methods of building roads, and our highway networks expanded. Automotive engineers were improving automobiles. Travel became easier—between city and suburb, and from one suburb to another. This contributed to a mass shift of people from the cities to the suburbs, offsetting the migration from the farms to the cities.

The two streams, moving in opposite directions, were of course made up of different kinds of people. While the displaced agricultural workers coming into the cities were in many cases unskilled and impoverished, those leaving for the suburbs were relatively affluent. The exodus to the suburbs even swept with it some of the headquarters offices and manufacturing plants of large corporations.

You know the rest. Our cities today, with skyrocketing budgets for social services, education, and other municipal needs, find their tax base shrinking. And the increased reliance on the automobile complicates their problem all the more. With all their other costs mounting, they must find money for the attack on pollution.

Obviously, technology was by no means the only factor involved in all this. Our policies on welfare payments, our willingness to spend far more on highway construction than on mass transit, our programs for insuring mortgages, with most of them on suburban housing—these and other factors had their impact, too. Nevertheless, we must recognize that technology was one of the factors in the genesis of today's urban difficulties, just as it was a factor in the development of some of our other social ills.

In cases like this, the problem is usually not the direct effects of a given technology, but rather the side effects. These side effects are often unforeseen, which gives rise to the popular impression that technology is introduced without first being evaluated. As Robert Sproull of the University of Rochester has put it, "The impression is abroad that technology is a driverless bus, careening downhill with no goals or direction, carrying us all to a messy end."

You and I know that this is false. Goals for technology are set, and before technology is introduced, it is evaluated. When a company's research and development effort brings forth a new invention, the company evaluates the development very carefully indeed before it installs facilities for commercial production. If the facilities are expensive enough to cause the company to borrow money or sell stock to finance them, commercial or investment bankers may make their own evaluations. Depending on the

nature of the invention, government agencies may be involved as well.

But the scope of such evaluations is necessarily limited. The manufacturer and the bankers are concerned primarily with how well the invention will do the job for which it is intended. To the extent that they can, they look at side effects, too, but usually they have neither the resources nor the authority to investigate them exhaustively. In the days when Henry Ford was still a struggling mechanic, would he have been able to foresee the complex changes which his mass-produced automobile was to bring about in the economic and social life of the world? Could the inventors of radio and television have predicted the far-reaching effects of instant communications?

If a government agency is involved in the appraisal of a new technology, its evaluation is also limited. Harvey Brooks has pointed out, for example, that there are at least three government agencies concerned with weather modification. The Department of Agriculture has the objective of reducing storm damage to crops. The Bureau of Reclamation wants to increase rainfall in the dry Western states. The Federal Aviation Administration seeks methods of dissipating fogs over airports. None of these agencies, however, looks at weather modification in all its aspects.

All this may have been adequate in a less crowded world. Today, however, with a rapidly expanding population pressing on the finite resources of this planet, we must do more. If we are to reverse the growing disaffection with science and technology, if we are to avert unwise political reaction to our recurrent environmental crises, we must set up the apparatus for a systematic and continuing assessment of our technology, both existing and new. This assessment must be interdisciplinary, involving social as well as physical scientists. It must be made from the standpoint of society as a whole. It must take into account social as well as economic costs. It must consider alternate routes to a given goal, and reckon the costs for each route.

Congressman Daddario of Connecticut has introduced a bill which would establish an assessment board to advise the Congress on emerging technologies. A similar bill has been introduced in the Senate. The National Academy of Sciences has recommended a somewhat more elaborate mechanism.

While I am not prepared to recommend specific procedures, several points appear to be basic. First of all, it seems clear that the assessment will have to be carried on under government auspices. There is no other way of assuring that the interests of all social groups will be adequately represented. Further, since the problems spawned by technology are national in their scope, the assessment will have to be carried on at the federal level.

Second, whatever form the evaluation or assessment mechanism may take, it should not circumvent the existing political processes. Such assessment board or office should evaluate and recommend, but the responsibility for action should remain lodged in the Congress and the President, with their decisions subject to review by the courts.

Third, we must avoid the issuance of reports which simply gather dust. Regardless of the approach adopted, there must be an assessment body comparable in its influence to the Council of Economic Advisers, capable of mobilizing opinion and producing action.

Fourth, we should avoid building up another cumbersome bureaucracy. The staff of the government office or board could consist of a small group of competent physical and social scientists. The studies they need in carrying on the assessment process should be made by established government agencies, universities, think-tanks, and private corporations, as circumstances indicate, but this

work must be coordinated to provide an order of priority and to avoid waste.

So much for the technology assessment mechanism. Let me close with two general observations. One of them is that whatever program is set up, technology assessment will be complex and difficult, and the results will be imperfect. At the time the telephone was introduced, or radio, or television, or the computer—beneficial as all of these were—no long-range forecast of their indirect effects could have been correct in every detail. But the broad outlines could have been foreseen at the very beginning, and steps could have been taken to encourage those effects that were desirable, and to redirect those that were not. Further, if the assessment process had been a continuing one, errors in the original predictions could have been detected and compensated.

My other observation is that technology assessment, by itself, will not solve the problems associated with technology. What it will do is give us—and our representatives in government—the information we need to attack these problems intelligently. It will give us the background we require if we are to rearrange our priorities and proceed with some rational long-range planning. But solving the problems, and making and implementing the plans, will be up to all of us. And that as it should be. The responsibility is ours.

I end these remarks on a note of challenge—a challenge expressed by Glenn Seaborg in a speech he delivered to the Nobel Symposium in Stockholm just a year ago. Here is what he said:

"Technology can be directed creatively so as to bring human society into close harmony with its natural environment. It can be made to create more wealth with less waste. . . . It can be made to create beauty where we have let it spawn ugliness. It can be made to bring man both greater security and more individual freedom. What it does, however, will be accomplished only when we stop blaming it for our shortcomings, reassert our mastery over it and agree on what we want it to do."

That is the challenge for us—to reassert our mastery over technology and agree on what we want it to do. The job will be difficult. It will require the combined efforts of industry, government, the universities, and all of the other groups in our society. But we have a strong incentive to succeed. What we are working to achieve is the better society of tomorrow—here in Baltimore, in our country, and around the world.

AMERICA'S RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT TO SOVIET JEWRY

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, the Honorable Angelo D. Roncallo, Controller of the County of Nassau, State of New York, delivered an outstanding and timely address on the plight of Soviet Jewry. So that my distinguished colleagues in the Congress may have the benefit of reading this enlightening address, I would like to include it in the RECORD here.

I feel that my presence here, as a Catholic in a Jewish synagogue, points out the concern every religious person, regardless of creed, should have for the plight of Soviet Jewry. Although every religion in Russia and her satellite countries has suffered greatly, it

is the Jew who has focused the world spotlight on the harsh persecution practiced by the communists. It is the Russian Jew who is risking his safety and life demanding his freedom to emigrate. And it is the non-Russian Jew who is loudly and forcefully shaking the rest of the world from its complacency by defying the power of the communists.

As a religious person, I deeply admire the courage and fortitude of the Russian Jew. Not only is he helping his own people, but he is serving as an example of heroism to other repressed religions in the U.S.S.R.

Too many Americans, for too long a time, have engaged in the kind of wishful thinking which has led them to believe that somehow communism has changed—that it is no longer the tyranny it was under Stalin, somehow a new era of freedom has dawned for the people of the Soviet Union.

This optimistic view, unfortunately, has not been borne out by the facts. In 1956, it is true, Nikita Khrushchev condemned Stalin and his so-called "cult of personality". The evils of the Stalin era, Khrushchev declared, were the results of Stalin's own personality. All of this, he promised, would change.

But instead of changing for the better, it is now Khrushchev who has been rejected, and Stalin who has been reinstated. In February 1969, for example, the Soviet Communist Party's most authoritative journal, *Kommunist*, officially rehabilitated the late Josef Stalin as an "outstanding military leader", repudiating as "inventions" the tales told by Nikita Khrushchev at the 20th Party Congress in 1956. The same issue of *Kommunist* makes clear that this rehabilitation is not accidental and is linked to current policies.

The renaissance of Stalinism has been accompanied by a renewed campaign against one of Stalin's favorite targets and scapegoats—the Jews.

We must remember that Soviet hostility to Jews dates to the programs of the period before the Revolution. The communists, since coming to power in 1917 have launched a campaign of persecution against all religions, but the Jews have remained a convenient and vulnerable target.

In order to place the recent anti-Semitic campaign in proper historical perspective, it is important to review the history of religious persecution in the Soviet Union.

In 1925 the League of Militant Atheists was formed in the Soviet Union to publish and spread anti-religious material and like, the government's economic plan, an atheistic five year plan was launched in 1927 and again in 1937. In the late 1930's the League was reported to have 3.5 million members, but it failed in its primary task. Religion has not been destroyed in the fifty years since the Russian Revolution—but not due to any lack of effort on the part of the communist regime.

Despite an intensive fifty year campaign calling for its eradication, religion remains a force in modern Russia. A recent poll, conducted by university students in the city of Kazan (with a population of 900,000), showed that 21% of those questioned declared that they were religious. A surprisingly large number of the believers, 34%, belonged to the working class. The report was issued by the official magazine of Soviet atheism.

Speaking on January 22, 1958, then Premier Khrushchev stated, "We are for the freedom of the religious convictions of the people and for respect for the religious views of every human being in every nation."

Those in the West who pose questions about the state of religion in the Soviet Union are referred to Article 124 of the Soviet Constitution: "In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom

from anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens."

We are not told, however, what this means. The decree on the separation of church and state and of school and church of January 23, 1918 was not aimed at religious freedom or tolerance but at the undermining of the very existence of religion.

The clergymen were deprived of voting rights and were considered obscurants and enemies of the people, not engaged in work. By order of Lenin, the All-Russian Extraordinary Committee for the Suppression of Counterrevolution was established in 1918 and during the first three years of communist rule, thousands of clergymen were the victims of Soviet terrorism.

According to official Soviet data, 423 churches were closed and 322 destroyed in the first half of 1929, and 1,440 churches were closed by the year's end. Synagogues were converted into clubs, Buddhist monasteries were closed, Moslem mosques were converted into atheist museums and the printing of the Koran was prohibited.

The provision that the school shall be separated from the church denies to the church any educational function, since these are considered to be a monopoly of the state.

Another legal document, "Decree of Religious Associations", was enacted April 8, 1929 under Stalin by the Central Executive Committee of the People's Commissars. This legislation sets forth in nineteen paragraphs what religious associations must do and must not do. The right to participate in religious rites is defined by the government as worship in an approved meeting place by a registered congregation led by acceptable ministers. There is strict enforcement of the regulation against giving religious instruction to the young, including parents giving religious instruction to their own children. Public worship is forbidden, as is any attempt to preach beyond the bounds of the approved meeting place. Baptism of children is likewise forbidden, and only those religious groups which have met the approval of the government are even permitted to participate in this limited practice.

While those below the age of 21 may not be given religious instruction, they are the major target of the state's own anti-religious "propaganda", another Soviet practice contrary to Article 124.

Before the Revolution, the training of Russian Orthodox clergy was ensured by 58 seminaries with twenty thousand students and by about two hundred ecclesiastical schools and minor seminaries. Above the seminaries were four ecclesiastical academies. On September 8, 1918, all ecclesiastical establishments had to close their doors.

During World War II, the communist government sought to unify the people against the German invader, and also attempted to create the image in the West of the Soviet Union as a democratic and freedom-loving state. The editors of papers and magazines were instructed to stop publication of articles attacking the church and, although the laws and regulations relating to religion remained in force, they were not strictly applied. In 1944, in fact, theological studies were permitted to resume on a limited basis.

With the end of the war came an increasing reign of terror. An example of renewed vigor with which the Soviet Government attacked religion may be seen in the case of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

On the night of April 11, 1945, Metropolitan Josef was arrested and with him the entire Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy. Barely two weeks after his arrest, Moscow Patriarch Alexei consecrated a Russian priest, Makarii, as Bishop of Lviv, and on April 28, 1945, a so-called Initiatory Group was organized in Lviv, whose purpose was to work to bring the Ukrainian Church into the Russian Orthodox Church. On March 8th-10th, 1946, a "Council" took place and it invalidated the decli-

sion of the Council of Brest in 1596, and united the Ukrainian Church with the Russian Orthodox Church.

Metropolitan Josef was sentenced in 1946 and nothing was heard about him until the death of Stalin in 1953. At that time, he was made the same proposition which he had refused in 1945; they demanded that he recognize the authority of the Patriarch of Moscow. He again rejected this proposal and as the result of another trial in 1958 he was sentenced to an additional seven years of compulsory labor in a concentration camp.

The reason for the Soviet Government's desire to unite the Ukrainian Catholic Church with the Russian Orthodox Church represents an important aspect of the treatment of religion under communism. Just as the church was needed during World War II to increase Soviet prestige in the eyes of the world and unite the people, so it is needed in peacetime to sell Soviet foreign policy and the philosophy of socialism.

Dr. Matthew Spinka, prominent church historian at the Hartford Theological Seminary, notes that the Soviet policy has "... resulted in the ever-increasing subjection of the church to governmental control, so that in the end, but little actual difference could be discerned between the external relations with the church which had existed under the Czarist regime and that which existed under the Soviets. It in turn established the pattern of relations which became not only the fixed form for Russia but for all communist-dominated countries as well.

"This *modus vivendi*, has lulled the church into the belief of the possibility of a 'peaceful coexistence' and of preservation of its essential rights, while in reality it has been used as a tool for eliminating all religion from society. This presents perhaps, the most difficult problem facing modern Christendom."

We have seen the callous and ruthless manipulation of certain segments of Christianity to further communist goals, but no such preference of tolerance is even offered to Judaism.

Judaism in the U.S.S.R. is subject to unique discrimination. Jewish congregations are not permitted to organize a nationwide federation or any other central organization. Judaism is permitted no publication facilities, and no Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917, nor is a Russian translation of the Jewish version of the Old Testament allowed.

The study of Hebrew, even for religious purposes, has been outlawed and the production of religious objects, such as prayer shawls, is prohibited. The number of Jews in the Soviet Union is close to three million, of whom at least one million have been estimated as deep believers. For these there are approximately 60 synagogues and rabbis, or one synagogue and rabbi for every 16,000 believers. No new rabbis are now being trained and the average age of rabbis is over seventy. Little hope remains for a continuation of Jewish religious life in the Soviet Union.

The rabid anti-semitism of the communist leadership has been well-known. It was no coincidence that in the much publicized purge trials in Czechoslovakia in 1952 that eleven of the fourteen accused in the Slansky Case were of Jewish origin. Writing in *The Confession*, which has now been made into a movie, Arthur London tells of his first interrogator who took him by the throat and shouted, "You and your dirty race, we will know how to annihilate you! What Hitler didn't finish, we will!"

Despite repeated statements to the effect that things since Stalin have improved in the Soviet Union with regard to religious freedom, the fact is that they have been getting worse. The campaign has mounted in recent years. Mr. Oliver Clement, an orthodox professor declared that from 1959 to 1962, the

number of churches open decreased from 22,000 to 11,500 and the number of priests carrying on their functions from 30,000 to 14,000. More than half the monasteries have been closed, from 69 in 1958 to 31 in 1962. Of eight seminaries reopened in 1945, two have been closed and two have been almost stripped of their students.

News reports from the Soviet Union today indicate that religion is in as difficult a position today as it ever was. *Pravda Ukraini* for October 3, 1966 tells the story of a "Brother Prokofiev" who had already been in prison three times, but as soon as he was released, he began to organize secret Sunday Schools again. The result was a fourth arrest.

Sowjetskaais Russia recounts how the Baptist Marinkowa has had six children taken away from her because she gave them Christian faith and forbade them to wear the Communist pioneer necktie. When she heard the sentence, she said only, "I suffer for my faith." She now has to pay the boarding school bills of her children who are in a state institution which preaches militant atheism.

While other religions and sects continue to endure their share of persecution, we find that once again, the Jews are the major scapegoats. B'nai B'rith, in a documented analysis of textbooks used in Soviet schools, accused Moscow of "systematically excising history" in an attempt to make the Jew a "nonperson."

Findings of the study said that Jews "are rarely mentioned and their culture ignored" in basic history textbooks used by the Soviet educational system.

The sixth edition of "*Recent History*", published in 1967 as a ninth grade teaching manual, makes no mention of "anti-semitic persecutions" in recounting the history of the Nazi regime from 1933 to 1939. The same book, discussing Nazi death camps, says that in "1933-34, 100,000 Communists were thrown into prison and into especially established concentration camps" but makes no mention that the victims were Jews.

A chronology in the tenth grade textbook listing nations newly independent since World War II omits reference to Israel, although such countries as Algeria and the United Arab Republic are treated in separate sections.

The great Soviet Encyclopedia has adopted the same tactic of exclusion. In contrast to the 1932 edition which dealt with Jewish history and culture in 117 pages, the second edition, published in 1952, has but two pages devoted to Jews. Virtually all Jewish history is deleted. "The inevitable result," declared B'nai B'rith, "is that the students are denied a positive image of the Jew."

The Soviet Union has, however, done far more than refrain from giving a positive image. It has clearly presented a negative and hostile image. In May 1970, for example, the Soviet Ministry of Defense published a novel whose vicious anti-semitism recalls the Nazi's descriptions of Jews lying in wait to despoil Aryan girls. Two hundred thousand copies of this book, called, *Love and Hate*, were printed by the Armed Forces publishing house of the Ministry of Defense. It was sent to the library of every military unit in the Soviet Union.

Jews in the Soviet Union have become virtual captives, not able to practice their religion, and not able to emigrate. One Soviet Jew who did manage to leave, Lyuba Bershadskaya, describes the scene at her departure: "The day I left Moscow to go to Israel, two hundred people came to the airport to say 'goodbye'. They already considered me a free person. They trusted me. People kept calling out, 'Lyuba, tell Nixon, tell U Thant, tell Nixon!'"

In recent days, the Soviet government has allowed a slight increase in the number of Jews permitted to emigrate to Israel. It was reported this week that the Soviet government has made a landmark decision to allow an estimated 300,000 Jews leave for Israel

within the next few years. Over five hundred Jews have already left this year. Even this token gesture of freedom is astounding, considering the rigid, hostile nature of communism. And, it has been brought about solely by the courage of Russian Jews who have demanded their freedom. The dam of Communist repression has been cracked, and the thin trickle has turned to a steady stream. If the pressure from within continues, the crack will widen and the stream will increase. We all pray for the time when the dam will crumble entirely.

It is our responsibility to make the true facts about life under communism known to the world. Religion, we must remember, has been the traditional enemy of all modern tyrannies. Mussolini stated, "Religion is a species of mental disease." Karl Marx called it the "opium of the people" and Hitler denounced Christianity not only because Jesus was a Jew, but because it was "cowardly to speak of giving love for hate."

We must not forget that tyranny is also the enemy of all religion, and of freedom as well. The Soviet Union, in its more than fifty years of communist rule, has wasted no effort in teaching us this lesson. We must not break faith with those brave people still striving for their freedom within the Soviet Union, for, in the long run, their fight is our fight and the fight of all free men, everywhere. Thank you.

PRO DEO ET PATRIA

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert the full schedule of the "Pro Deo et Patria"—For God and Country—service, held recently in the Pleasant View Lutheran Church, Indianapolis, Ind.:

"PRO DEO ET PATRIA"—FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

(A patriotic service in honor of the birthdays of two great Americans, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln)

PLEASANT VIEW LUTHERAN CHURCH

Prelude: "Finlandia" Sibellius.

Processional hymn: "God the Omnipotent" (sung by all):

"God the Omnipotent! King, who ordainest
Great winds thy clarions, lightnings thy
sword;
Show forth thy pity on high where thou
reignest:
Give to us peace in our time, O Lord.

"God the All-merciful! earth hath forsaken
Meekness and mercy, and slighted thy
word;

Bid not thy wrath in its terrors awaken:
Give to us peace in our time, O Lord.

"God the All-righteous One! man hath defied
thee,
Yet to eternity standeth thy word;
Falsehood and wrong shall not tarry beside
thee:
Give to us peace in our time, O Lord.

"God the All-wise! by the fire of thy chastening
Earth shall to freedom and truth be restored;
Through the thick darkness thy kingdom is
hastening:
Thou wilt give peace in thy time, O Lord.

"So shall thy children with thankful devotion

Praise him who saved them from peril and sword,

Singing in chorus from ocean to ocean:

'Peace to the nations, and praise to the Lord.' Amen."

The Invocation (by the Pastor).

The pledge of allegiance to our Creator.

1. The Apostles' Creed (said in unison):

"I believe in God, the Father almighty, creator of heaven and earth. I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord. He was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary. He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. He descended to the dead. On the third day he rose again. He ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again to judge the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting." (International Consultation on English Texts)

2. The Pledge to the Christian Flag (said in unison, right hand over heart):

"I pledge allegiance to the Christian Flag, and to the Saviour for whose Kingdom it stands; one brotherhood, uniting all mankind in service and love."

The pledge of allegiance to our country.

1. The American's creed (said in unison):

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states, a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of Freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty by my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies." (William T. Page, clerk, U.S. House of Representatives in 1917)

2. The pledge to the American flag (said in unison, right hand over heart):

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

3. The National Anthem (sung by all):

"Oh, say can you see by the dawn's early light?

What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming?

Whose broad stripes and bright stars, thru the perilous fight,

O'er the ramparts we watched were so gallantly streaming?

And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air,

Gave proof through the night that our flag was still there.

Oh, say does that star-spangled banner yet wave

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

The prayer for Our Country (prayed in unison):

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer

That Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection;

That Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government

And entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another

And for their fellow citizens of the United States at large.

And finally, that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased and dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion;

And without a humble imitation of Whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation.

Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

(Prayed by George Washington at the conclusion of his Inaugural Address as the 1st President of the United States).

(The Congregation is seated; Late Comers may be seated by the Ushers).

The first Scripture lesson: Psalm 33: 1-12.
Hymn: "O Beautiful for Spacious Skies" (sung by all):

"O beautiful for spacious skies,
For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain!
America! America!
God shed his grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea.

"O beautiful for pilgrim feet,
Whose stern, impassioned stress
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
Across the wilderness!
America! America!
God mend thine every flaw,
Confirm thy soul in self-control,
Thy liberty in law.

"O beautiful for heroes proved
In liberating strife,
Who more than self their country loved,
And mercy more than life!
America! America!
May God they gold refine,
Till all success be nobleness,
And every gain divine.

"O beautiful for patriot dream
That sees, beyond the years,
Thine alabaster cities gleam,
Undimmed by human tears!
America! America!
God shed his grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea.

The second scripture lesson: Romans 13: 1-7.

The Anthem: "Let There Be Peace on Earth," Miller-Jackson. The Senior Choir.

"Let there be peace on earth
And let it begin with me;
Let there be peace on earth,
The peace that was meant to be.
With God as our Father,
Brothers all are we.
Let me walk with my brother
In perfect harmony.
Let peace begin with me,
Let this be the moment now;
With ev'ry step I take,
Let this be my vow;
To take each moment and live each moment
In peace eternally.
Let there be peace on earth,
And let it begin with me."

Hymn: "The Battle Hymn of The Republic" (sung by all):

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of his terrible swift sword:
His truth is marching on.

"Glory, glory, Hallelujah!
Glory, glory, Hallelujah!
Glory, glory, Hallelujah!

His truth is marching on.
 "He has sounded forth the trumpet that
 shall never call retreat;
 He is sifting out the hearts of men before
 his judgment seat;
 O be swift, my soul, to answer him; be jubila-
 nt, my feet!
 Our God is marching on."

(Repeat Chorus)

"In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born
 across the sea,
 With a glory in his bosom that transfigures
 you and me:
 As he died to make men holy, let us die to
 make men free,
 While God is marching on."

(Repeat Chorus)

The Sermon: "Have We Forgotten?" Pastor
 Kahlenberg.
 The Offering.

Pastor Kahlenberg.

The organ offertory: "God Bless America"
 Berlin. (1st Service only).

The Offertory Anthem: "It's a Long Road
 to Freedom" Medical Mission Sisters. The
 Junior Choir. (2nd Service only).

Refrain:

"It's a long road to freedom, a winding steep
 and high.
 But when you walk in love with the wind on
 your wing
 And cover the earth with the songs you sing,
 The miles fly by."

"I walked one morning by the sea,
 and all the waves reached out to me.
 I took their tears, then let them be."

"I walked one morning at the dawn,
 when bits of night still lingered on.
 I sought my star, but it was gone."

"I walked one morning with a friend,
 and prayed the day would never end.
 The years have flown—so why pretend."

"I walked one morning with my King,
 and all my winters turned to spring.
 Yet ev'ry moment held its sting."

The presentation of the offering and the
 doxology (sung by all):

"Praise God, from whom all blessings flow;
 Praise him, all creatures here below;
 Praise him above, ye heavenly hosts;
 Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen."

The preparation for prayer (to be read by
 the Pastor):

"We have been recipients of the choicest
 bounties of heaven. . . . We have grown in
 numbers, wealth and power as no other na-
 tion has ever grown; but we have forgotten
 God. We have forgotten the gracious hand
 that preserved us in peace, and multiplied
 and enriched and strengthened us; and we
 have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of
 our hearts, that all these blessings were pro-
 duced by some superior virtue and wisdom of
 our own."

"Intoxicated with unbroken success, we
 have become too self-sufficient to feel the
 necessity of redeeming and preserving grace,
 too proud to pray to the God that made
 us. . . ."

"It behooves us then, to humble ourselves
 before the offended Power, to confess our na-
 tional sins, and to pray for clemency and
 forgiveness." (Spoken by Abraham Lincoln
 in 1861.)

THE LITANY OF ALLEGIANCE AND DEDICATION

Pastor: Believing that God is "The King
 of Creation and the Lord of the Nations"
 without Whom the very blessings of "life,
 liberty and the pursuit of happiness" would
 not be possible.

People: I will confess my ingratitude and

disregard, my neglect and negligence when
 it comes to God and living as a citizen in
 this wondrous world which is really His.

Pastor: Realizing that no nation on earth
 can long endure without a deep and abiding
 Faith in God,

People: I will let others know that I believe
 in God and I will endeavor to make His
 presence felt, His power known and His pur-
 poses of justice, goodness and kindness alive
 and active wherever I walk.

Pastor: Being mindful of the religious
 heritage of my forefathers who founded
 America with God and divine principles up-
 permost in their minds,

People: I will not only cherish their rever-
 ent reliance upon God, but I will endeavor
 to build upon their beliefs for this and future
 generations.

Pastor: Understanding that liberty is not
 something easily won or easily kept,

People: I will endeavor to support,
 strengthen, and sustain the freedoms for
 which many have paid the supreme sacrifice.

Pastor: Knowing that the leaders of our
 nation today face great priorities and grave
 problems as they seek to preserve peace in
 our times both at home and abroad,

People: I will pray for them, that they
 may always seek divine help and guidance,
 especially in times of decision.

Pastor: Finally, realizing that the princi-
 ples of Christian morality are necessary to
 undergird our society,

People: I will endeavor to follow the teach-
 ings of Jesus Christ in thought, word and
 deed every day. Amen.

The Lord's Prayer (prayed by all):

"Our Father in heaven, holy be your Name,
 your kingdom come, your will be done,
 on earth as in heaven Give us today our daily
 bread. Forgive us our sins as we forgive those
 who sin against us. Do not bring us to the
 test but deliver us from evil. For the king-
 dom, the power, and the glory are yours now
 and for ever." Amen. (International Consul-
 tation on English Texts.)

The benediction (by the Pastor).

The recessional hymn: "My Country, 'tis
 of Thee" (sung by all):

"My country 'tis of thee,
 Sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing:
 Land where my fathers died,
 Land of the pilgrims' pride,
 From every mountain side
 Let Freedom ring."

"My native country, thee,
 Land of the noble free,
 Thy name I love;
 I love thy rocks and rills,
 Thy woods and templed hills;
 My heart with rapture thrills
 Like that above."

"Let music swell the breeze,
 And ring from all the trees
 Sweet freedom's song;
 Let mortal tongues awake;
 Let all that breathe partake;
 Let rocks their silence break,
 The sound prolong."

"Our fathers' God, to thee,
 Author of liberty,
 To thee we sing;
 Long may our land be bright
 With freedom's holy light;
 Protect us by thy might,
 Great God, our King." Amen.

Silent prayer.

Postlude: "This Is My Country." Raye-
 Jacobs.

HAVE WE FORGOTTEN?
 (Deuteronomy 6: 12)

(Sermon delivered by the Reverend David P.
 Kahlenberg, pastor, Pleasant View Luther-

an Church of Indianapolis, Ind., on Pa-
 triots' Sunday, February 14, 1971)

How many times have you said these two
 words, and how many times have they been
 said to you: "Don't forget!" And yet, we do.
 It's easy to forget. It's hard to remember.
 That's why such things as birthdays and
 anniversaries and other observances like them
 are so essential. That's why every February,
 we fondly and affectionately stand at atten-
 tion long enough to salute two of the most
 illustrious leaders of American history, the
 1st and the 16th Presidents of the United
 States.

Both were giants in every sense of the
 word, physically, intellectually, creatively,
 productively, and morally. Both had the tre-
 mendous task of welding and rewelding a
 nation almost torn apart by war. Both were
 held in such high regard that millions came
 to call them each in his own right and each
 in his own time, "Father." The 1st President
 was and is known as the "Father of our
 Country," and the 16th President was and is
 known simply as "Father Abraham."

On this date that comes almost equidistant
 between the national holidays that celebrate
 their births, it is appropriate that we should
 remember George Washington and Abraham
 Lincoln, what they did, what they said, what
 they stood for, and what they mean to Amer-
 ica, as Rudyard Kipling reminds us, "Lest
 we forget! Lest we forget!"

Because, you see, I'm not sure we have
 remembered very well, or well enough at
 least, the lessons those great Americans tried
 to teach us. That's why today I want us to
 honestly ask ourselves this crucial question:
 Have we forgotten?

As usual, I have 3 words to assist you in
 pinpointing that inquiry. And the first word
 is "origins." Have we forgotten our origins?
 Way back in the 5th book of the Bible, in
 the book of Deuteronomy, this same possi-
 bility was posed. The children of Israel had
 endured the agony of enslavement in Egypt
 and the awful years of living as wandering
 nomads in the desert wilderness.

All of that was now behind them, & what
 lay ahead was the Promised Land, flowing
 with milk & honey instead of scraps of sap
 for food, with houses instead of tents for
 homes, with all kinds of comforts instead of
 all kinds of inconveniences. But before they
 plunge headlong into Paradise, their leader,
 Moses, like all good preachers, makes a
 speech. And in it, he echoes & re-echoes a
 warning. "Beware," he says. "Take heed, lest
 when your cities are built, your houses are
 beautiful & your stomachs are bulging that
 you forget the Lord your God who brought
 you out of the land of Egypt, out of the
 house of bondage. Remember God! Remem-
 ber His goodness. Remember where you came
 from. Never forget your origins."

Moses repeats warnings like that no less
 than 4 times in 3 chapters, in the 4th
 through the 6th chapters of the book of
 Deuteronomy. And if you want to know what
 happened to "The Chosen Race" in the Prom-
 ised Land, I will give you some homework.
 It's all there in the book of Deuteronomy &
 in the few books that follow it, & quite a
 story it is!

Well, have we forgotten? Have we forgotten
 our origins? Have we forgotten that America
 was founded on faith in God? Had you re-
 membered that it was? It's written right into
 our basic American documents like the Con-
 stitution & the Bill of Rights themselves.
 When the Pilgrims left Plymouth, John
 Robinson led the procession from the church
 to the waiting ship, reading aloud God's call
 to Abraham from an open Bible: "Get thee
 out from thy country, & from thy kindred, . . .
 unto a land that I will show thee: & I will
 make of thee a great nation . . . & in thee
 shall all families of the earth be blessed."

The Mayflower Compact, the very first document of democracy in America, which was written, read, signed & sealed on board the ship itself, starts with these words: "In the Name of God, Amen." It goes on to state that the entire adventure to the New World was undertaken for the glory of God & the advancement of the Christian Faith.

John Adams was right when he said that "no country was ever founded on deeper religious foundations." Calvin Coolidge came close to it too when once he remarked that America was born out of a religious revival.

And it was George Washington himself, who as he took the oath of office as this country's 1st President, his hand resting on the Holy Bible, added these words at the end of the oath on his own: "So help me God." It is obvious, is it not, that God & religion & worship all must have meant much to Washington to have him pray a prayer at the close of his Inaugural Address like the one we prayed a few minutes ago.

Abraham Lincoln's faith & religious fervor was just as strong.

Standing on the platform of the observation car in Springfield, Illinois, & speaking to his friends & neighbors for the last time before leaving for Washington, D.C., President-Elect Lincoln made one request: "that you pray for me."

Once when Abraham Lincoln met with the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction, Newton Bateman, the Great Emancipator started telling him how disturbed & distressed he was about slavery. Taking a New Testament out of his pocket, Lincoln started chiding those who knew what the Good Book had to say about human bondage, but who were opposed to him. Suddenly, Lincoln paused for a long time his frame & features charged with intense emotion. Slowly, he got up out of his chair & started pacing up & down the room. Then tears welled up in his eyes, & with a trembling voice, this is what Abraham Lincoln said: "I know there is a God & that He hates injustice & slavery. I see the storm coming & I know His hand is in it. If He has a place for me, I believe I am ready . . . I know I am right because I know liberty is right, for Christ teaches it, & Christ is God . . ."

And in a few minutes, in Preparation for Prayer, his words will ring in our ears once more, words which he spoke at the outset of the Civil War: ". . . we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand that preserved us . . ."

I wonder if we have. I think both Washington and Lincoln would agree that our nation will endure if it has enough consecrated Christians in it—enough people who believe in God greatly, love God dearly, pray to God daily, worship God regularly, serve God sincerely and who live in His presence persistently.

Have we forgotten that our origins as a people go back to the Almighty? We'd better hope and pray we haven't, and we'd better do something about not letting it happen either.

The second word is IDEALS. Have we forgotten the ideals men like Washington and Lincoln embraced and espoused, ideals like equality, honesty and integrity, brotherhood, justice and compassion? Or have our visions faded and have we compromised our ideals, thus forgetting them?

Somewhere I recently read that the old American ideal used to be morality. Now it is money. Love isn't what makes the world go round anymore. It's cold, hard cash! Money talks. Money gets things done. Walter Lippman once warned that money is rapidly becoming the only important thing. "Get money," he said, "and anything goes, provided you don't get caught." Maybe money

has become our master. So have such things as goods and gadgets, lust and luxury, pleasure and property.

Do you remember what George Washington said in his Farewell Address? "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." And where did perhaps the poorest, most poverty-stricken person ever to enter the White House get ideals like these: "all men are created equal . . ." "with malice toward none; with charity for all . . ."

"Gold is good in its place, but living, brave, patriotic men are better than gold." Where did Lincoln get those ideals? Why he came by them from the Bible and through the Christian faith. And if our nation is going to continue to be strong, and sturdy, and stable, we'd better get back to the ideals of the men we honor here today, ideals we may well have forgotten.

The third word is aspirations. Have we also forgotten our aspirations as a people and as persons? Have we forgotten our forefathers' goals, their hopes and dreams that America could be the land of the free and the home of the brave? The two men we remember here today, you know, gave their lives for the noble causes of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Lincoln's one great ambition in life was not to become popular or powerful or important. Do you know what it was that he wanted more than anything else? To be esteemed, he said, "of my fellowmen, by rendering myself worthy of their esteem."

George Washington's life was given "Pro Deo Et Patria," For God and Country. He could have settled back and enjoyed a life of luxury and leisure, but that wasn't what life was all about according to George Washington. Life's aspirations for him included giving, serving, helping, and doing for people and for a republic that was formed and fashioned by the great Provider.

Well, what do you think? Have we forgotten? Have we forgotten our origins, our ideals and our aspirations? If we have, what do you suppose it will take, what in God's name will have to happen before we wake up, before we remember? Maybe we'd better get busy before we have to find out.

ROUTZAHN'S NAMED RETAILER OF THE YEAR

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Routzahn's department store in Frederick, Md., represented by Mr. Allen R. Routzahn, will be presented the Retailer of the Year Award by the Brand Names Foundation of New York at the annual banquet to be held in New York City on April 8.

The decision on the award was based on effectiveness shown by Routzahn's in its use of all available advertising and sales promotion tools, sales training methods, and effective promotion. One of the prime considerations was the personal and corporate activities of the store in the promoting the welfare of the local community.

I congratulate Routzahn's and its staff and employees for receiving this important award.

CRITIQUE OF THE "SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my friend and constituent, Mr. Benjamin Ginzburg, executive secretary of Accuracy in Media—AIM—a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization to promote accuracy in news reporting, has just completed a critique of the CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon," which I believe all who read this RECORD should see. Normally AIM awaits response to their questions by the network, but in this instance CBS had announced its intention of rebroadcasting the program after having been made aware of its inaccuracies, so the critique, without response, was released.

AIM also recently addressed a letter to the Washington Post which has not, and probably will not, be printed, defending Vice President Agnew's recent charges that CBS was guilty of inaccurate and slanted reporting in its 1968 documentary, "Hunger in America." As I believe this, too, would be of interest to those concerned about accurate reporting of the news, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

ACCURACY IN MEDIA (AIM),
Arlington, Va., March 20, 1971.

Mr. RICHARD S. SALANT,
President, CBS News,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. SALANT: Our own analysis and the analysis of others of the CBS documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon," broadcast February 23, 1971 indicates that there were a number of specific factual inaccuracies in the documentary. We would appreciate having your comments on the following points.

1. CBS stated: "The Pentagon . . . will still spend \$30 million this year on public affairs—an amount more than 10 times greater than what it spent to tell people about itself just 12 years ago."

Query: The Department of Defense informs us that the \$30 million figure for the current fiscal year includes substantial expenditures of a type that were specifically excluded from the \$2.8 million budget of FY 1959. The Department states that for this reason it is misleading to compare the two budget figures in the way CBS did. Does CBS agree that the two figures are not strictly comparable for the reasons given by the Department of Defense?

2. CBS stated: "A special, still unpublished report for the prestigious 20th Century Fund estimates the real total at \$190 million." CBS then showed a graph comparing this figure of \$190 million with the news budgets of the three commercial television networks, noting that combined these total \$146 million.

Query: Has the unpublished report of the 20th Century Fund been reviewed by competent independent analysts familiar with the Defense Department budget? Has the Defense Department had an opportunity to comment on this report and the way in which the \$190 million figure was calculated? Does this figure include expenditures on such things as training films, as suggested in your letter to me, dated March 10, 1971? If so, is

it legitimate to count the cost of training films for the military forces as an expenditure of the Defense Department "to tell people about itself?" If the report has not been subjected to critical review by competent independent experts, does CBS consider it to be legitimate to use this figure, even with qualifications, as an indicator of Departmental expenditures on public information?

3. CBS stated: "The Pentagon has a team of colonels touring the country to lecture on foreign policy."

Query: Is this an appropriate description of the group from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in light of the following facts: (a) in addition to four colonels and a Navy captain, the team includes a State Department foreign service officer; (b) the briefings this group gives cover 33 topics, including foreign policy; (c) the briefings are designed primarily to educate Reserve officers, not the general public; and (d) the briefings are given at seven different locations throughout the country to make it possible for Reserve officers in various parts of the country to participate with a minimum of travel expense?

4. CBS stated, with reference to the ICAF briefing in Peoria, Ill.: "The invitation was arranged by Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Co., which did \$39 million of business last year with the Defense Department."

Query: We are informed that the seminar in Peoria was not arranged by the Caterpillar Tractor Co., but by the Association of Commerce, which provided the auditorium and other facilities. The meeting was co-chaired by an officer of the Caterpillar Tractor Co. and by the owner of the Ace Hardware Store of Peoria. Does CBS dispute this and hold to its contention that the meeting was arranged by Caterpillar Tractor Co.? If so, what is its evidence?

5. Following a statement by Roger Mudd of CBS that the Army has a regulation barring personnel from speaking on foreign policy implications of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, CBS showed a Marine colonel giving a six-sentence statement with the implication that this was contrary to regulations.

Query: Our information is that the statement the colonel was shown as giving is actually a synthetic production of CBS, created by taking sentences from widely separated places in the colonel's speech and joining them together to make what appeared to the viewer to be six consecutive sentences. We are informed that the sentences used by CBS came from the following pages of the briefing text:

Sentence 1, page 55; sentence 2, page 36; sentence 3, page 48; sentence 4, page 48; sentence 5, page 73; sentence 6, not indicated.

We are further informed that sentences three and four were quotations from Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma of Laos and that this was so indicated by the speaker but omitted by CBS to make it appear that these were the speaker's own words. We are informed that the scripts from which the colonel and others were speaking were all cleared in advance by the Defense Department and other appropriate government agencies including the Department of State. Would you not agree that it is totally improper to synthesize statements as was done in this case? Could this not be considered a violation of Article IV (23) of the NAB Television Code, which states: "No program shall be presented in a manner which through artifice or simulation would mislead the audience as to any material fact?" Was it the intention of Roger Mudd's introductory comment to imply that what followed was in violation of army regulations? If so, would it not have been appropriate to describe the clearance process for these scripts in order to avoid any reflection on the individual officers?

6. CBS stated that military speakers "tra-

verse the country shaping the views of their audiences."

Query: Does CBS have specific information about the success military speakers have in "shaping" the views of those to whom they speak? How does this compare with the "shaping" done by other speakers, including such campus favorites as Tom Hayden and Bernadette Devlin?

7. CBS devoted a substantial part of the program to the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference, describing the visit of 64 prominent civilians to key military installations, including a visit to North Carolina where a weekend war game was staged. CBS showed part of the war games, but at no point in the broadcast did it indicate that this was not being put on solely for the benefit of the 64 prominent civilians. The impression was given that these individuals should properly have been billed for the cost of the war game. CBS stated: (The cost of the tour) "does not include the amount spent on elaborate briefings, the war game itself, nor the expenses of several thousand servicemen who performed for the civilians along the way."

Query: Is this not misleading since the Defense Department states that the war game was planned and executed for military training and study purposes and that it lasted three days? The Joint Civilian Orientation Conference tour is said to have observed it for only one of the three days and that others who observed it, none of whom were mentioned by CBS, were 450 military personnel from the Strike Command operational and training bases, 200 members of ROTC units and about 165 local civilians. Would not the viewers have obtained a more accurate understanding of this operation and its purpose if these facts had been mentioned?

8. CBS devoted nearly one-fourth of "The Selling of the Pentagon," as measured by the printed transcript, to films made by the military. It stated that over 300 films a year are made by the Pentagon and that the annual cost of making these movies is over \$12 million. It said that most of the films were "made originally for troop information, but a large number is later released for public showing."

Query: According to the Defense Department, in FY 1970 the amount spent on films made specifically for public information purposes was only \$30,000. Why was this fact not stated by CBS, rather than the \$12 million figure which includes films made for troop information, research and development, recruiting and medical and religious use? Do you not agree that the use of the \$12 million figure gives a possible false impression about the amount spent on public information films, especially in a medium like TV, where the viewer cannot backtrack and reflect on all the qualifying remarks? The Defense Department states that only a very small percentage of all the films included in the \$12 million figure are cleared for public release. If this is true, is not this figure irrelevant to the subject of the documentary in question? The Defense Department points out that six of the seven films discussed by CBS were made solely to fill troop information requirements. Would not it have given a more accurate picture to the viewers if you had mentioned this fact?

9. In introducing a Defense Department film on Vietnam, CBS stated: "The Pentagon helped John Wayne make 'The Green Berets.' John Wayne helped the Pentagon make this film in Vietnam."

Query: Was it the intention of this comment to suggest that John Wayne's willingness to narrate the film in question was a quid pro quo for Defense Department assistance in filming "The Green Berets?" This is the inference many would draw from the statement. The Department of Defense informs us that the two films are entirely unrelated, and that Mr. Wayne's participation in "A Nation Builds Under Fire" was a last

minute substitution that resulted when another actor became ill and was unable to narrate the film as planned. The Department states that the application from Mr. Wayne for assistance with "The Green Berets" was treated no differently than other requests of this type and that Wayne Productions reimbursed the Department for the expenses incurred.

Does CBS have any valid reason to support the implication that there was a tie-in between Defense Department assistance with "The Green Berets" and Wayne's assistance with "A Nation Builds Under Fire?" If not, would you not agree that the implication is unfair?

10. After showing John Wayne summing up the record of communist murder, assassination and terror in Vietnam, CBS stated: "Not only movie stars have aided Pentagon propaganda."

Query: Was it the intention of CBS to imply that the statement that John Wayne was shown as making about communism was "Pentagon propaganda?" What is the definition of propaganda that the authors of this statement had in mind? Would any factual description of the record of communist oppression be labeled "propaganda" under this definition? Was there any intention to convey the impression that the statement was not factually accurate, and if so, in what respects does CBS believe it to be inaccurate?

11. After showing Walter Cronkite making a statement in a Defense Department film in which he describes the spread of aggressive communism in Europe, Asia and Cuba, CBS states: "On a policy level, the Pentagon says it has discarded the rhetoric of confrontation. But city by city, public showing by public showing, the language and symbols of the early 60's are still being widely distributed in the 70's." It goes on to say that films narrated by Walter Cronkite and Chet Huntley are still being shown "even though Walter Cronkite and Chet Huntley may now disagree with the intent of the films they narrated."

Query: Has CBS ascertained that its employee, Walter Cronkite, now disagrees with the statement he made in the film shown about the record of communist aggression over the past thirty years? If so, why did you say that Mr. Cronkite "may now disagree" rather than that he does now disagree. If Mr. Cronkite is still of the opinion that communism has shown aggressive tendencies and that defense against it is necessary, why did you imply that "his may no longer be his view?"

What is the meaning of "the rhetoric of confrontation?" Does this mean that the Defense Department has agreed that it will no longer discuss the history of the past thirty years insofar as this might imply that the communists have shown aggressive tendencies? Does this include refraining from criticism of such post-1962 events as the invasion of Czechoslovakia? What is the official statement that announced the abandonment of "the rhetoric of confrontation?"

12. CBS stated: "In an excerpt from a film called 'Road to the Wall,' the Pentagon has James Cagney tell of a Communist plan that encompasses even more than the world."

Query: Is it true that "Road to the Wall" was produced by CBS and was described in a CBS press release as "an historical treatment of the Communist Party in operation throughout the world...?" In view of this is it not inaccurate to say that the Pentagon had Mr. Cagney make the statement quoted? Would it not be more accurate to say that CBS had Mr. Cagney make the statement?

13. After showing part of a film called "Red Nightmare," CBS stated: "Although the Pentagon labels them informational, these films contain a high proportion of propaganda, as well as an obsession with monolithic communism. Tax money financed all of them..."

Query: Again, what is the definition of propaganda that is being applied in this documentary? Do the excerpts from the films shown contain evidence of propaganda by this definition, whatever it may be? Since the films selected by CBS were selected from among the several hundred films made by the Defense Department each year precisely because they are films that deal with communism, what is the significance of the statement that these carefully selected films shown on the broadcast "contain . . . an obsession with monolithic communism?" Did CBS think that films dealing with communism ought to discuss subjects other than communism? Or is the implied criticism related to the adjective "monolithic?" Does CBS believe that the crushing of freedom in Czechoslovakia in 1968 in the era of "polycentric communism" was essentially different from the crushing of freedom in Hungary in 1956 in the era of "monolithic communism" and that this should be reflected in Departmental films on communism?

14. CBS states: "It has been more than a decade since the national policy of peaceful coexistence replaced the harsher rhetoric of early cold war years."

Query: From what year and with what policy statement does CBS date the beginning of "the national policy of peaceful coexistence?" Since it is stated that this happened sometime before early 1961, it must have antedated the Bay of Pigs invasion, the Cuban missile crisis, the erection of the Berlin Wall, the passage of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, the crushing of the Czech liberation movement and the confrontation by proxy in the Middle East. Could it possibly be that in speaking of the adoption of "the national policy of peaceful coexistence" more than a decade ago, CBS was referring to the announcement of this policy by N. S. Khrushchev on November 6, 1957? Does CBS agree that this is a term used by the communists with a very special meaning in an effort to reconcile current policies with Lenin's well known statements that war between the two systems was unavoidable?

15. After the sentence quoted in No. 14 above, CBS stated: "But to the filmmakers at the Pentagon, with at least 12 million dollars a year to spend, 1946 seems to have lasted a whole generation."

Query: Is there not an implication in this sentence that the bulk of the \$12 million spent by the Defense Department on films each year is devoted to the type of films that CBS concentrated on? If not, why was the \$12 million figure introduced into the script in this context? What is the significance of the year 1946? Is the implication of this that serious problems with the communist countries terminated in that year and that the Pentagon has failed to recognize the change for the last 25 years? Would it not be proper to remind your viewers that the film CBS made for the Defense Department in 1962, "The Road to the Wall" was made in the year after the construction of the wall began? Is it the implication of the CBS statement quoted above that this event and its significance should have been ignored by the Defense Department because the Cold War ended 15 years earlier?

16. CBS showed Assistant Secretary of Defense Jerry Friedheim conducting a daily morning press briefing. It begins by saying that Mr. Friedheim does not tell all that he knows and would not have his job long if he did. It then shows Mr. Friedheim being unresponsive to three successive questions and responding with only one or two words to two other questions.

Query: Since the Defense Department states that Mr. Friedheim made nine announcements and responded to approximately 34 questions at the briefing filmed by CBS, would you say that the excerpts from his briefing that CBS broadcast were repre-

sentative of Mr. Friedheim's total performance of that briefing? Was it just by chance that CBS chose to show Mr. Friedheim dealing with three questions that concerned security matters that he was not at liberty to discuss? Is it true, as the Pentagon states, that these three questions were the only ones out of the 34 asked that Mr. Friedheim declined to answer? Were these questions in fact asked consecutively, or were they selected and rearranged by CBS to convey the impression that non-responsiveness was characteristic of Mr. Friedheim's press briefings, as the introductory remark by Roger Mudd might have led one to believe? Would it not have given the viewer a better understanding of the responses if it had been explained that the negative responses were required because the data requested was classified?

17. CBS aired a small portion of an interview with Daniel Z. Henkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. By rearranging Mr. Henkin's words, CBS had Mr. Henkin respond to a question about the purpose served by displays of military equipment at state fairs and shopping centers in these words: "Well I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their Armed Forces. I believe that the American public has a right to request information about the Armed Forces, to have speakers come before them, to have questions, and to understand the need for our Armed Forces, why we ask for the funds that we do ask for, how we spend these funds, what we are doing about such problems as drugs—and we do have a drug problem in Armed Forces. What we are doing about the racial problem in the Armed Forces, and we do have a racial problem. I think the public has a valid right to ask these questions."

Query: Is this not a synthetic answer to the question? Is it not true that all but the first sentence of the answer as shown by CBS was actually part of a much longer response to this question by Mr. Mudd: "Do you regard the display of military equipment in the country and the instant availability of military speakers at Kiwanis and Rotary and so forth as excessively militaristic?" Would you not agree that understanding of Mr. Henkin's explanation of the purpose served by military exhibits was not improved by omitting an important part of his reply and substituting his reply to an entirely different question? Could this not be considered a violation of Article IV (23) of the NAB Television Code?

18. After having created a synthetic and seemingly inept answer to Mr. Mudd's first question, CBS then followed with a question which appeared to be a follow up to the first question, but which actually was asked after four other questions had been asked. Mr. Mudd said: "Well is that sort of information about the drug problem you have and the racial problem you have and the budget problems you have, is that the sort of information that gets passed out at state fairs, by sergeants who are standing next to rockets?" Mr. Henkin replied: "No, I wouldn't limit that to sergeants standing next to any kind of exhibits. I thought we were discussing speeches and all." In the broadcast, CBS deleted the second sentence of Mr. Henkin's reply and substituted one sentence extracted from his reply to an earlier question. The substitute sentence was this: "Now there are those who contend that this is propaganda. I don't—do not agree with this." This statement had been made in reference to Mr. Henkin's statement, not used by CBS, that the Defense Department has an obligation to discuss with the American public the problems that we confront, problems such as the increasing Soviet threat.

Query: Could this rearrangement of Mr. Henkin's words, without informing the viewers, be considered a violation of Article IV (23) of the Television Code? Was not the

purpose in dropping the second sentence of Mr. Henkin's actual reply to cover up the fact that the intervening discussion had been dealing with military speakers, not exhibits of military hardware?

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

Query: What evidence does CBS have that the Pentagon arranged for Major Rowe to be interviewed by Congressman Hebert? Congressman Hebert has asserted that the program was entirely his own idea, and that he interviewed Major Rowe in order to give his constituents in Louisiana an opportunity to see Major Rowe, who had been imprisoned by the Viet Cong for five years and had made a sensational escape, facts which CBS did not mention in describing Major Rowe to its viewers. Congressman Hebert states that as far as he knows, no one in the Pentagon hierarchy even knew in advance of the plans to have Major Rowe on his program. He is on record as deeply resenting the suggestion that he was "used" by the Pentagon. Does CBS have any evidence that would substantiate its charges in any way? Does it have information that would suggest that war heroes such as Major Rowe would not be available to appear on programs with Congressmen who are hostile to the military, such as Senator Fulbright?

21. CBS shows a brief scene from a military briefing in Saigon in which the military briefing officer declines to answer a question. CBS introduces this with this comment: "The most popular phrase at these sessions, however, needs no explanation."

Query: Did CBS film the entire briefing from which this excerpt was taken? How many questions were asked at the briefing and how many were answered with "no comment?" Were any announcements made at the briefing? Did the questions which the briefer refused to answer deal with classified military information?

22. CBS summed up with this peroration by Roger Mudd: "On this broadcast we have seen violence made glamorous, expensive weapons advertised as if they were automobiles, biased opinions presented as straight facts. Defending the country not just with arms but also with ideology. Pentagon propaganda insists on America's role as the cop on every beat in the world."

Query: Was the violence made as glamorous as that children are exposed to daily on CBS television programs? Would not the question of whether a statement was a "fact" or a "biased opinion" depend on the bias of the person making the judgment? Would not some say that the "biased opinions" heard on the programs were those of the CBS commentator? Did CBS intend to deprecate the use of ideology in the defense of the country? Would you disagree with Garfield's statement: "Ideas are the great warriors of the world, and a war that has no idea behind it is simply a brutality?" Can you cite any evidence to back up the statement that Pentagon propaganda insists on America's role as the cop on every beat in the world? Is the Pentagon insisting that the U.S. play a military role in the Middle East? In Africa? In Eastern Europe?

23. CBS stated: "This propaganda barrage is the creation of a runaway bureaucracy that frustrates attempts to control it."

Query: In making this statement was CBS aware of the fact that cuts in Defense Department budget requests for the current fiscal year were made both by the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress? The cuts for public information activities are said by the Department of Defense to

total \$12 million. This does not suggest that the bureaucracy is beyond control.

I regret having to trouble you with so many questions, but I think you will agree that it is important that these questions be cleared up. As Roger Mudd said early in "The Selling of the Pentagon," "Nothing is more essential to a democracy than the free flow of information. Misinformation, distortion, propaganda all interrupt that flow." Accuracy in Media believes that "The Selling of the Pentagon," upon careful analysis contains a great deal of misinformation and distortion that interrupts the free flow of information. Your detailed comments are earnestly requested.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN GINZBURG,
Executive Secretary, Accuracy in Media.

ACCURACY IN MEDIA—AIM,
Arlington, Va., March 20, 1971.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In a speech on March 18, Vice President Agnew charged that CBS had been guilty of inaccurate and slanted reporting in its 1968 documentary, "Hunger in America." Dr. Frank Stanton, President of CBS, responded that the FCC had cleared CBS of any wrongdoing in the production of that documentary.

The FCC issued a "memorandum opinion" on "Hunger in America" in response to several complaints it had received about the broadcast. One of the complaints was from Congressman Henry Gonzalez of Texas, who provided the FCC with the transcript of the hearings concerning this program that had been carried out by a subcommittee on the House of Representatives.

The FCC found that on October 26, 1967, a CBS camera crew filmed an incident that occurred in the premature nursery of the Robert Green Hospital in San Antonio, Texas. A premature baby, Claude Wayne Wright, Jr., who weighed only 2 lbs. 12 ounces at birth, stopped breathing. The resident physician, Dr. Luis Montemayer, was summoned, and he resuscitated the infant. A CBS cameraman filmed the entire incident. The FCC ascertained that the child died three days later of meningitis and peritonitis due to prematurity. It found that there was no evidence that either the mother or father was suffering from malnutrition.

CBS showed the film that it had taken of this child on October 26 in its documentary, "Hunger in America." It stated: "This baby is dying of starvation. He was an American. Now he is dead."

The FCC established that prior to broadcasting this film, CBS made no effort to establish the identity of the infant or its parents. The hospital personnel stated that CBS had not been told that the cause of death in this case had anything to do with malnutrition. The doctor filmed by CBS resuscitating the baby said: "they (CBS) said the baby died from hunger, but he did not. He died from complications because of prematurity." The prematurity was found to have resulted from an accidental fall.

It was clear, therefore, from the FCC findings that what CBS said of the baby shown in "Hunger in America" was false. The film did not show the baby dying, and the death of the baby three days after the film was made had nothing to do with malnutrition.

The questions this raises are these: Was this a deliberate falsification on the part of CBS? Was the falsification the result of carelessness on the part of CBS rather than any intent to deceive? Did CBS make all reasonable efforts to ascertain the correct facts and was it given false information about the incident by persons it had reason to believe were reliable sources of information?

If the answer to the third question had

been found by the FCC to be affirmative, the answers to the first two questions would be negative. It would then be possible to say that the FCC had absolved CBS of any wrongdoing in this matter. The fact is that the FCC did not find the answer to the third question to be affirmative. It found that CBS had not identified the infant, had not checked the hospital records to ascertain the cause of death, had not talked to the attending physician and had not interviewed the parents. The CBS producer of "Hunger in America" claimed that he recalled being told by a Mrs. Vera Burke, who was in charge of social services at the hospital, that the infant in question had died as a result of maternal malnutrition on October 27, 1967. Mrs. Burke had denied making any such statement.

The FCC commented: "Here there is a conflict with the memory of the CBS witnesses differing from the hospital personnel." The FCC decided that it would be inappropriate for it to try to tell which of the witnesses was telling the truth and which was lying. The commission said: "The 'truth' would always remain a matter open to some question . . ." The commission did not go into the question of whether or not CBS was not careless in failing to ascertain the identity of the infant and the reasons for its death from hospital records or the attending physician. Nor did the commission consider the question of the accuracy of CBS in portraying as the death of a baby an incident that occurred three days before the baby actually died. Nor did the commission take up the propriety of showing a baby that weighed less than three pounds and was two months premature without stating that the baby had been born prematurely and that this, not starvation, explained its small size.

Unfortunately, the FCC ducked the issue in the "Hunger in America" case. It stated very clearly that it would not try to judge in this or other cases whether or not broadcasters had been accurate and truthful in their reporting. It stated: "The Commission cannot appropriately enter the quagmire of investigating the credibility of the newsman and the interviewed party in such type of case." The commission stated that it would be concerned only with cases where there was evidence that bribery had been involved on the part of the newsman or where the broadcaster had directed his employees to rig the news.

Since this is the official position of the FCC, based on its consideration of "Hunger in America," it is obviously impossible for CBS to claim, as Mr. Stanton has done, that the FCC has absolved CBS of the complaints of falsifying the facts in the documentary, "Hunger in America." The plain fact is that the documentary does contain a sequence that purports to show a baby dying of starvation which the FCC says is false. There is no one outside the CBS organization who has ever said that they provided CBS with information that the baby died of starvation. By any standards of good journalistic practice, CBS was guilty of carelessness in making this statement about a child whose identity they did not know, whose parents they had never interviewed and whose medical record they had not examined. The FCC may lack the courage to make that judgment, but no respectable newsman would say that this was anything less than sloppy journalism.

If the false statements CBS made about the baby in the documentary were an honest mistake based on information which CBS found to be incorrect after more careful scrutiny, one would expect CBS to admit the error, apologize for it and correct it in the documentary.

This was not done. Even after being confronted with the results of the investigation about the infant and the causes of its death, CBS maintained that there had been no mistake on its part and that the documentary did not falsify the record with respect

to the infant shown. Mr. Benjamin, Senior Executive Producer of CBS News made this denial in a letter to Congressman Henry Gonzalez dated July 25, 1968. Mr. Benjamin told Congressman Gonzalez that the baby shown in the CBS documentary had died sometime between October 25 and October 27, not on the 29th. He said that medical personnel at the hospital had told CBS that the baby had died because of maternal malnutrition and that there were no symptoms that indicated pre-natal injury. Mr. Benjamin told Congressman Gonzalez that CBS had asked the San Antonio Express-News, which had first challenged the accuracy of the CBS account, to correct the error which reflects so adversely and erroneously on journalistic accuracy of CBS News.

In a letter to a viewer dated October 8, 1968, Mr. Richard S. Salant, President of CBS News, stated that Hunger in America was accurate in all respects. Mr. Salant said that CBS could not establish the identity of the baby in question, but that the information that it died of maternal malnutrition was based on information supplied by an entirely reliable hospital authority. He declined to disclose the identity of the source of information, saying that no responsible journalist would do this.

If the FCC contributed nothing else to this unpleasant case, it did reach a judgment, which it documented, that CBS did give the public false information about the death of the baby and its causes in "Hunger in America." In the words of Mr. Burton Benjamin, this reflects adversely on the journalistic accuracy of CBS News. What reflects even more adversely on CBS, however, is the persistent refusal to admit and correct the error. Mr. Frank Stanton, President of CBS, carried on in this tradition in his response to Vice President Agnew's March 18th criticism of the dying baby sequence in "Hunger in America." Rather than admitting the error, Mr. Stanton stated that CBS stood by "Hunger in America" and falsely asserted that the FCC had cleared CBS of any wrongdoing in this connection. He thereby conveyed the false implication that the FCC had found the CBS version of the incident to be correct.

There is good reason for a credibility gap with respect to television news reporting when the top officials of CBS try to cover up errors of this kind and do so by issuing new erroneous statements.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN GINZBURG,
Executive Secretary, Accuracy in Media.

A GOOD DAY'S WORK, YOUR
HONORS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in today's society, it seems at times that permissiveness and total disregard for what were once considered our American values have become the beacon guiding our actions. I was particularly heartened by two recent New York court decisions which helped to clarify the constitutional meaning of freedom and the responsibilities it entails. I am pleased to share with my House colleagues the following article from the New York Daily News and know that they join me in commending Justices Kupferman and Lupiano for their landmark decisions:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News]
GOOD DAY'S WORK, YOUR HONORS

The Appellate Division of the First Department (Manhattan and Bronx) did itself proud twice over, we think, on Tuesday, March 16, 1971.

In a decision written by Justice Vincent A. Lupiano, the court held that a schoolteacher may search a student, even off school premises, when the teacher suspects that a crime has been committed or is about to be.

The specific case involved a teacher—Saunders Lehrer of Roosevelt High in the Bronx—who chased a pupil down the street, caught him, and found in his pocket all equipment necessary for taking heroin.

Such a search, said the court, was not illegal within the meaning of the Constitution's Fourth Amendment, since a teacher is in much the same legal status as a parent.

This, as Bronx District Attorney Burton Roberts well says, is a landmark decision which "should now be utilized by the school system to combat crime and narcotics." We hope it will.

Tuesday's other Appellate Division ruling which we admire was written by Justice Theodore Kupferman. It held a father to be within the law in cutting off support for his 20-year-old daughter when she became a hippie, took to trifling with dope, and refused to come home from college.

A female minor has a right to live her own life, reasoned Justice Kupferman; but when she violates dad's "reasonable standards, rules and regulations" dad is no longer obligated to support her: "She cannot expect to have her cake and eat it too."

Again, loud and prolonged applause for these decisions.

GONELLA RIDES AGAIN

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us had the pleasure of working with Mr. John Gonella when he served as a congressional liaison officer with the White House during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. I was delighted to discover in reading last Sunday's Washington Post that his voice, always remarkable in other fields, had been raised effectively in public debate. Against the ill-advised and inaccurate reference of a Post columnist, he essayed to defend that noted Scot, George Gordon, Lord Byron. I would wager my own Lyndon Johnson tie clasp that the great poet could not have presented his case with more eloquence. As a fellow Celt of a non-Caledonian line, I welcomed this warranted chastisement of the blundering Welshman.

I append Mr. Gonella's defense to my remarks for the literary edification of my colleagues:

LORD BYRON WAS NOT MAD

By what right does your itinerant scribe Kevin P. Phillips refer to George Gordon, Lord Byron as "the mad poet Lord Byron"?

Does Mr. Phillips consider a man mad because he liked to dally with beautiful women whose appetites matched his own? Is a man mad because he preferred the benevolent suns and classic beauty of the isles of Greece to the damp harshness of his native northern Scotland?

Relative to the morality and customs of his times, Byron was an iconoclast—maybe even eccentric—but mad he was not even in the very final stages of the disease that killed him. I would caution Mr. Phillips not to play fast and loose with adjectives that he cannot substantiate, especially as his name connotes a Welsh heritage and as everyone brought up in Britain knows, all Welshmen are slightly teched.

I offer Mr. Phillips a wager of one Lyndon Johnson tie-clasp against six Spiro Agnew watches that the structural beauty of "Childe Harold" will long outlast the structural strength of the "Southern Strategy."

JOHN GONELLA.

WASHINGTON.

THE QUESTION TROUBLING THE NATION

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, last month I made a rather extensive examination of current public attitudes and opinions toward winding up the war in Vietnam—my remarks in this connection appearing on pages 6043 to 6048 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 11.

On the same day, I introduced House Joint Resolution 462—my own version of an end-the-war resolution—the text of which is as follows:

Whereas, the people of the United States, at great cost and sacrifice to themselves, have over a period of years been providing direct military assistance to the people of South Vietnam in an attempt to preserve for them the opportunity to determine their own political future without outside interference, and

Whereas, by so doing, we have fulfilled several times over whatever commitment we may have had to the people of South Vietnam, and

Whereas, the President of the United States, in his Foreign Policy Report as sent to the Congress on February 25, 1971, has defined our present policy towards ending the conflict in Vietnam as well as in adjoining areas of former Indochina as being one of seeking "above all a rapid negotiated solution" thereof and, meanwhile, in the absence of such a settlement, of seeking "through Vietnamization, to shift American responsibilities to the South Vietnamese," and

"Whereas, the burden of responsibility for fashioning and carrying out a policy to bring peace to Indochina through negotiations or, failing that goal, to disengage our forces from the conflict therein, should not fall solely on the President of the United States, but rather should be a responsibility shared by both the President and the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress joins with the President in confirming, as the constant primary goal of our policy towards the conflict in Indochina, the search for a negotiated end to the war therein for all participants; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be supported and encouraged in all his efforts to achieve such a negotiated settlement of the political issues dividing the people and nations of Indochina, including the related issues involved in obtaining agreement for

the release of all prisoners of war, journalists and other innocent civilian victims, as held by both sides in the conflict; but, irrespective of any such settlement, be it further

Resolved, That United States troop withdrawals from Indochina be continued, on an irreversible basis, until all United States armed forces are withdrawn from Indochina; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress, in this regard, that United States servicemen in Indochina should be withdrawn from any and all participation in ground combat activities therein on or before June 1, 1971, except insofar as it may be necessary for such troops remaining therein after such date to defend themselves or their positions; and be it

Resolved, That it is further the sense of Congress, in this regard, that all other United States servicemen in Indochina, including those specifically engaged in combat-support activities of whatever nature, should be withdrawn therefrom, pursuant to the President's orders, at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. Speaker, I have not, since then, made any effort to attract cosponsors for this legislative proposal although I am happy to note some volunteers in that regard have come forward and have now, by themselves, introduced similar resolutions. I am also happy to note that there does appear to be some developing further interest in this approach on the part of other colleagues who are, at least, potential cosponsors. To them—and to all others who have not yet considered my proposal—an invitation is hereby extended to discuss it with me, to the end that we might work together in improving the language of the same, to which I certainly am not wedded, and hopefully toward developing a consensus around the main thrust of the resolution. That thrust, as I see and intend it, is in the direction of trying to wring the ambiguity out of our current Vietnamization policy; a policy which nearly all of us have supported in that, thereby, the President has successfully and substantially reduced our combat role in Vietnam while, simultaneously, expanding upon the capacity of the South Vietnamese armed forces, preparing them against the day when they, as they eventually must, will have to stand alone.

However, during the months since this policy was instituted, and despite the evident progress that has been made thereunder, few of us—for the benefit of the American people—have addressed ourselves to the difficult questions relating to what our eventual intention is, in Southeast Asia, via the Vietnamization route. Clearly, it is incumbent upon us to do so now. And, equally clearly, we should not leave the responsibility for doing so solely up to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my resolution could become the vehicle for such a debate. So, too, could other such proposals. But, especially since yesterday's defeat, in the House Democrats' party caucus, of the efforts of the proponents of a withdrawal "date certain" and uncertainty left in the wake of the compromise resolution the caucus produced, I feel it is only around some such language as I have proposed that we can, if ever, find our own bipartisan consensus.

Let me attempt, now, to briefly re-

state what my resolution would accomplish.

First, it would—at long last—join President and Congress together in about as clear cut an expression of national policy regarding the termination of our involvement in the war in Vietnam as Congress could ever hope to produce on its own. I have purposely put it this way because, of course, the President can—as I hope he may next Wednesday—end the ambiguity that so concerns me on his own; and, of course, these remarks are partially made in the hope that the President might, to whatever tiny extent, be encouraged thereby to do just that.

For my resolution puts the congressional stamp of approval on the primary goal of our current Vietnam policy—which is, or ought to be, to find, if we can, a political settlement of the issues dividing the people and nations of Southeast Asia.

Pending—or failing—the realization of that goal, however, my resolution would then attempt to tie down the often hinted at fact that our withdrawal process, once begun, is irreversible in nature. I believe this is what the President has in mind, but there could well come a point in future time when the pressures upon the President to reverse the process might become well nigh intolerable; and I believe Congress should do what it can to strengthen his hand against those pressures, and against the advice of those who urge upon him one last "roll of the dice."

Finally, my resolution addresses itself to the still open question concerning our intentions via Vietnamization: Do we intend a total withdrawal of all combat and combat-support troops? Or do we intend to maintain a combat-support presence in South Vietnam long enough—however long that might be—to guarantee, if that is possible, the survival of a non-Communist government therein?

In essence, I suppose these questions—and related ones—bring us down to the key question of whether or not we ought to seek a Korean type solution in and for South Vietnam.

It is my judgment, Mr. Speaker—one man's judgment—that we should not; and it is further my judgment that, rightly or wrongly, a majority of the American people do not think so either—leading me to the conclusion that Mr. Nixon would not be able to rally the American people to such a policy, nor to the support of more than the maintenance of a small, residual force of logistical and liaison U.S. personnel after, say, July 1 of next year.

Thus, my resolution—reverting to a sense-of-Congress form—calls upon the President to end our participation in all ground combat by July 1 of this year, and then—still in that advisory form—for the withdrawal of all other U.S. servicemen from Indochina, including those specifically engaged in combat-support activities of whatever nature, at the earliest practicable date thereafter. Although this language will clearly not satisfy the date certain people, it is, nevertheless—as I see it—language consistent with the congressional advisory role in foreign policy, as well as language

that recognizes the special problems of the President, as Commander-in-Chief, in ordering and directing the difficult and dangerous process of withdrawing combat and combat-support troops from an on-going war in such a way as not to vitiate whatever slim chance may still remain of securing a negotiated settlement thereof.

Mr. Speaker, the debate in which this House has engaged these past 2 days relative to the Selective Service Act, and the extension of the President's induction authority thereunder, underlines the congressional desire to join with the President in fashioning a withdrawal policy from Vietnam, and in agreeing upon as clear and concise a plan as possible for ending our involvement in the conflict therefor which has cost us so dearly.

The reasons that underlie that desire, and the growing sense of urgency that affects us all, are well summed up in this week's Life magazine editorial, entitled "The best way home from the war in Vietnam"—an editorial that, if I may be bold enough to say so, seems in many ways to bolster the arguments I have already presented in behalf of House Joint Resolution 462.

That editorial is as follows:

THE BEST WAY HOME FROM THE WAR IN VIETNAM

According to President Nixon, one of his major difficulties in Vietnam is that "Americans are very impatient people; they feel that if a good thing is going to happen, it should happen instantly." This is an almost unbelievable complaint for a U.S. President to make in 1971. Americans have been extraordinarily patient in waiting for a resolution of the Vietnam war—the longest and most inconclusive in U.S. history and the most marginal to our vital interests.

When Nixon beat Humphrey in 1968, in part because he seemed less a prisoner of past Vietnam policies, would anyone have imagined that well into the third year of his term, the U.S. would still be so heavily involved in the war—or so unsure of its future course? Widespread misgivings have been greatly increased by the results of the Laos "incursion." The Administration indicated all along that Laos was to be a limited operation; but whatever damage the South Vietnamese did there, or "experience" they gained, there is no doubt that the precipitous end, and the manner of withdrawal, gives Hanoi a considerable propaganda victory. The photographs of South Vietnamese soldiers dangling from the skids of homebound U.S. helicopters have already made their demoralizing point with the U.S. public.

On April 15 the President is scheduled to announce his next installment of troop withdrawals, hinged on how well he thinks the war is going. He has already pulled out roughly half of our peak strength of 550,000 and rightly points out, "We've kept every promise that we've made." At the pace he is going, he should be down to the level that Secretary Laird and others have talked about: somewhere between 50,000 and 100,000 troops left in Vietnam, in a noncombat role, by spring 1972. We don't think that is good enough. Nor has the President said when this "residual force" could come out, or how much longer we will go on using air power in Vietnam. The question about the war most profoundly troubling the nation is when, and for that matter whether, all U.S. troops will come home from Vietnam. We urge Nixon to announce in his forthcoming speech the final date he proposes for total U.S. withdrawal.

An end to ambiguity would do more than

anything else to dissipate the miasma of distrust which surrounds the war, and its conduct by the President. The result would be to involve us all—the Congress and the public too—in a clear-cut, publicly proclaimed and understood course.

The President proclaimed the Laos operation with prudently low-key comments, but he has been drawn into statements that cloud our whole intention in Southeast Asia. He foresees "high levels of American assistance and air operations" continuing indefinitely. In North Vietnam, he holds open the possibility of escalated U.S. bombing (and has in fact resumed heavy raids on some northern military targets). He has also added a new condition for U.S. withdrawal that neither he nor President Johnson had ever stated before—that he intends to maintain a "residual" U.S. force in Vietnam large enough to give Hanoi "an incentive to release" its U.S. prisoners of war. The prisoners' fate should be on everyone's mind and conscience, but Nixon's statement sounds less like a serious contribution to seeking their release than a political fall-back position to justify, if he feels it necessary, indefinite prolongation of a substantial U.S. military presence.

Fears that Nixon may be tempted to prolong the war, or be driven to doing so, primarily revolve around a question he has not yet publicly addressed: Will we finally leave Vietnam, even if it turns out Saigon may not last without us? That is the hardest question of all, but neither we nor the President can any longer avoid it, or have it both ways. Some of the war critics imply it is somehow ignoble or self-serving for Nixon to want the survival of a non-Communist government in the South. He is right to try, after the sacrifice of so many lives and so much treasure, to salvage the possibility of a non-Communist South. But it is hard to see how an indefinite prolongation of our stay any longer serves that purpose—at acceptable cost.

The U.S. has done a great deal in, for, and to Vietnam—probably too much. This would be a good time for the President to remind the nation that U.S. efforts since 1965 have greatly strengthened the South. That in the interim other Southeast Asian nations have been able to increase their stability. That U.S. policy has long included a stated willingness to accept a Communist South Vietnam if that is what its people choose. Though we do not ask the President to say this, his statements should permit Americans to conclude that if worse came to worst, Communist victory in the South could be borne more easily than an indefinite U.S. role in an endless war: this indeed would be to become the "pitiful, helpless giant" of Nixon's midnight fears.

If the U.S. has no real option but to leave, then why does Nixon threaten to stay? If it is just a matter of hang-tough rhetoric, argues Harvard Professor Stanley Hoffmann in the current issue of *Foreign Policy*, Nixon is misleading the U.S. public by perpetuating "the illusion that there is a winning outcome, a good way out." The familiar White House explanation is that Nixon's hawk talk, the ambiguity about his intentions, the unwillingness to "tie his hands," all are diplomatically vital for bargaining with the enemy. This is fine in theory—but what bargaining with the enemy? Washington has alternately tried to "bomb" and to cajole the North into serious bargaining, to no avail.

In fact, it is now possible to wonder whether the Communists have any intention of bargaining with the Administration. Why should they: if they feel they are winning, they have no reason to make concessions; if losing, no reason publicly to admit it, or to restrict their future freedom of action. Constantly to proclaim the bargaining advantages of our ambiguity is to underestimate the enemy's intelligence in perceiving our position. And it is to underestimate the ex-

tent to which U.S. hands already are tied—by the troop withdrawals already made and the political inevitability of making more.

Since almost no one outside the White House any longer believes Nixon's refusal to commit himself to total withdrawal will win concessions from the other side, most Americans can no longer understand and accept his policy. The domestic costs of this are intolerably high—for the Presidency, for Congress and not least for the armed forces.

The Harris poll reports that a majority of Americans no longer believe Nixon is telling the truth about the war; only 34% approve of his conduct of it, a new low. Nixon told Howard K. Smith the other night that he has had less support than any President of this century. It must seem that way to a harried Nixon, though the public attitude was considerably worse in 1967-68, when the Vietnam war destroyed one U.S. President. Only a hardened partisan could take satisfaction in the prospect that it might destroy a second.

Confidence in the Presidency is not the only domestic casualty. Congress, which has before it several different resolutions to end or limit the U.S. role, has been essentially powerless to exercise fundamental constitutional checks over executive warmaking powers. Another victim of the continuing war is the very institution that some see as the war's "villain," the U.S. military establishment. In a war in which "fragging" U.S. officers is not uncommon, and "wasting" civilians "wasn't any big deal" (as Lieutenant Calley says), the military's reputation and morale have been undermined badly. Some of the Pentagon's best minds are eager to get the Vietnam war behind them, in order better to reexamine their own proper mission and how to meet it. We may need soldiers again, in clearer causes.

Though the fact may not be quite so apparent, Nixon's reluctance to cut the U.S. loose from the war is also costly for the South Vietnamese. The million-man South Vietnamese army is now the second largest and best-equipped in Asia (after China's), and about as strong as U.S. tutelage is ever going to make it. Politically, the open-ended, large-scale U.S. military presence gives the Saigon regime a false sense of its own viability so that it has yet to take the necessary steps to enlist wider popular support. The U.S. cannot and should not "dump" Thieu and Ky or try to handpick their successors. But with the next South Vietnamese presidential campaign coming up in the fall, we should not be too committed to the present regime, and should oppose its suppression of opponents. Such a stance is difficult to carry off, but a withdrawal commitment from the White House would help immensely.

If anything is unambiguous about the present U.S. role in the war, it is the tremendous stress on what is antispectacularly described as "U.S. air power." The air war over Indochina, conducted by a great power whose own survival is not at stake, is of dubious effectiveness and increasingly questionable morality. The stupefying fact is that in the past two years alone, the U.S. has poured into a relatively narrow strip of Asian jungle more bomb tonnage than was used in all of World War II on the industrialized Axis powers. Like his predecessor, President Nixon seems to have succumbed to what journalist I. F. Stone calls "the Buck Rogers delusion," the false notion that the U.S. wins battles and keeps its hands clean, as long as "we" are in the air above, and only "they" are on the ground below.

Largely because of the increased use of U.S. air power over a wider geographic area, the number of war refugees and probably of civilian casualties has actually risen since Nixon began "winding down" the war. However deadly the political animosities between Vietnamese, it is impossible to believe that they could or would continue devastation at the current levels after U.S. policy and U.S.

firepower are removed from the war. Knowing this, many Americans are bound to feel deeply troubled until the U.S. air role ends. But it is precisely this role that Nixon has been most noncommittal about ending.

Last July, LIFE urged that final U.S. withdrawal be completed no later than Dec. 31 of this year. But whatever the particular date, we think the President should proclaim one publicly. If the President judges it necessary to maintain a noncombat military assistance group in Vietnam a little longer, he should indicate its mission—certainly not large-scale bombing—and its size—certainly no more than a few thousand men. (We hope he won't attempt to justify keeping a larger U.S. backup force in Vietnam as part of a "Korean Solution." Though there are still 63,000 U.S. GIs in relative security in South Korea, the two situations aren't at all parallel. South Korea has a firm, militarily delineated border and an insistently anti-Communist population; American troops are not in disputed territory where they inevitably become special targets.)

No doubt about it—in its temptations, its rhetoric, its debilitating effects on the U.S. body politic and the people of Indochina—prolonged and open-ended withdrawal has too many undesirable resemblances to prolonged and open-ended warfare. Adopting the different perspective of a final commitment on withdrawal would change the entire atmosphere. The President could then test out the hopeful proposition of Harvard's Hoffmann that "even a basically unpleasant and emotionally upsetting political outcome can be made not merely acceptable but desirable—if the government shows that it is in control of events and has deliberately and firmly chosen its course." Putting an end to fruitless ambiguity, the President should be able to count on revived understanding and support.

LEGISLATION TO BAN THE IMPORTATION OF HARP SEAL FUR SKINS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in the St. Lawrence River and off the coast of Canada, Norwegian and Canadian companies are participating in a slaughter of harp seal pups. In last year's harvest, 300,000 baby seals were killed, skinned, and exported so that a few persons could wear sealskin garments. This slaughter of seals continues because countries like the United States have allowed themselves to become markets for sealskin clothing.

I have introduced legislation that will allow the United States to actively participate in the attempt to diminish this slaughter by banning the importation of harp seal fur skins and articles made in whole or part of these fur skins. The United States in its preeminent position in the world must do all in its power to discourage the useless destruction of fur-bearing mammals; especially when the destruction is for the luxury of a few Americans owning sealskin coats.

I urge that the United States show its good faith by passing this legislation. As we struggle to preserve and protect the environment and its inhabitants, one of the most wanton acts of destruction remaining is the killing of fur-bearing animals for the purpose of garment making. This type of destruction exemplifies a

brand of thinking that has destroyed so much of our environment. There is no reason for the slaughtering of these seal pups, but there is a logical and ethical imperative to eradicate the turn of mind that allows such slaughters to continue.

THE FORGOTTEN MURALS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, during the 1930's, the Treasury Department instituted the Public Works of Art Project—PWAP—designed to put many unemployed artists to work. These artists concentrated on the interior of public buildings. Here in Washington, works by artists such as George Biddle, Reginald Marsh, Ben Shahn, and Symeon Shimin grace walls in the Departments of Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, State, Agriculture, the main Post Office and even the National Zoo.

The artists' labors began with the noble goal of giving visual expression to the American dream. Today, although fallen into a state of disrepair due to neglect, the murals remain striking testimony to the spirit and perseverance of the American people and should be saved. Certainly this type of art enhances our public buildings and contributes to the city as the center of culture, a role historically belonging to it. The restoration and preservation of this type of art would serve as an important contribution to maintaining the city's appropriate role as the main cultural center for our metropolitan area.

Following is the text of a feature article which appeared in the Washington Post, March 28, 1971, entitled "The Forgotten Murals." It gives an excellent description of the murals and their history.

The article follows:

THE FORGOTTEN MURALS: FINANCED—THEN IGNORED—BY GOVERNMENT

(By Meryle Secrest)

On the fifth floor of the Department of Justice is a spectacular sight: a three-sided mural by George Biddle.

Coming upon a beautiful wall painting in a government building is as surprising as finding a peacock walking around in the lobby. You can't imagine what it's doing there. Yet there it is, glowing gently, almost completely ignored.

The Biddle mural faces a bank of elevators that do not seem to get the building's main passenger traffic. On the left wall, the mural depicts women sewing in a sweatshop. The central panel celebrates the quiet joys of country life. On the right, families in a city tenement chop wood, huddle in a narrow room, iron and tend babies.

This beautiful work is one of about 50 murals painted for Washington public buildings in the '30s under a Treasury Department program, first called the Public Works of Art Project (PWAP) and later the Section of Fine Arts Program, running from 1933-43. Like the WPA's Federal Art Project, the Treasury Department programs were designed to put a lot of unemployed artists to work. But unlike the WPA, the Treasury Department concentrated on one field: decorating the interiors of public buildings.

Under these programs, 1,116 murals and

301 sculptures were executed for public buildings across the United States, most in post offices and rest in courthouses.

Washington has its share of murals, in the Department of Interior, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (once the Social Security Building), the State Department (which took over the War Department offices), the main Post Office Building, the Department of Agriculture—and even the Zoo.

The artists were all men of established reputations in the '30s—Henry Varnum Poor, John Steuart Curry, William Gropper, Reginald Marsh, Ben Shahn and Boardman Robinson, to name a few.

Yet these murals are great overlooked marks of this city. People who work in the buildings pass them by without seeing them. Tourists come and go without ever discovering their existence. They are uniformly badly lighted and almost all unlabeled.

The bureaucratic point of view seems to be that these murals are an unwanted legacy from the New Deal days. Because of protective government regulations, the murals cannot be conveniently eradicated under a new coat of paint. But they can be taken off the walls and put in storage, which is what happened to a mural by Louis Bouche, until recently on the stage of the Department of the Interior building.

Or they can be totally overlooked. Some murals, like that of Biddle, are in good repair. But there are many others in urgent need of cleaning and restoration. They are defaced by years of dirt and grease, gouged with holes and crumbling away.

The Reginald Marsh frescoes on the fourth floor of the Post Office building have been scored with inch-deep gouges through the surface plaster, probably slashed by mail carts.

George Hardy's sixth floor mural of a Dispatch Rider in 1776 portrays a group of soldiers, one marred with a large black cross over his mouth. Other murals in the Post Office building are dimly lit and dirty.

The murals in the Justice Department are about the best kept of the lot, but "Contemporary Justice and the Child," by Symeon Shimin, is flaking away noticeably.

Other murals are hidden. Ben Shahn's outstanding series of murals on Social Security themes on the main floor of HEW are flanked by gold draperies, which are frequently drawn across them when the space is needed for exhibits. Even when the draperies are pulled back, they obscure a sizeable portion of the murals.

In the State Department, there are murals you can't see at all. Kindred McLeary's two murals on warlike themes, executed when a part of that building housed the War Department, have been covered with curtains screening them from public view. Phillip Guston's handsome panels on the stage of the HEW auditorium are usually folded away, out of sight.

Murals not ignored, neglected or covered over are subject to other dangers. When Mrs. John Mitchell, wife of the Attorney General, decided to spruce up the entrance corridor to her husband's office with a new coat of blue paint, she did little to enhance a sizeable group of murals on that floor.

These murals by Henry Varnum Poor are in reds, golds, browns and yellow-greens to harmonize with the beige, pink and gold-tinted marbles and the heavy brown doors.

The same lack of decorating logic applies at HEW, where two murals by Seymour Fogel flank the Independence Avenue lobby.

Fogel's murals, "Wealth of the Nation" and "Security of the People," in beige, brown, gray, soft blues and greens, harmonize with the nearby bronze doors, bronze trims and mottled green marble pillars and floors. But the color scheme is demolished by red carpeting leading to the three doors and a color portrait of President Nixon, hung a few

inches from one wall-sized mural, competes with it for attention.

The one bright spot in the picture is the belated interest of a few government officials to the importance of preserving government-owned works of art. A nationwide inventory of art in public buildings will be launched this year. Other ideas being discussed: complete restoration of the murals, adequate labeling and a tour of murals in public buildings.

Washington's murals began with the noble goal of giving visual expression to the American Dream.

In a letter to President Roosevelt in May 1933, in which he urged the creation of such a program, the artist George Biddle wrote: "The younger artists of America are conscious as they never have been of the social revolution that our country and civilization are going through; and they would be very eager to express these ideals in a permanent art form. . . . They would be . . . expressing in living monuments the social ideals you are struggling to achieve."

Biddle perhaps was thinking of the murals, executed for the Mexican government by Diego Rivera in the '20s, whose strong, bold visual impact brought Rivera international recognition. Rivera's murals, touched by Communist ideology, dramatize national goals.

"Roosevelt replied that he was interested, though he probably had grave doubts concerning the political consequences of the government supporting art for its own sake," Francis V. O'Connor, a national authority on government art projects of the '30s, stated in the catalog for "Federal Art Patronage 1933-43," an exhibition organized by Maryland University's Department of Fine Arts five years ago.

"He later told Biddle that he did not want 'a lot of young enthusiasts painting Lenin's head on the Justice Building'—obviously a reference to the storm then raging around Diego Rivera's portrait of Lenin in the mural he was painting at New York's Rockefeller Center."

Despite Roosevelt's misgivings, the program was begun under the direction of Edward Bruce, a painter, lawyer, banker, business executive and promoter who was perfectly suited to the task (although his widow, Peggy Bruce, said "the job killed him." He died in 1943).

Olin Dows, who worked with him, says in a written reminiscence, "During the first six months of 1934, Bruce brilliantly improvised the organization and administration of our government's first art program. It was so successful that he formed the more permanent Section of Fine Arts without political opposition."

Dr. O'Connor, who has studied the Treasury and WPA programs extensively, says, "Bruce fought off all the critics and never made any changes. But he vetted all the designs very carefully in advance. I have grave doubts about the amount of esthetic freedom his painters were allowed. . . . However, muralists seldom balk. They realize it's a public work."

Almost to a man, the muralists took a heroic view of American life. Their themes are monumental: justice, freedom, truth, honor. They see the American Dream as a perfectible idea, glorifying the taming of the American wilderness, the American past, the dignity of labor, the heroism of judges and statesmen and the courage of the American pioneer. Their messages are designed to uplift, politically and morally. These were the days when people thought that the absolute achievement of social justice only took good intentions. They believed in the desirability of noble purpose.

The Biddle mural on the fifth floor of the Justice Department, gives solemn, almost grave weight to its themes: "The life of the law has not been logic. It has been experi-

ence." "The sweatshop and tenement of yesterday can be the life ordered with justice of tomorrow." "If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."

However, the mural Gilbert White executed for the Department of Agriculture in 1934 was too high-toned, even for those idealistic times.

White's 40-foot panel is in the classic Greek vein, showing symbolic figures resting after a day in the fields. Cybele (the earth) is there and so is Ceres, goddess of the good crops. The Latin inscription, "O fortunates nimium, sua si bona norint, Agricolas," is translated as, "How happy the men of the fields would be if they know their good fortune."

Nobody seemed to like the mural, including the government officials involved. Bruce called White's diaphanous goddesses "ladies in cheesecloth," and another PWAP official said the mural was too allegorical and classical. In any event, the then Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, felt it necessary to affix a large plaque to the mural, stating that he had approved it. The plaque is still there.

The murals commissioned for the Post Office building led to a series of skirmishes between the artists, officials and members of the public who were either shocked, offended or indignant. Frank Mechau painted a Wild West scene for the fifth floor to illustrate the early dangers of the mail. It shows a group of Indians raiding a stagecoach and appearing to scalp a group of nude women.

"That's the craziest thing I ever saw," John Collier, commissioner of Indian Affairs, said after he looked at it. He added that the incident could never have happened. Mechau insisted that his intention was to create an imaginative reconstruction of a massacre and that, in any event, Indians west of the Mississippi made a practice of taking white women alive.

Several years later, those nude women were again a source of embarrassment to the Post Office when nightclub entertainer Evelyn West poked around the building and found them. It seems the lady used to sell pictures of herself to admirers until the Post Office declared them lewd and cut off her mail.

That was in 1951. Frank Mechau's mural hasn't bothered anybody much lately, perhaps because nobody can see it. It's covered with a thick coating of grease and dirt.

Rockwell Kent became involved in even more of a controversy when, in 1937, he mixed politics in with his twin murals on the themes of mail service in Alaska and mail service in Puerto Rico.

One mural shows Eskimos with dogsled and reindeer in juxtaposition with a mail plane. Its companion on the other wall depicts Puerto Ricans holding up a letter which they have just received from the Eskimos. The letter carried a message in Eskimo. After the government got curious enough to translate the message, it was discovered that the message concerned the then-burning subject of Puerto Rican and Alaskan independence.

The message said, "To the people of Puerto Rico our friends! Go ahead. Let us change chiefs. That alone can make us equal and free."

Puerto Rican politicians reacted with indignation, calling the mural a libel, a calumny and an insult. Their reaction was violent enough that the government erased the message.

Of all the murals and sculptures still in the main Post Office, the twin frescoes by Reginald Marsh, on the interior of a mail ship and a mail room, are probably the most valuable. Dr. O'Connell says these are "very vulnerable to abrasion and scratchy depredations. A hole that isn't filled will let dampness in and get bigger."

Fortunately, the attitude of official Washington is changing slowly from one of complete indifference to the realization that it

has, in many cases, inherited some valuable works of art. There are government regulations protecting the murals, although Dr. O'Connor observes: "Just try and find people to implement them before the mural is all in tatters on the walls."

Karel Yasko, assistant commissioner of design and construction for the Public Building Service, the General Services Administration, is one of a handful of concerned men in government who are trying to remedy years of neglect.

Yasko's planned inventory has already focused attention on the issue. But a great deal more could be done. To begin with, the murals could be properly lit.

They uniformly need labels, prominently displayed. The public needs to know, not just who painted the mural, but what it is about. The murals by Poor at Justice are particularly good examples because, unless you know the historical incident, his murals are completely baffling.

Finally, Dr. O'Connor suggests "Mural Tours," similar to those conducted at the Mint or the FBI, "so that the interested citizen can find for himself the artistic treasures buried in the Justice, Post Office and many other federal buildings.

"This might also lead to the removal of the censorious covers which obscure the Kindred McLeary murals in the Old State Department building and to a program to restore the many paintings which have been worn or defaced in the course of time."

Nevertheless, these murals, which might have seemed embarrassing in the '40s and old-fashioned in the '50s, have the nostalgia of distance for our eyes.

There is something endearingly quaint about, for instance, the mural by Emil Bistram on the theme of "Contemporary Justice and Women," which shows women becoming competent students, librarians, typists, scientists and artists, and doing so in illustrations from '20s magazines.

While some murals seem to make naively optimistic statements about the perfectability of men and institutions, the best of them retain their power to move us. The mural by Shimin on "Contemporary Justice and the Child," is a powerful indictment of man's inhumanity to children. So is the Ben Shahn mural on the theme of child labor at HEW.

These Washington murals have become a part of the American heritage now. They are artifacts worth excavating.

CRISPUS ATTUCKS TRIBUTE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, throughout the ages there have been those individuals whose actions have transcended the era in which they occurred—acts which give meaning, which are history.

Crispus Attucks was a man of history who has too long been slighted in the annals of American history, for he was a devout American who was first to sacrifice his life for her independence.

He was a black man who had suffered the personal oppression of slavery; but in his commitment to the cause of liberty he recognized man's basic quest for freedom from those tyrants who threaten both individual and collective independ-

ence. And, he recognized the need for individual and collective deeds for halting such forces.

Crispus Attucks is a symbol of hope, of resistance to oppression for all Americans, for all men who strive to reverse historic injustices, repression of the spirit and the will and who seek not only unity, but a harmony created out of mutual and genuine respect and faith and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Newark, N.J. will honor the memory of Crispus Attucks with a parade on Sunday, April 4 as it does annually. The work of many individuals is responsible for this endeavor. Credit is due especially to Dan Williams, parade chairman, Connie Woodruff, Maj. Roscoe Jennings, James Threatt and John A. Thomas, founder.

ON MISUNDERSTANDING THE ATOM

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and one of the Nation's most distinguished scientists, delivered some timely remarks recently to the National Press Club on a subject of vital importance to all of us living in this modern, nuclear world.

In his speech, Dr. Seaborg pointed out the need for greater public understanding of nuclear power and of its tremendous potential in peaceful pursuits.

I am inserting the text of Dr. Seaborg's remarks in the RECORD:

ON MISUNDERSTANDING THE ATOM

(Remarks by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, at the National Press Club Luncheon, Washington, D.C., March 22, 1971)

I want to take advantage of these few moments with you to speak quite bluntly and frankly about what is on the minds of many people today concerning nuclear energy and its future. It is obvious that some of these people are truly concerned about nuclear energy today; many are trying to learn as much as they can about it, many are speaking a great deal about it before learning much about it—and, obviously, many are thoroughly confused about it.

What is most interesting to me about all this is how the "environmental era" we have entered only within the last two years has engendered a public interest in the peaceful atom that we in the nuclear community could not raise in more than 20 years of normal public information activity. Of course there has always been a public fascination with nuclear weapons—as well as an understandable fear of them—and it was to be expected that the complexities of the AEC's statutory role in managing its national security responsibility would complicate its pursuit of the peaceful atom. But how exasperating it has been for our public information people to receive letters such as the typical one from a fifth-grade school teacher who wrote: "I am teaching my class all about nuclear energy. Please send me a picture of

an atomic bomb—and some mushroom clouds if you have them."

This is not an isolated example. Over the years we have received thousands of such requests. Recently, however, we received a letter that is somewhat of a classic of the type that has led us to wonder about our communications on the peaceful atom. In fact, in view of the current nuclear power controversies, this letter provided us with the nearest thing yet to a bit of comic relief. It began: "It has recently come to my attention that the power companies of the country have built and plan to build nuclear power plants in this country." And it continued, "Since the American public has not been openly informed of this and it was quite by accident that I learned of it, I would like as much information as possible on these nuclear power plants."

Now I ask you, how can an agency receiving a letter like that be accused of "promoting" the peaceful atom?

More seriously though, the peaceful atom—and nuclear power in particular—is a subject on many minds today and as is true with many important subjects has its fair share of vocal critics. In many respects I find this a healthy sign. The public has a big stake in something as vital as its supply of power and how that supply is to be achieved in the healthiest and most environmentally sound manner. It is, therefore, essential that those who deem themselves critics and judges of nuclear power be responsible in their critiques and judgments. This has not always been the case.

I do not plan to elaborate on this today but I would point out that typical of the attack on nuclear power that we find least responsible is that which isolates a few shortcomings, difficulties and failures over a 25-year history of development and implies that they represent the major thrust of nuclear progress. This is a dangerous distortion of the truth.

Those of you who have been following our nuclear energy programs know full well that nuclear energy is not merely a genie to be released at our command to perform all sorts of peacetime miracles. Its many peaceful promises can only be fully realized through the difficult development of extremely complex technologies. And it is far easier to sit on the sidelines and comment on the problems than to apply the talent and hard work necessary to bring these developments to fruition. I have seen, firsthand, this talent and effort applied and the successes that have resulted. I believe that the Atomic Energy Commission has been and is fulfilling its obligation to the American people and that our accomplishments in the many applications of the peaceful atom—in medicine, in agriculture, in industry, in research and in the generation of electric power—are accomplishments of which every American can be proud.

But I didn't come here today to praise or discuss the AEC and its programs. Basically I want to deal with three questions that relate to the so-called "nuclear power controversy" that has attracted national attention. Broadly stated they are:

Do we need all that power?

If so, why should it be nuclear?

If nuclear, can we have it safely?

I bring up the first—Do we need all that power?—because it is fundamental to the environmental thinking characterized by one rather questionable Earth Day slogan: "All power pollutes."

It is unfortunate that often those people who are so rightly concerned with the environment have this one-sided outlook regarding the use of energy. They have been conditioned, because of man's abusive use of some energy, to believe that an energy-in-

tensive society such as we have today in our advanced nations must inevitably "self-destruct." A limited view of history has hypnotized them into seeing energy only in terms of a means of ruthlessly extracting resources from nature, using them foolishly (and often unjustly) and then dumping them back into nature in amounts and places where she cannot handle them. The immediate reaction to all this is simply—stop it! Reduce the production of power. Return to the use of less power-intensive products. Use less power to produce fewer products to cause less pollution and we will all be better off. This is some of the reasoning offered.

But while there is always much to be said in favor of belt-tightening and improving efficiency, offering that approach as a panacea is unrealistic and unimaginative. And while we should not use the possibility of abundant energy as an excuse to try to support runaway population growth or ludicrous per capita consumption, neither should we believe that a power growth moratorium holds the solution to these social and economic problems. Changes in rational goals, public attitudes and private life styles may reduce the rate of growth of our energy consumption but those who believe we can reduce our total energy consumption fail to take into account three things:

We are going to have a significant increase in population over the next few decades even if we are successful in our population control effort.

The basic physical needs—and hence basic energy demands—of that population will be enormous because we are in the midst of a social revolution that will inevitably raise the standard of living for the world's underprivileged peoples.

Vast amounts of energy—energy-intensive industries—hold the key to saving, not destroying, the environment as we grow to meet the human demands ahead.

My first two points, I believe, are self-evident. My third one needs some elaboration. The basis for my claim is that, properly used, energy can create materials that substitute for the massive consumption of "natural" materials; that with new technologies—and intelligent, far-sighted planning—it can do so with less impact on less land, and that it can be used to conserve vast quantities of natural resources while allowing us to return to nature a minimum of waste in its most acceptable form. Much of this last claim has to do, of course, with recycle.

As you may know, we are now into the beginning of what might be called a "Recycle Revolution." Industry, government, the scientific community and the people are all in favor of this revolution. And I believe it may be the most significant step man has taken since he initiated the Age of Steam. But recycling involves far more than composting your leftovers, stacking your newspapers or returning your empty bottles and cans. If you have read about any of the new and proposed recycle plants lately you will realize that these are large technical facilities requiring considerable amounts of power. The same is true of our municipal sewage treatment plants and waterworks and the same holds for most pollution abatement facilities in the new and growing business of environmental control. It is simply a law of physics that to change the form and location of matter you must use energy.

Perhaps you also have heard the argument of one of today's outspoken ecologists that many of the "synthetic" products we use today are environmentally undesirable because they require a large consumption of energy to produce. Hence, the reasons we should return to the use of the natural prod-

uct in place of its synthetic substitute. For example, it is stated that synthetic textiles demand a huge expenditure of industrial power while cotton is made by the natural energy of the sun. Therefore, why not return to the use only of cotton shirts and dresses? The point seems reasonable until you pursue it further, calculating the additional land area required to produce cotton equivalent to today's synthetic textiles, projecting the future demand on an all-cotton economy, and adding to this the environmental impact of all the fertilizer, the pesticides and the power of harvesting and processing machinery that would be required to sustain such a cotton agriculture. And you would have to consider that power unless you sought to eliminate the environmental effect of these mechanical labor-savers by going back to the days of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." I for one am not inclined to get us into such a "cotton-pickin'" situation.

Of course we can still have a viable cotton industry coexisting with our synthetic textiles which are essential today and can be produced with a minimum of harmful impact on our environment at a cost most people would be willing to pay. The difference is that this latter approach requires a positive outlook, some imagination and the desire to put science and technology to work more creatively.

Among the other modern industries that some ecologists have criticized as being energy-intensive are cement, aluminum and plastics. But the extra energy used to produce these materials must be considered in terms of its trade-off for other environmental demands. For example, all these materials replace wood in a variety of ways. If we were to declare a moratorium on their use and return to using only their "natural substitute," think what an additional demand this would make on the forests we prize today as natural preserves and recreational land! There are numerous other examples. And I can cite many different ways that the elimination of energy-intensive applications would be more environmentally damaging and socially expensive in terms of today's demands.

This is not a defense of the desecration that has been caused by the abusive and thoughtless use of abundant energy. No one denies that this has taken place and we can still see it taking place now even as we are beginning to fight against it. But the problem today is that we are "hooked" on this historical hindsight in which we cannot—or refuse to—see that new, less destructive and more creative ways of generating and using large amounts of energy are possible, among them nuclear power. It is for this reason that dedicated workers in the nuclear field are doubly disturbed when their technology is attacked by some proclaimed environmentalists. We in the nuclear community feel that we are pragmatic environmentalists—that we are working with a source of energy that can be the least harmful to the environment from a power generation standpoint, while providing the abundant power needed to solve the environmental and social problems of our time.

Let me explain why we believe this.

We must face the fact that to a growing extent electricity is the lifeblood of our modern civilization. Without it, in both our urban and rural areas, very little moves or works. I do not believe I have to elaborate on this, as we have had some startling real-life demonstrations of this in recent years.

In spite of the fact that we may be able, to some degree, to improve our efficiency in generating electricity and reduce our waste in using it, it would be unrealistic and perhaps even dangerous not to accept the projection that over the next 30 years

our electricity demand will grow sixfold. In several densely populated areas of the country electric utilities already face a continuous touch-and-go situation in meeting local power demands. The reason for this projected growth, contrary to a popular notion, is not that we are merely adding numerous new electric-powered frills at home. These electric gadgets draw a negligible amount of power. In recent years it has been the growing use of air-conditioning that has accounted for the largest single increase in the residential use of electricity, as well as more families being able to afford the major electric facilities that are essential today.

A large portion of the additional electric power requirements that we will see in the future will be caused by a shift from other energy sources to the use of electricity to fulfill basic needs such as heating and cooling, industrial processing and transportation. And in most cases the shift will be away from energy sources far less desirable from an environmental standpoint. Abundant, economic electricity also can help industry and transportation introduce systems that are inherently less polluting—such as the electric steel furnace which serves the additional environmental function of making the recycle of automobile scrap more economic. We must also recognize that it is much easier to exercise environmental controls over a centralized source of power such as an electric generating station than over a million individual fires whether they are in homes, industrial plants or auto engines.

To meet our future power demands there is no doubt that a great number of large central station steam generating plants will have to be built and operated. We can explore and develop other possibilities to some extent. In certain areas of the country we may be able to harness enough geothermal heat to meet some local and regional power demands. At a few coastal points we may be able to make some limited use of tidal power. And there may be some places where we could reliably collect and concentrate enough solar energy for local domestic applications.

But to believe that it is feasible, technically, economically or environmentally, to develop these energy sources to supply most of the huge additional electric generating capacity required across our country in the years ahead is sheer folly. We are still going to have to depend on the heat from fuels to supply by far the largest portion of our needed power.

What kind of fuels will these be and where will they come from?

This may come as a surprise to you—coming from the Chairman of the AEC—but over the next 30 years the major portion of our electricity will be coming from the burning of fossil fuels—coal, oil and natural gas. And I would not be speaking in good conscience and in the best interest of this country if I did not say—and say emphatically—that we had better do everything possible to continue to develop these resources to the best of our ability, to see that they are mined, transported and used safely, economically and with as little harmful impact on the environment as possible. Much is being done to accomplish this. Much more could be done. And the public will have to accept the idea that these refinements and improvements, which may benefit them only indirectly, will add to their energy bill or their cost of living.

But all this notwithstanding, we must move ahead with the very best development and use of nuclear power. And though safety and environmental standards must remain foremost considerations we should also move ahead with such development without undue delay. The reasons are numerous. Let me begin with the most basic of these—those

involving the depletion and distribution of natural resources.

Most of you are familiar with the statement that man has consumed more energy in the last 30 years than in all previous human history. Almost all that energy has been consumed in the burning of non-renewable fossil fuels—coal, oil and gas produced by nature over the course of millions of years. We are rapidly depleting the remaining recoverable supplies of these resources and it gives me little comfort to hear that we may have a 20-year reserve of natural gas or 50 years worth of petroleum or even several centuries of coal.

I reject these assurances on other than quantitative grounds. By simply setting a match to these irreplaceable materials to generate electricity and produce process and space heat we are doing more than consuming their energy. We are destroying materials essential to transportation—both as fuels and lubricants—and essential as a source of chemicals to a growing number of industries. We are also accepting the inevitability of great increases in air pollution—a health hazard which is already approaching disastrous proportions in some areas of our country.

Few people realize that if we seek to reduce pollution and congestion in our cities by substituting electric powered mass transit systems for private gasoline-powered automobiles we will have a large new demand for electricity. For example, the connected load of the Washington Metro System, when in full operation, will require a capacity of 500,000 kw. Of course, the maximum use of this rapid transit system by 1990 might replace as many as half-a-million cars on our city streets and therefore effect an enormous reduction in air pollution. And if we were to make the transition in our major urban areas throughout the country to the use of electric automobiles, as well as electric mass transit systems, we would require tens of billions of additional kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. This, of course, would offer us a tremendous reduction in air pollution in terms of today's effects of internal combustion engines which are responsible for a significant portion of our urban air pollution. But how foolish it would be to generate all this electricity by burning fossil fuels—by substituting one form of pollution with another. Nuclear power will be essential to help handle this added capacity in an environmentally sound manner.

There are other negative aspects of relying solely on fossil fuels for our energy sources that cannot be overlooked. These are the logistic, economic and political implications. Let's look at a few of these.

An energy economy based strictly on fossil fuels requires the continuous shipment of such fuels by rail, pipeline and water transport. This daily movement of growing amounts of coal, oil and gas poses many problems that we are just beginning to anticipate and project.

For example, the number and size of oil tankers is increasing every year, raising the potential for disastrous oil spills. Yet we are dependent on oil from distant ports—even more so today in the light of need for low-sulphur residual oil.

Natural gas and liquified natural gas (LNG) must also travel in greater volume and greater distances today, and their increasing movement and storage is fraught with potential hazard.

The shipment of coal, which already has shown itself to be a problem, could increase to enormous proportions if coal were the sole fuel for electric generating plants 20 or 30 years from now—as it would become when rapidly depleted gas and oil became too costly for such use. As I pointed out at a Con-

gressional hearing last year, an all-coal economy in the year 2000 would require the burning of about 10 million tons of coal each day. Frankly, I do not think the people of this country want to see their power system vitally dependent on the mining, transporting and burning of such a huge amount of coal. Nuclear power must take over a large share of the burden.

It is not enough to say there is sufficient coal in the earth to keep us going for 300, 400 or even 1,000 years. The questions are: Where is that coal? At what economic and environmental cost can it be made available? And what is the cost of extracting and using it in terms of human health? I say that these questions must be faced just as seriously as we in the AEC face our long-term responsibilities involving the development of nuclear power.

We must also look beyond our own borders to anticipate the problem of burning all the world's fossil fuels. We in this country, with all our energy demands to support our high standard of living, are drawing large amounts of energy and mineral resources from other parts of the world. With rising expectations in those areas and increased technological capacity to fulfill those expectations there will be growing pressure to change this situation. International competition for these resources will grow more intense. Developing nations will begin to need more of their indigenous supplies. And they will also want to be less dependent on other countries for certain vital materials. This could have several implications: Nations that have natural energy resources might want to export less and use more domestically. As nations that are wealthy in mineral resources use more of these domestically or strike harder bargains for their export, the other nations, including our own, in many cases would have to expend more energy to extract such minerals from lower grade ores, recycle these scarcer materials or produce substitutes. In some areas of the world such new needs for energy would encourage a turning to nuclear power that, once installed, offers a nation some independence from the problems of day-to-day fuel supply and in the future would offer both economic and environmental advantages as well. In short, the course is well set on a global basis for a greater turning to nuclear energy—not because of its novelty, or its prestige or its military implications—but simply because of its need to fulfill human goals that depend on more than "people power."

Now let's take a brief look directly at nuclear power—and particularly at those aspects of it that are so much on people's minds, namely the questions of its safety and environmental impact.

I admit that this is an exceedingly difficult subject to deal with. Our sudden awareness of our ecological problems has made us—and perhaps rightfully so—what might best be described as "environmentally uptight." Today almost any new technology or product introduced to the public is eyed suspiciously and if anyone casts any doubts about its short or long-term effects or side effects the tendency is to stamp it "guilty until proven innocent." Nuclear power is in this position and suffers doubly because of its indirect military association. But in the case of nuclear power, anyone who is willing to examine it without prejudice and objectively will be convinced of the following:

The nuclear industry is high among the safest industries in America. Years of National Safety Council records prove this conclusively.

Nuclear power plants that have been licensed for operation in the U.S. to date have accumulated more than 100 reactor-years of safe operation without a serious accident.

Furthermore, another 780 reactor-years of operating experience without a reactor accident have been provided by our Nuclear Navy.

Those who try to equate proportionately the environmental effects and potential hazards of the newer large nuclear plants with their older smaller predecessors simply do not understand today's dynamic nuclear technology. The newer plants are not merely exact scale-ups of the older ones with equally scaled-up effects and risks. They have the benefits of improved technology, of innovations in environmental and safety controls and of better quality control. Furthermore, they are subject to more stringent regulation and more sophisticated monitoring.

What about the environmental effects of nuclear power—particularly about the release of radioactivity in effluents to the environment? Growing environmental concern, during recent years, has understandably included the specific concern that the use of nuclear energy to supply projected demands for electric power may result in large exposures of the population to radiation. We are convinced that, kilowatt for kilowatt, the generation of electricity by our commercial nuclear power stations has had far less impact on the environment and our health than the fossil fuel methods of power generation. We are confident that this situation will not only continue, but that it will improve.

Operating experience with nuclear power reactors to date should certainly help to dispel concern over radiation exposure. Estimates, based on levels of radioactivity at nuclear power sites, show that average radiation exposures to the U.S. population from this source is presently one one-thousandth (0.001) of a millirem per year.

Power reactor designers and manufacturers are continuing to make progress in providing systems that reduce levels of radioactivity in air and water effluents to very low values. Also, the Commission is continuing to support research and development to provide practical means of reducing releases of long half-life radionuclides such as krypton-85 and tritium from the operation of chemical reprocessing plants.

We have been very successful in limiting releases of radioactivity from nuclear power reactors to small percentages of regulatory limits. Nevertheless, there continues to be a concern expressed by some that exposures to the public from this source may approach radiation protection limits that are generally applicable to radiation from all sources. This will not happen.

In this regard, an important step was taken by the Commission last year by the publication on December 3, 1970, of amendments to our regulations that will help to further assure that radioactive material in effluent releases from nuclear power plants is indeed kept at very low levels.

At the present time the Commission is working towards developing more definitive guides on design objectives for nuclear power plants to minimize their release of radioactivity. In January and February of this year we held meetings with environmental and conservation groups, nuclear power utilities, power reactor suppliers, * * *. We discussed with them their ideas as to the nature of the criteria, the levels presently considered to be "as low as practicable," and what further reductions may be anticipated with further technological advances.

The present state of technology is such that the design and operation of nuclear power plants within AEC regulatory requirements for keeping releases of radioactivity to the environment as low as practicable will assure that radiation exposures to the public living in the near vicinity of these plants will generally be less than a few percent of exposures from natural background radia-

tion. The whole body exposure per capita per year averaged over the U.S. population from radioactivity in effluents released from nuclear power plants and chemical reprocessing plants during normal operation even in the year 2000 will be substantially less than 1 millirem. In comparison, average annual exposures to the U.S. population from natural background radiation is about 125 times as great.

It is evident that the concern of some of our most vocal critics over possible health hazards from nuclear power is unwarranted. In fact, death and disease indirectly attributed to the generation of power from all sources should decrease considerably as nuclear power assumes a major portion of that burden—as we are able to reduce the known adverse effects of air pollution by a shift toward nuclear generated electricity and by applying pollution controls to fossil fueled plants.

Why then all this furor about radiation and nuclear safety? I think it springs from three things. First, and generally speaking, the upsurge in nuclear power in recent years has coincided with the upsurge in interest in environmental problems. Therefore, we are faced with the public's fear and lack of knowledge of anything nuclear being reinforced by an increasing antagonism toward all technology which they are being told is the main source of our environmental plight.

Secondly, and in view of this environmental plight, there are many reputable individuals and organizations that are raising legitimate questions and concerns about the safety and growth of nuclear power. We in the AEC recognize these concerns and are attempting to answer all questions to the satisfaction of those raising them. We have been meeting with many of these people formally and informally, and I believe in a cordial and cooperative manner. We hope to continue and broaden these contacts. And we feel much good will come from them.

The third factor that I would mention is the source of our greatest trouble, and I might add the main roadblock to reasonable resolution of the nuclear controversy. That is the small but vehement group of nuclear critics who have been creating and trading on several points of public apprehension and misunderstanding of nuclear power.

Under a crusading banner those critics specialize in creating public alarm by inferences, by selecting isolated examples of past problems—some of them of a minor nature, some more than 20 years old and some totally unrelated to civilian nuclear power—blowing them all out of proportion and implying they are the rule instead of the exception. And perhaps most effective of all, they use large projections and hypothetical examples in a totally negative, one-sided and deceptive manner.

One has only to read all that these particular critics write—and we do—to be struck by their constant use of "what if," "almost" and "could have," as they seem to give endless examples of accidents, incidents and problems that never did seem to live up to their catastrophic expectations—that in fact did not harm anyone. Not satisfied with these past "near misses" they delight in projecting the possibility of future nuclear disasters. And they do this just as deceptively by implying that a highly hypothetical accident, one that, even conservatively speaking, has a likelihood of occurrence approaching zero, is a likely possibility. Rarely is there any attempt to examine the risks—or even the known harm—involved in using the alternatives to this relatively safe technology. Seldom are there any

realistic recommendations made for other alternatives.

In view of all this let me conclude with a few of my own projections on nuclear power. And since the year 2000 seems to be a date toward which many of our modern cynics look with great trepidation, let me use that as the focal point of these projections.

By the year 2000 we will see about 1000 million kilowatts of electricity generated by about 1000 nuclear power reactors, sharing about half of the nation's power load, with highly improved fossil fueled plants carrying the other half.

Of these 1000 nuclear facilities perhaps half will be powered by fast breeder reactors, a number of which will have been in operation long enough to produce sufficient new fuel to refuel themselves and an equal number of other reactors.

As I have previously indicated, the annual average whole body radiation exposure to the U.S. population resulting from the release of radioactivity to the environment from the normal operation of all nuclear power plants in the year 2000 will be less than 1 millirem or equivalent to less than 1% of the radiation exposure to the population from natural background radiation. And the plants emitting this negligible radiation will be indirectly responsible for a reduction of billions of tons of carbon dioxide, millions of tons of sulfur dioxide and large quantities of oxides of nitrogen and particulate matter that would then be coming each year from fossil fueled plants—even those built or backfitted with pollution controls—if we continued to rely solely on such plants for the bulk of our electricity.

Long before the year 2000, it will have become routine for the high-level waste produced in reprocessing fuel from these plants to be converted to solids and buried or stored where it cannot reach the biosphere.

Located according to a national electric power siting plan, and equipped with the latest cooling technologies, these nuclear plants will not be permitted to produce harmful thermal effects on their local environment. And the waste heat from many of them will be diverted to beneficial uses.

By the year 2000 we will also have seen the successful control of thermonuclear fusion and perhaps the first full-scale fusion demonstration plant in operation.

Realistically, some accidents and failures can be expected among all these plants. No technology, no matter how excellent the engineering, construction and regulation, can guarantee 100 percent reliability or safety. But I can say with confidence that the chances of such accidents seriously affecting the lives or property of the public beyond the plant boundary are extremely low. I believe that the consequences of such accidents could not even approach the disastrous proportions that some nuclear critics imply will be inevitable.

Furthermore—and here some people will say I am making my most optimistic forecast—I believe that in the decades ahead nuclear power will show such impressive safety statistics that the insurance industry will be among the biggest investors in nuclear power.

Perhaps of even greater significance though, my projections show what will be more important than how much power we can generate through nuclear methods or otherwise. And that is that we shall have learned to apply all this power wisely—in a way that will support not the extravagances of a gluttonous, short-sighted society but the just needs of all people—people who have learned to live in harmony with each other and with their environment.

Of all the charges that are thrown at those of us who are working for nuclear

power—and I think this also applies to everyone in the energy field—the one we find most offensive is that which accuses us of giving people the means to destroy themselves and their world—to procreate wildly and rob the earth of its last drop of wealth, life and beauty.

To this charge I have but one answer: If the fact that we can produce abundant power to bring man the foundation for health, happiness and peace can be seen only as a means of advancing man's basest impulses and not challenging his creativity and fueling his desire to preserve his environment and uplift his fellowman, then we have far more to be concerned about than nuclear power. I do not think that we must pull the plug on our modern civilization. I do not think that man must return to the dark and cold to find his reason and morality. He must learn to live with his new-found technological capacity and live up to the new responsibilities it brings, not merely because it is here, but because developed and applied wisely it will help him achieve his most human goals.

For this reason we must strive to understand and work intelligently and cooperatively with the peaceful atom. To turn our back in ignorance and fear on this potentially great force for global good would be a failure that future generations would never forgive. To face the Nuclear Age and turn it from an age of anxiety to one of accomplishment and new hope is a good for which we should all strive together. I still believe that this is what we are going to do.

MAINTAINING ISRAELI PARITY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, many of us have watched with deep concern the unsettled posture of the Middle East. Thus far, the self-reliant and courageous Israelis have managed to maintain their strength and advantage at bitter cost. While Israel has struggled to maintain a balance of power between herself and her unfriendly neighbors, she has also strictly adhered to the Nixon doctrine of standing on her own feet. Within the last 22 years, she has managed to retain her sovereignty in three defensive conflicts. To accomplish this, every Israeli citizen has had to contribute a large share of both his income and his personal service; many have lost their lives.

Yet, emboldened by Soviet support and American irresolution, the Arabs continue to threaten and unjustly accuse Israel. To serve as a counterbalance, the United States must give strong assurances that Israel will not be forced to accept unsafe borders.

Israel is not new to the problem of unsafe borders. She has already learned at great cost that international peacekeeping forces cannot assure any measure of safety alongside insecure borders.

Israel would assert that a safe border is one that she can protect. To withdraw from strategically safe borders now without complete assurance of future peace

would expose Israel to all the old threats. Moreover, it would force Israel to depend on other nations for her shipping rights, her border rights, and her very existence.

Frankly, it is doubtful whether any outside forces would care about Israel's survival as much as the Israelis. It is hard to believe the mercenaries in a military force protecting Israel's borders would fight as effectively as her own sons and daughters have done. Unfortunately, I suspect that with an international peacekeeping force as the only buffer between Israel and her age-old enemies, the past will prove to be prophetic. Israel has only too often in the past seen international guarantees fade away and dissolve under pressure.

The land Israel acquired in the 1967 war was land that Israel would not have sought had she not been threatened. If Israel had been permitted to live in peace, to harvest her crops and to rear her young unthreatened, there would have been no 1967 conflict and ensuing takeover of borders.

Since Israel has successfully demonstrated her military strength to her enemies, we must permit her to demonstrate her bargaining strength in order to negotiate a lasting peace. To ask Israel to give up strategic boundaries in advance of negotiations is to negate a lasting peace. Israel should not be made party to such a poor bargain.

The United States must therefore at this time, more than ever, meet Israel's need for money, material, and open support. But the United States should not ask, and should not expect, unrealistic Israeli concessions. Let Israel set her own terms, for it is she who has to meet them.

I am, therefore, cosponsoring a resolution today, a copy of which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the perusal of my colleagues. It is only one means by which we can insure that Israel will not be pushed back into the sea. I intend to seek other means as well.

The resolution follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the policy of the United States for the promotion of peace in the Middle East should be to exert its best efforts to arrange for direct, face-to-face negotiations between the State of Israel and the Arab States; and, further, that neither the United States nor any other power should attempt to impose a settlement in the Middle East nor attempt to induce a settlement other than through direct, face-to-face negotiations between the State of Israel and the Arab States.

AMVETS AWARDS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, each year AMVETS, an organization of American veterans who have served during time of war, recognizes men and women who

have made exceptional contributions to world peace and to the welfare of the veteran and the Nation.

AMVETS presents to these women its Silver Helmet awards—silver replicas of the GI helmet of World War II.

As a member of AMVETS, I was pleased this year when the organization recognized the work of men from my own State of Michigan.

The distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD), was presented the Silver Helmet congressional award in recognition of enlightened service and leadership to the people of the Nation as an outstanding legislator, civic leader, athlete and American citizen.

A special Silver Helmet award was presented to the Dodge Division of the Chrysler Corp., in recognition of its foresight in the development of programs emphasizing good driving knowledge and expert driving skills in the youth of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily congratulate my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, and the men and women of the Dodge Division, and insert the full text of the awards in the RECORD:

The 26th Annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in New York City, New York, on August 26, 1970, did unanimously resolve that its Congressional Award be presented to The Honorable Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader U.S. House of Representatives, in recognition of enlightened service and leadership to the people of the Nation as an outstanding legislator, civic leader, athlete and American citizen.

Gerald R. Ford, "The Congressman's Congressman," recognized repeatedly by his colleagues for his distinguished service, richly merits the honor afforded him by AMVETS Silver Helmet Congressional Award.

Congressman Ford's shining record of accomplishment in all facets of his personal life reflects the impact which a good man, devoted to his family, his community, and his ideals as a public servant, can make upon his life, the lives of others and the times in which he lives and serves.

Having satisfied his obligation to his Nation by 47 months of active duty in World War II in the United States Navy, Mr. Ford then proceeded to set the course of his future private life as an attorney in Grand Rapids, Mich., from where he started his rise in the world of politics.

Many outstanding awards have been bestowed upon him over the years, including several for his continuing support of legislation beneficial to veterans and their dependents, but the most gratifying fact to AMVETS in reviewing his accomplishments is that during twenty years of service to the Nation as a legislator, while fulfilling all outside demands on his time, he still maintained an attendance record of 90.9% in the Congress, missing only 48 roll calls out of 5,346.

For these accomplishments, and in recognition of his responsibilities as Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, AMVETS is proud to present to one of its Life Members of the Hewitt Madigan Post No. 126, Grand Rapids, Mich., the AMVETS Silver Helmet Congressional Award.

Presented March 27, 1971

The 26th Annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in New York City, New York, on August 26, 1970, did unanimously resolve that its Special Silver Helmet Award be presented to The Dodge Division of the Chrysler Corporation, in recognition of its foresight in the development of programs

emphasizing good driving knowledge and expert driving skills in the youth of our nation.

Nearly two decades ago, the Dodge Division of the Chrysler Corporation sensed the growing auto safety problems facing the nation, as the World War II population explosion took shape in the form of untold thousands more drivers of automobiles on the nation's highways.

Through its leaders like Matthew C. Paterson, Dodge, in cooperation with AMVETS, pioneered the development and use of safety belts and, in recognition of the need, presented personalized seat belts to each of the nation's governors, as well as the automobile editors of the United States.

In addition vehicle inspection and driver reexamination were an early goal of the two organizations.

AMVETS and DODGE have worked together on many worthwhile safety programs during years of long association. It has been most satisfying to have been part of a highway safety program, prior to its recent rise to national prominence. AMVETS and DODGE, with leaders like Bryon Nichols and Bob McCurry cooperating, recognized the problem and planned an active program, in advance of these national pressures; thus, "Operation D.E." came to be.

The teen-age driver is anxious to be a good driver and through driver education sponsored in the schools, the young drivers receive valuable knowledge and training. Therefore, DODGE and AMVETS have created a program which emphasizes the need for skillful drivers and recognizes the most skillful.

As a participant in the total war being waged by the auto industry in general to make our highways the safest possible, AMVETS salutes the Dodge Division of Chrysler Corporation in particular for their never-ending crusade toward this goal and are, therefore, extremely proud to present to Mr. Robert McCurry this AMVETS Special Silver Helmet Award.

Presented March 27, 1971.

A NEW PANAMA CANAL TREATY AT WHAT PRICE?

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that the administration is initiating efforts with certain officials of the Government of the Republic of Panama to reopen treaty negotiations concerning the present canal, a new sea-level canal, and certain other aspects of our relationship with Panama. I regard this activity on the part of the administration at this time to be extremely dangerous and ill advised.

Because of my strong feelings on this matter, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement of mine on this subject as I believe it should be brought to the attention of the Members of the Congress.

This statement follows:

NEW PANAMA CANAL TREATIES—POTENTIAL DISASTER FOR THE UNITED STATES

I am gravely concerned over reports we have received to the effect that the Administration is taking active steps which may result in the reopening of treaty negotiations with the Republic of Panama.

I have been associated with affairs in the Republic of Panama, and more particularly in the Canal Zone, since the mid-1930's and officially since 1953. As past Chairman of the Subcommittee on Panama Canal, I have worked closely with the Panama Canal Company, the people of Panama, and the people of the Canal Zone. In light of this long association with the affairs of Panama and the Canal Zone, I was amazed and dismayed to learn that the Administration has sent Ambassador Robert B. Anderson to discuss the reopening of negotiations for new treaties with the Provisional Government of General Torrijos. Ambassador Anderson, of course, was the Special Representative who headed the team which negotiated the three treaties with the Republic of Panama between 1964 and 1967.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the abortive 1967 treaties never came to fruition and ended on a very negative note. For example, copies of these draft treaties were never made available to the Congress of the United States but apparently were being circulated on the streets of Panama back in 1967. In addition, these proposed treaties evoked loud protest from the people of the United States and, more particularly, from the Congress. Indeed, the House of Representatives in the Ninety-first Congress expressed itself as to the 1967 treaties blunder through the introduction of some 105 resolutions declaring it to be the policy of the House of Representatives and the desire of the people that the United States should maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone. In fact, since 1967, the Provisional Government of Panama itself has made known its objections to the 1967 draft treaties in unmistakable terms.

From the standpoint of the U.S., there were a number of disabilities inherent in those treaties. They would have, for example, resulted in the United States relinquishing its powers of sovereignty over the Canal and would have operated in such a way that the United States would not be able to control effectively the Panama Canal or provide for its defense in a satisfactory manner. In addition, those treaties contemplated an unrealistic and unreasonable increase in tolls, rates and revenues and did not take into account the constitutional authority of Congress over the disposal of United States property. Also, those treaties would have removed the Canal from the authority of the United States Congress. In this connection, it should be noted that under the 1967 draft treaty relating to the present locks canal, control of the Canal would have passed from the Congress to the nine-man governing authority and the five American members would be appointed by the President subject to confirmation by the Senate and responsible to the Executive, not to the Congress. This arrangement alone would tend to cast the treaties in an unfavorable light with respect to the Congress. May I also call to the attention of the House, the report of the Subcommittee on Panama Canal dated December 1, 1970 which goes into some detail on the 1967 treaty proposals and other subjects concerning the operation of the Panama Canal.

Aside from the disabilities inherent in these treaties, they are based on a number of erroneous premises. For example, at the time the 1967 treaties were drafted and negotiated, it was thought that a sea-level canal was economically feasible and could be built by nuclear excavation. It is clear from the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission Report that nuclear excavation has been eliminated for the foreseeable future. Absent nuclear excavation, it would cost approximately \$2.5 to \$3 billion (at 1970 estimate cost figures) to construct

a new sea-level canal on Route 10, as recommended by the Interoceanic Canal Study Commission. Testimony before our Committee has shown that based on traffic forecasts and the Canal Improvement program, the existing Canal should be able to handle the traffic to the end of the century. At the present time, it seems clear that the Republic of Panama, or anyone else for that matter, cannot premise treaty negotiations on the assumption that Congress will authorize the construction of a new sea-level canal or enact legislation to transfer the existing Canal to any other country.

If the 1967 proposals were unacceptable to the American people and to the Congress, how much more unacceptable will new treaties be which go even further than the last round of treaties in ceding American jurisdiction and sovereignty in the Canal Zone? For the Government of Panama expressed its dissatisfaction with the 1967 treaties in an August 5, 1970 letter to our Secretary of State and simultaneously released a 32-page document explaining the reasons for rejecting the 1967 draft treaties. In general, this document took an extreme position which, in effect, rejected U.S. control of the Canal, the right of the U.S. to maintain military forces on the Isthmus, and rejected the management of the Canal for the benefit of shipping rather than the enrichment of Panama.

It seems to me that it is entirely improper and incorrect when so many priority problems are facing the country at this time, that we should be pressured into opening up negotiations on new treaties that will once again engender enormous controversy and opposition. Undoubtedly, reopening negotiations on the type of treaties anticipated will result in protest by the American people when they learn the facts.

The possibility of new treaty negotiations raises several basic questions in my mind:

1. Why must we enter into treaty negotiations which give every indication of being contrary to the best interests of the United States?

2. Must we enter into treaty negotiations at this time which can only cause further unrest in both the United States and Panama?

3. Where has the United States failed in living up to its duties, obligations and commitments as set out in the basic 1903 treaty and its revisions of 1936 and 1955?

I would be at least a little less apprehensive if someone in the Administration could answer these questions for me.

KOSCIUSZKO MEMORIAL LEGISLATION

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 26, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6759, in which I am deeply interested. It proposes to make the last residence in this country of the great Polish-American patriot, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a national historic site. I feel the enactment of this bill would afford fitting recognition to General Kosciuszko, who did so much in the cause of the American Revolution.

I submitted a similar bill during the 91st Congress. The proposal appeared

during the last Congress at a time when the legislative schedule was full and just prior to the semiannual meeting of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments of the Secretary of the Interior. The result was that my bill together with similar bills introduced by 14 of my colleagues did not receive the attention merited.

There are two features in this new measure which did not appear in last year's version. First of all, consistent with previous legislation in this area, the Secretary of the Interior would be empowered to exchange land or property. Thus, the present owner of the Kosciuszko home on the northwest corner of Third and Pine Streets in Philadelphia and the owners of adjoining properties could be adequately compensated in this manner under the proposed legislation. Additionally, the Secretary of the Interior is given an opportunity to fix the boundaries of the proposed historic site. Such a stipulation would be in keeping with precedents set by the Federal Government relative to Abraham Lincoln's Home in Indiana and with the birthplace of Booker T. Washington.

Past private efforts to effect adequate recognition of the historic value of this home, which was the residence of General Kosciuszko from October 7, 1797 to May 5, 1798, failed because of local zoning regulations. It is essential that Congress act to accomplish this worthy dream of Americans of Polish origin.

It is my understanding that the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments will make a recommendation to the Secretary on this measure at its meeting on April 19. I urge the members of the Advisory Board and, in due course, my colleagues to act favorably upon this legislation, which would provide the Bicentennial City of Philadelphia with a fitting memorial to this immortal Polish-American hero of the Revolution on its 200th anniversary.

Upon a favorable recommendation by the Advisory Board and the Secretary of the Interior, I urge that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs schedule hearings on the Kosciuszko memorial legislation as rapidly as possible.

In that the general spent more time in the "City of Brotherly Love" than anywhere else in the United States, with the possible exception of West Point, many of my constituents have advocated the establishment of such a national memorial in our city. I can only add my personal approval of all efforts to insure that future generations of Americans will be aware of the contributions to our liberty made by this man who left our shores only to struggle against tyranny in his native land.

Finally, I believe that by taking this action we are not only extending recognition to the efforts of a single patriot, but are honoring those of our fellow citizens who share his ancestral heritage. Indeed, we honor all the varied groups who have added their substance to the

fabric of America, by thus memorializing Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

SUPPORTS TRANSFER OF KENNEDY STADIUM TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable DON FUQUA, of H.R. 2293 which would transfer the title, operation, and maintenance of the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium to the U.S. Department of the Interior. The purpose of this legislation is an effort to resolve the financial dilemma with which the stadium is confronted and at the same time prevent the possible loss of a major league baseball team for the city of Washington.

The Committee on the District of Columbia has been holding some very interesting hearings on this subject. Many prominent citizens have voiced different views as to how this problem should be resolved.

One of the citizens is Mr. Roger B. Doulens, a former vice president of Pan American World Airways, and a very close personal friend of mine. Mr. Doulens has been very active and served in a leadership role in the development of sports in the Washington metropolitan area for many years. His testimony was in opposition to the transfer and I felt his views would be of interest to my colleagues in the House. I, therefore, include his remarks in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF ROGER B. DOULENS

My name is Roger B. Doulens, and I am a baseball fan.

I saw my first major league baseball game back in 1925, when I was a little boy, and I would estimate that I have seen approximately 1,000 major league games since that time.

Since 1953, I have been a season subscriber to Senator's home games and, despite the poor showing of the team more often than not, I still retain my interest in what I firmly believe to be the finest spectator sport practiced in the world.

I have followed in the newspapers with more than unusual interest the proceedings of this Subcommittee in the matter now before it. When you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Clark made time available to me I readily accepted, even though my appearance will be necessarily brief.

Mr. Robert Short, I believe, is the victim of his own mistakes.

In the first place, if the figure in excess of nine millions is correct, he paid too much for the franchise. I had the authority of Mr. Samuel F. Pryor to bid up to seven millions for the ball club—and we thought that even that figure was too high.

Secondly, with no previous exposure to baseball, he decided to become his own general manager. Now, a Horace Stoneham or a Calvin Griffith, who has spent his whole life in baseball, is qualified to do the wheeling and dealing necessary to keep his club in

contention. But Mr. Short's credentials, suspect two years ago when he acquired the franchise, were indicted last fall when he made that incredible transaction with Detroit.

In the third instance, Mr. Short operates with the philosophy that the people of the Washington area owe him a debt of gratitude, that it is their obligation to buy his product, and keep on buying, no matter how unpalatable the product might be.

I have no argument, personally, with Mr. Short. I have tried to be of help since his arrival on the Washington scene. A year ago I had lunch with one of his aides, Mr. Molomot—I paid the tab, incidentally—and gave him a lengthy list of names of personalities and business firms which I thought could be sold season tickets. Whatever became of that project I do not know.

On the other hand, I believe Mr. Short should be encouraged short of subsidizing his operation. I will reject a 10% or 20% surcharge on my ticket to pay for the interest or principal on RFK Stadium or to assist Mr. Short in paying his rent. I would encourage the rejection of any proposition which gives the Washington baseball club free rent until an arbitrary and capricious attendance figure is reached. I strongly oppose any unreasonable accommodations to Mr. Short, such as control of concessions and parking revenues, if they will add to the hopeless debt RFK Stadium already finds itself in.

If there is too much first personal singular in this brief presentation, Mr. Chairman, please believe me when I feel I am speaking for the average baseball fan. As a past president of the most prestigious baseball organization in this area—the Alexandria Club of Grandstand Managers—I like to think that my sentiments are also those of my colleagues who purchase the tickets to keep Mr. Short and Company in business.

I hope for the sake of Mr. Short, his franchise and the future of baseball in the Washington area that there is incentive for more people to purchase more tickets than ever before. No one wants the Washington Senators to draw more than a million fans at home any more than myself. But we see no reason why the ball club shouldn't start paying rent with the sale of the first ticket, not with the millionth.

Mr. Short has surrounded himself with some excellent baseball men, like Joe Burke and Burt Hawkins. He also has a most knowledgeable manager in Ted Williams, even though I believe that Williams' ultimate destiny is as general manager of the Senators with another proven baseball personality moving in to take on the field.

Mr. Short should give more authority to these people in purely baseball decisions and concentrate on being the executive for which he is so excellently qualified.

We want a winner in Washington—at least we want an interesting ball club. But we don't want it at any additional expense to the local ticket buyer, who is already paying the highest price in the major leagues.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to express myself.

PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation announced on Monday, March 22, 1971,

the route system over which rail passenger service will be provided after May 1, 1971. Many of us have been waiting anxiously to see the results of the study that lead to Monday's announcement.

I represent an area of western Maryland that has a long history associated with passenger rail service including part of my district where the first commercial passenger service in the United States took place on the B. & O. Railroad. This area is today in the throes of a very serious economic slump. Three of these counties lie in Appalachia, and one county has an unemployment rate of over 10.5 percent.

The Railpax system bypasses western Maryland altogether. The end points of Washington-Chicago and Washington-St. Louis can be serviced by two alternate routes—one of these routes is along the Potomac through Cumberland on the B. & O.-C. & O. line. Railpax has opted for the more northern route through Baltimore and Harrisburg in both instances.

This leaves western Maryland without any rail passenger service. I feel that the National Railroad Passenger Corporation should reconsider its decision and service at least one set of end points through Cumberland. With one Federal arm, the Appalachian Regional Commission devoted to the economic development of this region it seems foolish to me for Railpax to take actions that will serve a great blow to the same area. I believe that further public hearings on this subject should be held so that all the ramifications of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation's actions can be aired.

GUSTAV S. EYSSSELL: MASTER BUILDER—MASTER SHOWMAN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is not given to many men to achieve the unique status of one of America's most distinguished citizens, Gustav S. Eyssell. Mr. Eyssell was recently honored by many civic organizations and by the leaders of the motion picture industry for his twin careers as a master builder and a master showman.

Gus Eyssell has served our community and our country brilliantly. He played a major role in establishing the enduring character and format of the Nation's largest theatre, the Radio City Music Hall, where he served as managing director and president. Then he succeeded Nelson Rockefeller as the president of Rockefeller Center.

It was Gus Eyssell's great opportunity to play a major role in fulfilling the vision of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who dreamed the impossible dream of carving a world renowned complex of buildings, theaters and world-famous plazas out of

one of the most deteriorated areas of the city of New York. Rockefeller Center not only permanently changed the face of Manhattan but had a persuasive effect on urban planning all over the world.

It was Gus Eyssell who carried the dream forward; building many new buildings; innovating exciting concepts and always respecting the obligation of businessmen to participate in community affairs. He helped make New York a better place in which to live.

He is a trustee of Colonial Williamsburg; a trustee of Roosevelt Hospital; a former president of the Avenue of Americas Association, a member of the board of trustees of National Educational Television; a member of the Board of Directors of the United Nations Association of the United States of America. He has served as New York State chairman of United Nations Day for the past 7 years.

Gus Eyssell is not a letterhead celebrity; he does not lend his name—he gives his heart, his mind, and his great resource of daring and courage.

He was a poor boy who came from Kansas City where he lived near a young man named Truman who later became one of the greatest Presidents of the United States. It was there at 17 that he became treasurer of the largest theater in Missouri. His success brought him major posts in the film industry in Hollywood, Texas, and, of course, New York.

Gus Eyssell is not only a great private citizen, a superb worker; but he is also a great captain, a dynamic leader.

I have admired him along with the thousands who know him and the millions who have benefited from his work. This past week he retired as president of Rockefeller Center though he will continue to serve as a consultant to that remarkable "city within a city"; the place of hope that was built in the shattering days of the great depression when many in the world felt that there were to be no more tomorrows.

It was people like Gus Eyssell who kept the faith. He never wavered from John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s, principle of quality. What was built was built to last because it was intended for the many years ahead. It was faith in action. Today, 40 years later, it all looks as new as the day they opened the doors. We are all grateful to the Gus Eyssell's for they are proof positive that there are pioneers needed in every decade of every century. Pioneers are not only for the history books; they are for our daily papers and nightly newscasts, as well. Gus Eyssell is a great pioneer. We thank him and wish him well.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

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

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

FARM TRUCK DRIVER
QUALIFICATIONS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, farmers of Virginia and other areas throughout the country are deeply concerned about proposed Federal regulations of farm truck driver qualifications which are now scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 1971. The American Farm Bureau Federation and other organizations have protested certain of these proposed qualifications; and this matter is now under advisement by the department.

As of July 1, 1971, all drivers of farm trucks, including pickups, in interstate commerce must meet the following requirements:

First. Be at least 21 years of age.

Second. Carry a certificate, executed by a physician during the preceding 24 months, evidencing fitness to drive a truck.

Third. Pass a road test in truck operation.

Fourth. Take an examination on the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Regulations.

Fifth. If the driver is an employee of a farmer, he must supply the farmer with evidence of compliance with the four requirements above, plus an application for employment which shall disclose traffic violations and disposition thereof, plus an annual supplementary statement relating to traffic violations.

Obviously, such regulations would greatly handicap many of our small farm operations.

I am particularly concerned about the first requirement—under which a driver of a farm truck must be at least 21 years of age. This is utterly ridiculous, in view of the fact that we are drafting men into the Armed Forces and sending them all over the world in duties which often require the handling not only of military trucks but many other vehicles of tremendous size and complexity. We have men under 21 in Vietnam driving heavy equipment of all kinds and to say that here at home a man on a farm has to be at least 21 years of age to drive a pickup truck is the height of folly.

In addition to this, 18-year-olds are now allowed to vote in Federal elections and Congress has just recently approved a constitutional amendment which would extend this right for State and local elections. States are ratifying this proposed amendment and if it is approved, 18-year-olds throughout the country would

be allowed to vote. Are we now to say that a young man between the ages of 18 and 21 who can vote and who may be sent to Vietnam cannot drive a truck on the family farm? Surely, we all recognize the inequity of such a regulation and I certainly hope that the Secretary of Transportation will reject this proposal.

My understanding is that a meeting is being held today in the Motor Carrier Division of the Department of Transportation on these regulations and I certainly trust that reason will prevail over bureaucracy in eliminating this requirement from the proposed regulations.

"HAIL, HAIL, O FREEDOM!"

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the Lowell Sun on March 25—the 150th anniversary of Greek Independence Day—is one of the most eloquent statements of the immense and profoundly significant contributions which the Greek civilization and its peoples have made to the Western world, to this country, and to the city in which I was born and raised, and am proud to serve in the House of Representatives.

The sense of pride which the author, Charles G. Sampsas, a long-time friend, executive news editor of the Lowell Sun, and an American of Greek extraction, so clearly feels, can be shared by all of us, regardless of our individual ancestry, for the heritage of Greece is one from which we have all benefited beyond measure, and which is an integral part of the American way of life.

I deem it an honor and privilege to include this outstanding piece here in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

"HAIL, HAIL, O FREEDOM!"

(By Charles G. Sampsas)

LOWELL.—From the Athens of Attica in ancient Hellas to the modern-day Acropolis of Lowell in the United States of America is a panorama of more than 5000 years of history.

And it is worthy of recall on this auspicious and glorious day—the 150th anniversary of Greek Independence. For it was on this very day a century and a half ago that the Greeks rose as one and began the War of Independence, which resulted in their freedom from the Ottoman Turkish empire which had enslaved them almost 400 years.

That Black Tuesday in 1453 when Constantinople, the very heart of the Byzantine Empire and the very source of the Greek Orthodox faith, fell marked the beginning of the end for Hellenes throughout the Balkan areas. They were slaves and subjects of the hated Ottoman Turks for centuries. Inspired by their Christian faith and their courageous priests, they maintained their knowledge of the Greek language through their "secret schools," which were in cellars, in concealed attics, out in country fields, everywhere.

In his famed study on the world's literature, John Macy wrote of Athens: "And what

a civilization it was! In the small city of Athens in the fifth century before Christ there lived more men of genius than ever happened to live in any other place at any other time . . . No historian, not the wisest disciple of Herodotus, can explain just why so many men of brains were assembled on this particular spot of the world at this particular moment. All we know is that it is so. Greece had repelled the invading Persian armies and in spite of continuous internal rivalry and warfare was, in intellectual matters, a more or less united civilization. Athens was the center of the glory that was Greece."

The early Hellenes or Greeks were the historical antecedents of most Europeans, and, as Historian Thomas Spilios points out, "with the Judaeo-Christian tradition the farmers of Western culture. In the origins of Greek culture we see the origins of Western thought and art; the heritage of the modern Greek is the heritage of the Western world . . .

"The poet John Keats referred to classic Greek literature as 'the realms of gold.' This it is: It is the richest body of epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry the world has even known. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* of the 'deep-browed' bard Homer, the poetry of Hesiod, Sappho, and Pindar, and the plays of the great Greek dramatists Sophocles, Aeschylus, Euripides, and Aristophanes continue to startle, delight, and engage us with their masterful artistry and profound concern for the great problems of human existence. The idealism and speculative philosophy of Plato and the systematic logic and reason of Aristotle continue to form the dual basis of philosophic thought to this day. And the political achievements of Solon and Pericles are apex among the origins of a humane, just, and ordered society. In fact in every field of human knowledge, the beginnings are to be found in the genius of the ancient Greeks. They gave us our concepts of state and of democracy, our logic, our way of thinking, systems of science as well as standards for beauty. But though we remain the inheritors of the Greece legacy, we are still, perhaps, a world that has yet to rise to its greatness; we must still learn all that it can teach, and we can still earn our legacy."

Historian Spilios points out that the Greek achievement should not be measured in terms of one or two centuries, but in terms of their total history in Ancient, Byzantine, Turkish, and Moslem times. "For the Greeks are one people" and their remarkable continuity is seen in Homeric heroes and Church Fathers, Spartan warriors and Athenian philosophers, Byzantine emperors and Hellenistic kings, Macedonian hoplites, Maniat teachers and killed Evzones, in Pindar and Kazantzakis, in Zorba and Cavafy, in George Seferis, Greece's first Nobel Prize winner; in Aristotle Socrates Onassis and in the parishioners of Lowell's four Greek Orthodox churches—the mother church, Holy Trinity; Transfiguration (Metamorphosis); Holy George's and The Assumption of the Virgin.

The saga of Greece starts with the splendors of early Crete and Mycenae, proceeds with the Golden Age of Pericles and militaristic Sparta, and the expansion of Hellas under Alexander the Great, who smashed into Asia and Africa with his amazing victories at Issus and Arbela, while he was still in his early twenties. (And walking along Broadway in Lowell, you see a sign "Alexander the Great Restaurant"—a descendent of Macedonia paying his tribute to that young Macedonian leader who conquered the world.)

The story of the Trojan war is part of everyone's schooling; the ten-year conflict which taught so much to the world . . . the tale of the 300 courageous Spartans who stood against the endless thousands of Persians at Thermopylae; the magic of Atheni-

ans at Marathon . . . the endless, heartless Peloponnesian War, which tore Greece apart. The bravery is forever world history.

The majestic beauty of the Byzantine churches of Constantinople . . . and the rise of those early Christian Emperors . . . and the culminating disaster of 1453, when the very heart of Christian Byzantine empire, Constantinople, fell to the hands of the Ottoman, Turks, and darkness fell on the Western world. The harsh Ottoman Turkish rule lasted centuries . . . Greek children were taken annually as tribute to sultans to be raised as Moslem and the terrifying punishments of the Turkish such as impaling their victims.

From the fall of Constantinople—that black Tuesday of May 29, 1459, to March 25, 1821—Greece's Day of Liberation—the role of the Hellenes was heart-breaking. They lived virtual slaves of the Ottoman Turks. Their Christian faith was the one beacon which kept up their spirit.

On March 25, 1821, 150 years ago this very day, Bishop Germanos of Patras raised The Standard of The Cross at Agia Lavra monastery, and declared that henceforth Greece was free. This was the signal for the start of the Greek Revolution, a revolt which brought help to Greece from throughout the civilized world. Boston's Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, England's Lord Byron, joined with other Philhellenes and the "Philliki Etairia"—the great national secret society—to fight for Greece. The Greek heroes are legion; Kolokotronis, Mavromihales, Koras, Regas O Fereos, Zaimis, Lontos, Karaiskakis, Papafietas, Bouboulina, Kanaris, Bozzaris, Ysilantis and so many others.

Kolokotronis went to Mani, the Southern Peloponnesus, in January of 1821, and as Historian George J. Leber puts it: "His very presence in Greece was enough to arouse the spirit of the patriots, for his name was already known throughout the country, as a fearless patriot, and leader. In 1818, the Turks had evicted him from the Morea, or Peloponnesus, because of his aggressiveness and rebellious spirit.

"On March 21, 1821, the patriots besieged the city of Kalavrita, and in five days had taken the town. On the 22nd, Mavromichalis and his Maniates, with Kolokotronis and others besieged Kalames and took it on the 25th. In Patras, the Metropolitan Palafon Patron Germanos, with Andreas Zaimis, Londos and others, struck the colors for freedom, on March 25th, which date is recognized as the official beginning of the Revolution. With their forces, these leaders besieged the town of Patras. At the same time Lala, Corinth, Monemvasia, Navarino, Argos, and Nauplion were besieged by the patriots. The revolution was raised in Sterea Hellas by Panourgias at Amphissa, by Thanasis Diakos at Levadia, and by Diouvouniotis at Vouduunita."

Heroism was the order of the day and Diakos' famous words before he was put to death by the Turks resounded throughout Greece: "Better one day of freedom than forty years of slavery. I was born Greek, I will die Greek."

Help came to Greece from The Great Powers—England, France and Russia when all seemed lost—in 1827. Those three European powers had met in London and in a secret treaty agreed that Turkey must be kicked out of Europe. Their fleets were rushed to Greek waters and at a famous naval battle of Navarino, swept the Turkish-Egyptian ships out.

On Sept. 12, 1829, all of central Hellas and the Peloponnesus was free of Turkish forces.

After the woes of the first governments of Greece, Orthon, a Bavarian prince, was chosen by the European powers to reign as King of Greece. The people welcomed him, because he meant peace and Greece was free again.

President Thomas Jefferson gave moral support to the Greek revolution and encouraged the thousands of Philhellene-Americans to help Greece in her plight. Lafayette and Jefferson kept up considerable correspondence on the cause of Greek freedom. Dr. Edward Everett, president of Harvard University, and John Quincy Adams, were great leaders for Greek freedom. Dr. Everett's writings in *The North American Review* were decisive for the cause of Hellas among the American millions.

On Dec. 2, 1822, President James Monroe included the following words in his Message to Congress: "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."

Greece went through the gamut of any young nation—strife and disagreements, and the royal crown was always in danger.

In the late 1800s, the great surge of immigration to America included the Greek people. Poverty was the usual rule, because the land was practically barren for thousands, and the sea provided a living for a few thousands compared to the "great needs." Lowell's mills needed more and more help and at the start of this century, Lowell received thousands of Greeks who found employment in the then textile citadel of America.

Here in Lowell they established the Holy Trinity parish, which is 76 years old this year. The Holy Trinity Byzantine Church, corner Jefferson and Lewis streets, was the first of four Hellenic Orthodox churches and was the center of Hellenism in Lowell.

They established a Greek parochial school—with classes in Greek and English—which was one of the very first day schools among the Greeks in America. Its graduates are among the leaders in various professions, in Lowell and elsewhere.

In 1911, hundreds of Greeks left Lowell to go to Greece to take part in the Greco-Turkish War for the freedom of Northern Greece. They were members of Lowell's Holy Regiment and daily reports were published in *The Sun* on their progress.

Lowell's Greek colony was the first in the land—it was the mother city—the first stop for Greek immigrants. At one time there were 65 coffeehouses, representing just about every big city and state in Hellas. Lowell Hellenes also supported a Repertory Theatre, which presented live Greek plays every Sunday evening at The Playhouse, corner Market and Shattuck streets. The first important chapters of national Greek American organizations were established here—and the Lowell Hellas chapter of Ahepa, for example, is just about the biggest in the land.

The Acre-Acropolis, which included the entire North Common vicinity, was the center of Greek Americans in Lowell, but in the past quarter-century the coming of the North Common Village and the Americanization of the Hellenes of Lowell has resulted in their absorption in all Lowell life. They are no longer a so-called minority. They are part of the mainstream of Lowell living and they participate in all sectors—whether it's as chairman of the board of trustees at Lowell Technological Institute, as members of the board of directors of Union National Bank, executives in utility companies, as entrepreneurs (founders of the DeMoulias super market chain), as civic officials (Mayor

George C. Eliades; Mrs. Ellen A. Sampson, the first woman mayor in Lowell, Councilor Paul Tsongas, etc. etc.)

It is a long way from Athens to Market street, from Mani to Christian Hill, from Kalamaka to Andover street, from Hydra to the Highlands here, from Chios to Chelmsford, Delphi to Dracut, from Thebes to Tewksbury, from Grevena to Groton, but it is natural. Hellenistic civilization nurtured Christianity in its early days—indeed the first Popes were of Greco-Byzantine extraction.

Nothing strange about Hellenism and Americanism. (Indeed, the founding fathers in Philadelphia debated whether or not to make Greek the official language of the United States of America.)

Hellenic and American civilization are intermingled in this cosmopolitan city of ours, just as English, French, Polish, Portuguese, Armenian, Lithuanian, Italian, Lebanese, Jewish and other civilizations are part of the amalgam. The system of American democracy, as envisioned by Philhellene Thomas Jefferson and as expounded by Lincoln Roosevelt, Kennedy and others, keeps us together, particularly at this time when a prolonged war 10,000 miles away seems, at times, to be tearing this beloved nation of all of us apart. Democracy is a Greek word.

And as an American of Greek extraction I can never forget it.

Zhto H Ellas. And Forever America!

OFFICER GLEN P. FISHER

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of our colleagues to an exceptionally moving sermon preached as a eulogy by Father R. Joseph Dooley, of St. Francis Xavier Church in Washington, at the March 15, 1971, funeral of Officer Glen P. Fisher, a Washington Metropolitan policeman murdered recently in performance of his duty.

Father Dooley's sermon reads as follows:

SERMON: OFFICER GLEN P. FISHER, ST. FRANCIS XAVIER CHURCH, MARCH 15, 1971

Recently at a sports event, there was the usual pre-game ceremony, including the playing of our National Anthem and the raising of our flag. I noticed then, as I had at other similar events, the conduct of the crowd which, to me, seemed a microcosm of the American people. Most stood with rapt attention and quiet dignity, observing with pride the few moments dedicated to patriotism. Others seemed restless during the ceremony, and I heard grumblings about "old fashioned patriotism" and the propriety of this ceremony at gatherings of this type. And, of course, there were also the ones who refused to stand or remove their hats and who seemed to take delight in their aggravating conduct and obvious bad taste.

Today, we honor one of the members of that number whom we can call true patriots. One who loved his flag, his country, his city, his job, and his family. To Officer Glen P. Fisher of the Metropolitan Police Department, patriotism was not a momentary emotion, but rather the steady devotion of a lifetime. He put country and his city ahead

of himself. For what other reason would he have stepped into a darkened hallway in an apartment project last Wednesday night and ultimately to his untimely death.

Officer Fisher performed an act of extreme heroism equal to any this city has even seen. He, too, had a dream. He had a zest for life and love for his fellow man. Armed only with a search warrant, issued by the court, he was ruthlessly gunned down by a calculating and cowardly hoodlum. He looked forward to advancement as you do. His goals were set extremely high. What is Heroism? What is Dedication? A young officer deciding to give up his dream so you and I might have ours.

To the people he was dedicated to protect, he was just a "cop." He was 21 years old, an ex-Marine, a Vietnam war veteran with several citations, born and raised in Southeast Washington. Glen Fisher was surrounded by the police-style of living, since his father served on the D.C. Police Force before him. He was a good son and brother, a loving husband and father, and a wonderful Police Officer. He was, in every sense of the word, an outstanding young man—a real credit to his family and community. He was quiet and reflective—but a deep person when you got to know him.

Yet none of the vast majority of silent "fellow citizens," whose burdens and responsibilities he carried, cared very much. He was just a "cop" to them. Not a fellow human being; not a person with normal feelings of pain and pride and anger; not someone who would have preferred a quiet sedate family life—compared to his life as an undercover man. Not a young sorrowing wife's beloved husband. Not even a courageous and unselfish fellow citizen doing his duty, and theirs, to uphold the law.

You know, it is growing more and more difficult to induce young men in this country to enter the field of law enforcement. Why should they?

Read the newspapers. Listen to the radio. Watch television. There is a firmly established group of newscasters and reporters who regularly indoctrinate you with the anti-law enforcement mania of our times. In their subtle, "completely impersonal," but degenerating way, they are chipping away at the very foundation of American democracy. They routinely suggest, and produce alleged "evidence" to prove that policemen represent no one but themselves; that individual officers are sadistic in their treatment of persons accused of crime—who are always "innocent," of course, or "justified" in breaking the law.

"The Heroes" of these monsters of the media are the criminals—because "society made them so." The heroes are "the users", "the pushers", the narcotics peddlers, the rioters, the destructive demonstrators, never the policemen! He is the villain.

It has been said over and over again that ours is a "government of laws and not of men". Yet, no law is self-operative. Enforcement is not inherent in the words of any statute. Men enact our laws. Men interpret and apply them and men enforce them because other men don't obey them.

We are confused by judges who strain to interpret words in our constitution, which, for almost two hundred years, have seemed plain enough; but now are said to have meanings which result in proven criminals being set free on technicalities, when honest citizens are increasingly victimized by crime.

The Honorable Edward M. Curran, Chief Judge, of the U.S. District Court recently stated: "Constitutional rights are proper and necessary, but today we encounter, all too often, cases in which it seems that the concern of some courts is greater for the rights of the criminal than for the rights of society". Justice, is not a matter of expediency.

Yet, despite all these conditions Glen

Fisher, ten short months ago, after serving in Vietnam, joined the Metropolitan Police Department. He entered a profession which he knew involved great hazards and dedication. He did it, I believe, because of his Faith in God.

His untimely death has been a shock to all of us. Your profession, as law-enforcement Officers, is truly a sacred one. You have a religious and sacred responsibility in the performance of your duties. It was this consecration and dedication to the highest ideals of your profession that led Glen Fisher into a remote apartment hallway and his eventual death.

It now remains for each of us to let this tragedy serve to draw us to a higher dedication of our own lives and a willing acceptance of responsibility.

What we are doing today, we should continue to do. Pray for his soul and for his loved ones who have suffered such a loss. Pray that God will find him worthy of the reward for which he lived and worked and prayed. Please God, history will hear us out, that he and men like him who have given their lives in line of duty, have not died in vain. May he rest in peace.

Rev. R. JOSEPH DOOLEY,
Chaplain.

PLAUDITS TO THE ESSEX COUNTY SECTION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the Essex County section of the National Council of Jewish Women has been in the vanguard of establishing day-care programs. A successful day-care center was started by them in Newark, and is now in its second year. The program was one of four pilot programs, and was cosponsored by both the Essex County section of the National Council and the Beth Israel Medical Center.

Much credit for this program goes to Mrs. Leonard Wood, of West Orange, N.J., who had been vice president of community services, as well as to Mrs. Harold Sterling, also of West Orange, who is president of the National Council of Jewish Women Essex County section.

The ladies of this organization have good reason to be proud of their accomplishments.

The following article, which I am inserting in the RECORD, is taken from the New York Times of Wednesday, March 31. It discusses the day-care program established under the auspices of the National Council of Jewish Women.

The article follows:

JEWISH WOMEN EXPANDING CHILD CARE
(By Irving Spiegel)

DETROIT.—What began as a modest effort by a national women's organization to help working mothers has grown into a small network of child care centers throughout the country—and is constantly expanding.

Delegates attending the biennial convention of the National Council of Jewish Women at the Detroit Hilton Hotel, described today in interviews and reports the problems

they met and the satisfactions they derived from participating in their organization's child care program.

In hospitals, abandoned storefronts, buildings and church basements the majority of the council's 100,000 members are engaged in the maintenance of 50 integrated centers in Portland, Ore., Kansas City, Mo., Greensboro, N.C., Washington, New York, Boston, Newark and other cities. They forecast today an expansion to 100 centers.

"We have focused on day care as the most effective and acceptable way for our members to reach into the inner city to aid deprived children and mothers on welfare," remarked Miss Hannah Stein, the council's executive director.

SOME MUNICIPAL AID

The council's women, with some financial aid from local municipalities, defray the expenses in providing hot meals and supplying teachers for the children. The volunteers, through the use of paid experts, also give health and social services to the children.

Delegates reported on child care projects established in hospitals across the country, where the children, for the most part, are children of hospital employees. One delegate said that these projects provided a "naturally integrated group, across socio-economic lines as well as racial lines—the parents run the gamut from kitchen help and orderlies to nurse and doctor."

Miss Stein said that "significantly enough, our centers have in a large measure overcome the shortage of nurses, nurses' aides, laboratory technicians, kitchen and maintenance help which are so vitally needed in our medical institutions."

Miss Stein said, "We feel we are doing something to help the mother who wants to work to do so without neglecting her children."

The council's membership, organized in over 300 sections and units throughout the country, is conducting a nationwide study to describe the means by which young children of working mothers are being cared for and the extent of the need for day care.

The findings will be embodied in a report by Mrs. Mary Keyserling, former head of the women's bureau of the United States Department of Labor.

Speaking here today at a special session, Mrs. Keyserling said that the "future of our children and the future of our society are in jeopardy because of the neglect of millions of children."

In stressing the need for child day care centers, Mrs. Keyserling reported that six million children under the age of 6 have mothers who work and that three million children under the age of 6 live "in poverty."

ERIE COUNTY SESQUICENTENNIAL HONORS EDWARD A. RATH, SR.

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the House the sesquicentennial anniversary of the creation of Erie County, in the State of New York. On this date, 150 years ago—April 2, 1821—Erie County was officially separated from Niagara County. In honor of this event a celebration is being held tomorrow at Buffalo, the county seat, and a county office building, recently construct-

ed, is to be dedicated in memory of the first county executive, Edward A. Rath, Sr. It is a grand event, inspired by the spirit of a people with vital concern for traditional values attaching to their county and their State.

Erie County and Buffalo, the county seat, have had much to do with the major events of American history, from the beginning. In the War of 1812, Buffalo served as a mustering place for troops, and British and American Armies marched and countermarched through the county on numerous occasions. The first steamboat on the Great Lakes, entitled "Walk-on-the-Water" was constructed at Buffalo, in 1819. The Erie Canal, opened in 1825, brought trade and prosperity on a new scale, and manufacturing appeared. Ironworks were soon established, in company with a steam-engine company, grain elevator, stone and holloware factories, a nail factory, a silversmithy, a brass and bell foundry, plants making mirrors and picture frames, porcelain bathtubs, millstones, soap, and candles—and almost every other necessity and extravagance of the period.

In the rapid development of the railroads of the 1850's, Buffalo was expected to lose her position as queen of northern commerce, founded as it was on canal traffic. But this did not occur. Trade with the expanding West grew rapidly during and following the Civil War, and Buffalo became one of the great grain and livestock markets of the world. Attracted by existing markets and established trade routes, the railroad companies converged on Buffalo, which at once became a railroad center. By 1950 it was the second largest railroad center in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that I have taken recent action to keep Buffalo as one of America's leading railroad centers. Our efforts to expand Railpax passenger operations has resulted in tremendous support in the Congress and at the State level and I am optimistic about Buffalo's railroad future.

By the turn of the century, a new economic resource, electricity, was created by the harnessing of Niagara Falls, with a potential of 11 million horsepower available at low rates, and Buffalo industry entered on a new era of expansion. World Wars I and II brought new industries, especially the manufacture of dyes and airplanes. By recent count, the population of Erie County had climbed to a high level of 1,113,000, and, in Buffalo alone, to 463,000.

The astonishing record of Erie County has rendered her a leader in the commerce of the Northeast, almost from the very beginning of her municipal existence. It is a great pleasure to hail that record, and pay my respects to the people of that progressive community.

Mr. Speaker, every dedication ceremony evokes a sympathetic sigh for the honored citizen. Unlike other dedication ceremonies, together we mark tomorrow both a birthday for the county as well

as the worthy achievements of a devoted pioneer in governmental cooperation.

Erie County celebrates its sesquicentennial with a feeling of exuberant pride while together we commemorate the cherished memory of Edward A. Rath, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Rath was born April 17, 1907; died October 28, 1968, and was the son of August W. Rath, a lieutenant in the Buffalo Fire Department. He was educated at Masten Park High School and Hurst Business School.

Although Ed Rath started as an office boy, he went on to own and operate his own successful insurance and real estate company. He was active in municipal and county government before becoming county executive; a post to which he was elected for three terms.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include excerpts from a Buffalo Evening News article concerning Mr. Rath:

Mr. Rath recognized in recent years that the time had come to provide a comprehensive review of metropolitan relations in Erie County. This was reflected in his appointment of the Citizens Committee on Intermunicipal Affairs. He was cautious, but not a standpatter; economical, but not parsimonious; sensitive to criticism, but not afraid of controversy. He will be long remembered among the outstanding leaders and builders of Erie County.

Mr. Speaker, to confront and to solve the challenges of today, every community requires the sincere dedication and the personal sacrifice of inspired leadership. Although the policies and programs of the Federal Government touch upon the lives of every citizen, it is really the local levels of government that must immediately effect the implementation of every goal.

Under the far-sighted direction of Edward A. Rath, Sr., our county government was launched into a new era of collective cooperation and beneficial association with all levels of government, as it does today under B. John Tutuska.

Mr. Speaker, as the first executive to preside over the consolidated county government, Edward A. Rath, Sr., developed this new county government into a model of efficiency and integrity.

So this county office building has been appropriately dedicated to the honored memory of our fellow citizen, and my good friend. The building itself is a spacious, white, and bold symbol of remarkable achievement. It will remain a significant reminder of the past accomplishments and the creative progress of our county under the patient guidance of Edward A. Rath, Sr.

DORN INTRODUCES SPORTS BROADCAST BILL

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and amazed by the blackout on home radio and television for the recent heavy-

weight title fight. This home blackout—while the promoters of the closed circuit broadcast were raking in fantastic profits—has angered many Americans. This was a flagrant abuse of Government-regulated broadcast rights which must be avoided in the future.

The home blackout was a breach of faith with millions of Americans who had purchased TV and radio receivers with the expectation that they would enjoy free home reception of publicly broadcast sporting events.

We now hear threats that future super bowls will be broadcast solely over closed circuit. Conceivably even the great collegiate games such as the Rose Bowl, Sugar Bowl and Cotton Bowl would be blacked-out to home viewers.

Today I join with my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) in introducing legislation aimed at this problem, for this bill would require that broadcast rights for all general interest sporting events be offered first to stations or networks that broadcast without charge to home viewers. This bill would give the right of first refusal to the broadcasters which reach home viewers. This would not deny a fair financial return to promoters, since the various networks would still compete for broadcast rights. But, more important, it would protect the rights of millions of Americans to public interest broadcasting.

A "SICK" AMERICAN SPEAKS OUT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are tired of those who only want to tear down our country and the following remarks by Pat Michaels of radio station KGO, San Francisco, Calif., before the policeman-fireman awards breakfast in Oakland eloquently express this point.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Michaels' remarks in the RECORD:

A "SICK" AMERICAN SPEAKS OUT

I am sick . . . and there are those who claim that ours is a "sick" society. That our country is sick, our government is sick, that we are sick.

Well, maybe they're right. I submit that maybe I am sick . . . and maybe you are too.

I am sick of having policemen ridiculed and called "pigs" while cop killers are hailed as some kind of folk hero.

I am sick of being told that religion is the opiate of the people . . . but marijuana should be legalized.

I am sick of being told that pornography is the right of a free press . . . but freedom of the press does not include being able to read a bible on school grounds.

ANARCHISTS CANONIZED

I am sick of commentators and columnists canonizing anarchists, revolutionists and criminal rapists but condemning law enforcement if it brings such criminals to justice.

I am sick of paying more and more taxes to build schools while I see some faculty members encouraging students to tear them down.

I am sick of Supreme Court decisions which turn criminals loose on society—while other decisions try to take the means of protecting my home and family away.

I am sick of being told policemen are mad dogs who should not have guns—but that criminals who use guns to rob, maim and murder should be understood and helped back into society.

I am sick of being told it is wrong to use napalm to end a war overseas . . . but if it's a bomb or molotov cocktail at home, I must understand the provocations.

I am sick of not being able to take my family to a movie unless I want them exposed to nudity, homosexuality and the glorification of narcotics.

I am sick of pot smoking entertainers deluging me with their condemnation of my moral standards on late night television.

I am sick of riots, marches, protests, demonstrations, confrontations, and the other mob temper tantrums of people intellectually incapable or working within the system.

I am sick of hearing the same phrases, the same slick slogans, the pat patois of people who must chant the same things like zombies because they haven't the capacity for verbalizing thought.

I am sick of reading so-called modern literature with its kinship to what I used to read on the walls of public toilets.

I am sick of those who say I owe them this or that because of the sins of my forefathers—when I have looked down both ends of a gun barrel to defend their rights, their liberties and their families.

I am sick of cynical attitudes toward patriotism. I am sick of politicians with no backbones.

I am sick of permissiveness.

I am sick of the dirty, the foul mouthed, the unwashed.

I am sick of the decline in personal honesty, personal integrity and human sincerity.

And most of all, I am sick of being told I'm sick. And, I'm sick of being told my country is sick—when we have the greatest nation man has ever brought forth on the face of the earth. And fully 50 per cent of the people on the face of this earth would willingly trade places with the most deprived the most underprivileged amongst us.

Yes, I may be sick. But, if I am only sick, I can get well. And, I can help my society get well. And, I can help my country get well.

Take note, you in high places. You will not find me under a placard. You will not see me take to the streets. You will not find me throwing a rock or a bomb. You will not find me ranting to wild eyed mobs.

ANGER AND INDIGNATION

But you will find me at work within my community. You will find me expressing my anger and indignation in letters to your political office.

You will find me canceling my subscription to your periodical the next time it condones criminal acts or advertises filth.

You will find me speaking out in support of those people and those institutions which contribute to the elevation of society and not its destruction. You will find me contributing my time and my personal influence to helping churches, hospitals, charities and those other volunteer backbones of America which have shown the true spirit of this country's determination to ease pain, eliminate hunger and generate brotherhood.

But, most of all, you'll find me at the polling place. There, you'll hear the thunder of the common man. There, you'll see us cast our vote . . . for an America where people

can walk the streets without fear . . . for an America where our children will be educated and not indoctrinated . . . for an America of brotherhood and understanding . . . for an America no longer embarrassed to speak its motto "In God we trust."

TRIBUTE TO VICTOR E. BENSTEAD

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Victor E. Benstead, one of the outstanding citizens of Torrance, Calif., and a 12-year veteran of the city council, passed away on March 15 as a result of a heart attack suffered at his home at the age of 78.

Mr. Benstead was first elected to the Torrance City Council in 1952 and continued to serve until 1964. Prior to his election, he had served on the Torrance Civil Service Commission for 6½ years, including 5 years as chairman.

The city council and citizens of Torrance paid great tribute to the uncompromising service which Victor Benstead gave to his community by naming the municipal swimming pool after him while he was still living. The "Victor E. Benstead Plunge" will continue to keep his name before the community as an example of dedicated service for many years, while providing healthy recreational activities for numerous generations of Torrance residents.

A native Californian, Mr. Benstead had lived in the South Bay area since he was 9 months old and first moved to Torrance in 1921 at the age of 28 just shortly after the city was incorporated. Throughout his adult life, he dedicated himself to service to his community and to progressive improvement of the city.

While serving on the city council, Mr. Benstead adopted as his guiding principle the concept of assuring the greatest benefit to the city and its citizens each time he cast his vote. He often proclaimed that his goal and his creed as a councilman was to "call the decisions as I see them, without any indication from anybody else. I won't be influenced. I won't take orders from anybody."

Throughout his career in business and in public service, Mr. Benstead enjoyed the close support of his wife, Gladys. In addition to his wife, he is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Jane D. Byk and Mrs. Dorothy Banks, both of Torrance; three brothers, George of San Jose, Leo of Escondido, and Merle of Auburn; two sisters, Mrs. May Johnson of Los Angeles and Mrs. Priscilla Reginald of Lancaster. Mr. Benstead is also survived by three grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

The city of Torrance has lost a great and revered civic leader, and I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in a moment of silent tribute to the memory of Victor E. Benstead.

ARMY MEDIA BLITZ, AS SEEN BY
BUCHWALD AND HOPPE

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, two of our foremost humorists, Art Buchwald and Art Hoppe, have found inspiration in the Army's dead-serious campaign to win over young America with a \$10.6 million advertising blitz on television and radio.

Not everybody thinks what the Army is doing is funny, of course, but Messrs. Hoppe and Buchwald manage to point out some of the more ludicrous aspects of this unprecedented blitz.

I personally would prefer that the Army, and all other public agencies, continue to limit their messages to the time that has always been provided without charge by broadcasters for such public service pronouncements.

Once Government becomes a paying customer, the temptation to try to influence program content could be substantially increased.

Be that as it may, both columns make good reading, and I am pleased to include them at this point with my remarks.

JOIN THE ADMEN AND SEE THE ARMY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

As you know, the Army's spending \$10.6 million of our money telling us what a great Army it is and how we ought to join it.

Sixteen advertising agencies bid for the account. The winner came up with such slogans as "Today's Army Wants to Join You" and "The Army Can Take Your Hobby and Turn It into a Career." Plus lots of radio jingles.

One of the losers, it can now be revealed, was Nattering & Snith. This agency was recently cited under the new Truth in Advertising laws for claiming that Old Grandmaw's Bourbon cured athlete's foot, when taken internally.

Being on probation has understandably made Nattering & Snith somewhat nervous when it comes to truth in advertising. Unfortunately, this affected the agency's proposed campaign for the Army.

Scene: The Pentagon offices of Gen. Sydney (Old Blood 'n' Guts) Zapp, one of the toughest campaigners in the Army Advertising Corps. Enter Nattering & Snith, bearing portfolios.

Nattering: I think we've put together just what you want, general. See? Here's this sexy babe with a come-hither look and the slogan on which we center the whole campaign: "Hey, There, Killer, You Want the Army"

Gen. Zapp (surprised): Killer?

Snith: Right! We appeal to the killer instinct. You'll get the kind of recruits you want—instinctive killers.

The general (frowning): Look here, boys, I've served in a hundred campaigns and never once did we use words like "kill," "killer" or "killed."

Nattering: Granted. But that was before the FTC started cracking down on truth in advertising. The truth is, general, that the prime function of any army is to kill people when the need arises—the more the better.

Snith (eagerly): Listen to this jingle we've whipped up, sir. We'll get the Andrews Sisters to sing it:

"It's so thrilling,
So spine-chilling,
So deeply self-fulfilling
To legally go killing—
Join today's killer Army today!"

Nattering (pouring it on): Or this, general:

"Get yourself some bullets,
Get yourself a gun,
Join our killer Army
For unrestricted fun"

The General (angrily): Now, hold on! We're thinking more along the lines of educational opportunity. A slogan like: "The Army Can Take Your Hobby and Turn It into a Career!"

Snith: Right! We've got a 30-second TV spot. Shows this Jack-the-Ripper type with a big knife prowling these dark alleys. Then we hit 'em with your slogan: "The Army Can Take Your Hobby and . . ."

The general (furious): Look, you bone-heads. You can't mention killing. It puts the notion in any potential recruit's head that he just might get killed.

Nattering: Oh, we've given that a lot of thought, general. We figure the only way you can get this 10.6 million campaign past the FTC is to put a simple disclaimer in every ad.

The General: What disclaimer?

Nattering & Snith (together): "Caution: Joining the Army May Be Hazardous to Your Health."

So it's little wonder Nattering & Snith lost the account to N. W. Ayer and Son. The latter's winning campaign suggests that the Army is a lovely place to learn all about woodworking, bird photography and stuff like that.

All that remains to be seen is what the FTC is going to do about it.

SELLING OF THE MILITARY—BY TELEVISION
ADVERTISING

(By Art Buchwald)

The Army has launched a \$10.6 million TV and radio recruiting campaign. As the Wall Street Journal indicated, this could make the U.S. Army one of the biggest prime-time advertisers on television.

The announcement has the U.S. Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force boiling mad, as they are dependent on the networks for showing their commercials gratis, usually at one o'clock in the morning, just before they play the Star-Spangled Banner.

It has to follow that the Navy and Air Force will soon have advertising budgets as well, and pretty soon we'll have an advertising war on TV the likes of which we haven't seen since the soap companies added enzymes to their phosphates.

Since Madison Avenue now plays such a large part in electing our politicians, it's only right that they have a say about our defense.

I can just see the advertising agency making a pitch for the U.S. Air Force account.

"General, the Army is selling education, the Navy's selling travel and the Marine Corps is selling patriotism. We have to come up with something else."

"But what is left?" a four-star general in charge of advertising asks.

The agency man holds up a large poster: "Get High in the Air Force."

The general says, "Are you sure that will attract young aviators?"

"That's just the opener, general. Here's the idea for a commercial. We show a dogface in a muddy foxhole eating a can of corned beef. Then we show a sailor swabbing down the deck of an aircraft carrier all by himself. Then we cut to a Marine, shoulder-deep in water, coming out on the beach, and then show an Air Force officer.

"Flying a plane?" the general asks.

"No, dammit. He's walking down Sunset Boulevard with a girl on each arm. The voice-over says, 'If you like corned beef, join the Army. If you like mopping decks, sign up with the Navy. If you enjoy walking in water with a full pack, join the Marines.'

"Then we pan to the two girls again, and the voice says, 'The Air Force has a better idea.'

"Isn't that a little blatant?" the general asks.

"General, you run your bombing missions and let me run my advertising campaigns."

"I don't know," the general says. "The Army may not like it."

"Does Hertz like Avis? Does Crest like Colgate? Does Pepto-Bismol like Alka Seltzer? General, this isn't war we're talking about now. This is serious business. All right, so you don't like that commercial what about this one?"

"We show a mother holding her head. Her 18-year-old son comes in with a transistor radio blaring out rock music. The mother shouts, 'Will you turn that radio off!' Her friend from next door walks in. 'Clara, you're nervous and short-tempered. Here is what you need.' She hands her a folder, and we zoom in on it. It says on the cover, 'If your children give you a headache, make them join the Air Force.'"

The general says, "Holy smokes, that a bit rough."

The agency man says, "What do you want, good armen or good taste?"

"Well, I guess you know your business," the general says.

"Now, I've got a surprise for you. I've come up with a slogan that will knock 'em dead. Are you ready?"

The agency man takes out a large poster, flips it over and printed in large letters over a B-52 airplane are the words: "From the people who gave you a clean hydrogen bomb."

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, once again I want to pay tribute to the many brave Byelorussians who continue to strive for the restoration of freedom for their homeland. Just last week these dedicated people celebrated that one brief moment in 1918 when the Byelorussian National Council declared independence, ending nearly 3½ centuries of foreign domination. The Byelorussians were only able to enjoy their freedom for a few short months before their sovereignty was crushed, as happened to many sister nations, by the fist of the Red Army.

Today, the Byelorussian people live under a Communist regime imposed upon them by the Soviet Union.

Throughout their history, the Byelorussian people have transmitted from generation to generation their national identity, their cultural identity, and more important, the knowledge of what it is to be free and the desire for this freedom.

History has proved that no dictatorship has ever succeeded in holding a people in bondage forever. The time will

come once again when the Byelorussians will live in a free nation. Until that time, I can assure Americans of Byelorussian descent that America will not forget their plight and that we will continue to support and pray for that moment in history when justice and freedom reign and the people of Byelorussia again have their independence.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for many of us in Congress to comprehend the paradox which now exists in this country: despite massive unmet needs in our urban and rural areas, millions of Americans are without work. The irony is that while we have the resources, the problems remain unsolved. As our parks and recreation areas deteriorate, thousands of men stand idle in the Puget Sound area; as the housing shortage becomes critical, hundreds of skilled technicians and engineers join the welfare rolls.

On the day when the other body is scheduled to consider S. 31 to provide temporary public service employment, the Washington Post stressed that the unemployment crisis "calls for emergency help from the Federal Government. Congress ought to furnish it without delay." I have introduced H.R. 3613, similar in effect to S. 31. The Select Subcommittee on Labor after 5 days of hearings will soon take up this legislation in executive session. I urge all of my colleagues to study the concept of public service employment as an emergency measure which requires our immediate attention.

The text of the editorial follows:

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

The Senate is scheduled today to take up an emergency measure designed to put some \$150,000 unemployed persons to work in vital state and municipal public jobs. The bill is cosponsored by 34 senators and endorsed by the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties and a good many other estimable public bodies. Every consideration of logic and necessity seems to support it as well.

Two parallel developments that have taken place in almost every major city of the country dictate emergency action. One is a sharp rise in unemployment which has created a crisis for hundreds of thousands of urban families. The other is a drop in the revenues available to city governments resulting in a drastic cutback of vital municipal services; and this operates, of course, to aggravate the hardships suffered by the unemployed. Fund shortages have resulted in unfilled jobs in the face of eager but idle workers. Mayor D'Alesandro of Baltimore summed it all up graphically enough in testimony recently before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

The jobs are there in Baltimore. Our probation officers are handling the highest workloads in the history of the administration of justice in our city. We have a municipal

hospital, one of the finest in the country, yet the amount of registered nurses, the amount of nurses' aides that are servicing the various floors are at a minimum. We pride ourselves on being the showcase in urban renewal and housing and redevelopment; yet in the conservation areas we cannot move beyond the central business district or the little neighborhoods that serve as the core around it, because of lack of inspectors. The Civil Service Commission has waiting rolls of competent, eligible people who can fill the jobs. The work is there. The jobs are there. We have the plans. We don't have the financial resources to follow through.

Mayor after mayor came before the committee to report the same paradox. County Executive John Spellman of King County, Washington, said: "The displacement which has occurred in the Puget Sound area leaves us with the worst national resource waste in our nation's history. Talented men and women, superbly trained, highly productive, with a desire to work and to contribute to the nation's economy, sit idle."

The Emergency Employment Act would put many of these people to work by funding public service employment programs in such fields as environmental quality, health care, public safety, education, transportation, recreation, maintenance of parks, streets and other public facilities, conservation, beautification and other aspects of community improvement. It would authorize appropriations up to \$750 million through June 30, 1972, and a billion dollars for fiscal year 1973 to be provided on a sliding scale based upon the national rate of unemployment.

Last December, President Nixon vetoed an Employment and Manpower Act which embodied a permanent public service employment program. The proposal before the Senate today is temporary in character, with no more than a two-year duration; but the administration is opposed to it anyway, asking Congress instead to take up its Manpower Revenue Sharing bill. Whatever the merits of revenue sharing, its highly controversial character makes it unlikely to win congressional approval in time to be of much service to the crisis-pressed cities or to the hundreds of thousands of city-dwellers now out of work. The emergency calls for emergency help from the federal government. Congress ought to furnish it without delay.

TRIBUTE TO MADISON FAY BOYCE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of Madison Fay Boyce, chief bill clerk of the House of Representatives, who passed away Tuesday last.

Madison Fay Boyce was a fine gentleman, a patriotic American and a sincere and dedicated servant of the House. He began his public service career in 1950 in the bill clerk's office and rose to the responsible position of chief bill clerk which he held until his untimely passing. He served well and faithfully.

Madison Boyce was genial, personable, and able, and will be greatly missed. I want to take this means of extending to

Mrs. Boyce and other members of the family an expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

LAND USE IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, we all are aware of the great debate going on over land use in the United States.

Because I believe that we must all understand this important subject and problem fully, I hereby place in the Record an address delivered by Mr. Alvin E. Gershen, of New Jersey, at a recent joint meeting of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities and the New Jersey Federation of Planning Officials.

Mr. Gershen is an expert in the fields of municipal planning, urban renewal, housing, and engineering. Mr. Gershen's address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY ALVIN E. GERSHEN

We meet here today to discuss an idea—the idea that sensible, responsible, and reasonable men can work out a pattern for living together in the most crowded state in the nation.

It is an idea whose time has come, not because we are idealists who want to do the right thing but because we are realists and have to do what must be done.

We have reached the point where we need, in a very real sense, land reform. And if we do not work it out through legislation it will be imposed on us by judicial fiat—and falling that by the outrage and the need of people.

The people need land. Land to live on and raise families. Land to walk on, play on and enjoy. Land to work on.

And we are not giving it to them—or at least not enough of them. And we thus deny them homes and jobs and demean the quality of their lives. You know and I know that people won't stand for this forever.

So let us talk about New Jersey Senate Bill 803, the controversial and much misunderstood Land Use Development Act.

Let me begin by saying I think the principles embodied in S-803 will make good legislation. The bill is far from perfect technically and far from adequate in terms of today's problems. But thoughtful, useful and most important, necessary. And hopefully, politically saleable. Passage of a bill embodying these principles won't end our land problems. Mainly, it will symbolize our recognition that we are beginning to know the problems for what they are.

And what will a bill like this do?

It will codify a maze of zoning and planning case law and fragmented statutes.

It will come to grips with very real, and I am afraid, frequent conflicts of interest.

It will give individuals in a community the legal standing to protest when they are victimized by a zoning decision in a neighboring community.

It will protect the State's interest in its own capital developments.

It will help preserve districts with historical or architectural values worth preserving.

It will encourage central review of municipal master plans.

And finally, it would outlaw discriminating zoning practices. It will stop the use of zoning as a technique to exclude any economic, racial, religious or ethnic group.

Let's look at these points one by one and ask ourselves whether we really need a bill like S-803, or more to the point, do we need a new way, or a better way, of controlling and distributing our land.

New Jersey's basic law for zoning standards was written in 1928. Our planning law is 16 years old. To both of these have been attached a bewildering array of amendments and case law. Codification is clearly in order.

The conflicts of interest? You in local government know such conflicts exist and you know that public confidence in zoning decisions is shaky. It is time we did something about it.

And protection from a neighboring community's zoning sins? Should Town B simply have to sit and take it when Town A decides to build all its apartments on B's border and let B take care of the traffic? Should there not be redress for a homeowner in one town who is suddenly confronted with an all-night doughnut stand or drive-in movie across the street because the other town has zoned an area from residential to commercial?

Don't you think that municipalities have a responsibility to talk things out with their neighbors before authorizing changes that greatly affect each other.

And the State land?

Under current law, the State of New Jersey doesn't have many of the powers of even the smallest municipality. Why shouldn't the State be empowered to create a land bank, to buy up land for future highway, recreation, airport or institutional use? And why shouldn't those purchases be protected?

New Jersey is becoming a land-poor state and the value of real estate is increasing much faster than other costs. Are we to continue indefinitely paying double or triple the cost for state lands because we were forced to wait until land is specifically designated? The State has wasted many millions of dollars in this manner and the money comes from taxes paid by your constituents.

And do we not need badly a method of coordinating state land purchases? You local officials know the value of sound municipal planning. It is abundantly clear that the State, too, needs sound and coordinated planning. That purchases be coordinated. That the future of State facilities be protected. That municipalities not be given carte-blanche to make zoning or planning decisions that compromise state investment.

State property belongs to all New Jerseyans. They are entitled to protection of their investment. The people deserve to pay only a fair price for their purchases. They should not be subjected to skyrocketing costs when this can be avoided.

But there is more at stake here for all of us than the practical benefits that S-803 will bring. The Land Use and Development Act is as much a declaration of principle as a vehicle for progress.

We must either make up our minds to use wisely the land that is left to us or face consequences that can only be tragic.

We have abused the land over the last 50 years and abused it badly. We and those who went before us have allowed our cities to degenerate, our mass transit to collapse, our highway system to fall far short of needs.

We have fouled our streams and our air. We have built huge and uncoordinated housing developments, sometimes smack in the middle of flood plains. And we have proved in the process that our present zon-

ing and planning system is not enough to protect us from ourselves.

The northeast quadrant of New Jersey may never regain the open space and the natural beauty that was once there. The undeveloped southern regions are booming and we threaten to make the same mistakes there.

An ancillary problem, but one soluble by S-803, is the problem of taxes. For too many years we ignored them and resisted broad-based taxation and the pressures on the real estate levy have resulted in a regressive, ruinous tax structure and a fierce opposition to any kind of new taxes from over-burdened homeowners.

Many of these problems stem from our own success. This state has grown tremendously since World War II. And the rate has been such that our services cannot keep pace with it.

But this is an explanation, not an excuse. The population of this state, if left unchecked, can double every half-century for the foreseeable future, and the growth that went before will be as nothing to the growth that is to come.

More people, more industry, more schools, more jobs, more cars, more demand for water—and above all more demand for land.

Do we say to each other, "Well things are pretty good in my town—we don't need somebody else's problems."

Or do we recognize the obvious—that somebody else's problem is our problem? Do we finally come to know that we are all New Jerseyans, all Americans. All men.

Do we come together and work out a plan for the future or do we fall one by one, like a row of dominoes?

The history of this century is filled with revolutions—in Russia, in Mexico, in Cuba, in scores of Latin American and Asian and now African nations.

And why? Because the distribution of land, and hence, wealth, was badly out of balance.

Now, I am not suggesting that there is any immediate threat of bands of armed men seizing the State House. But the events of the Summer of 1967 were in large part triggered by the simple fact that in our cities too many people live too close together in too small an area too far away from job and recreational opportunities.

Let me read to you from the report of the Governor's Select Commission on Civil Disorders:

"Some Commissioners believe . . . that the very structure of municipal government in New Jersey, with revenue raising, zoning and planning functions fragmented among 567 municipalities and 578 school districts, is the largest contributing factor to the urban problems outlined in this report. They believe that the power of local municipalities to adopt restrictive land use powers, which exclude lower income people while attracting industrial and commercial rates, contributes substantially, not only to the inability of the older cities to finance essential services but also to the steady increase of segregated urban housing and education. In their view, consolidation of municipalities and school districts, and regionalized zoning and planning are the essential first steps toward any permanent relief of these parallel sources of urban tension.

"They fear that if legislative action is not taken to break down these legally-condoned barriers which have largely confined the Negro to the older cities, these centers of segregation will, despite well-intentioned remedial action, become increasingly ungovernable. They recommend legislation, granting state financial incentives to encourage consolidation of municipalities and school districts, and requiring regional control over zoning and planning."

You know the caliber of the men who served on that commission. They are not radicals. They are not the kind of men who make rash judgments. They simply had come to realize first-hand the scope of the problems facing this state. And they are fearful of what might happen to all of us if we don't move soon to come to grips with them.

It is my personal belief that the courts will force us into the elimination of restrictive zoning if we don't agree to it by legislation. There are legal challenges underway to the right of states to permit local zoning. One plaintiff contends that the 14th Amendment's equal protection clause is violated when the wealthy, by creating large-lot and large building requirements, seal themselves off.

Let's face up to the new employment patterns. For every new job that is created in a city, four to eight are created in the suburbs. People need jobs and they need homes close to those jobs. The jobs are in the suburbs and so the suburbs have to create the kind of housing that blue-collar and office workers can afford.

This is not a concept held only by black radicals or the liberal community, but by thoughtful people of every political hue. Employers need a pool of workers close to their businesses and industries.

The Nixon Administration has made it increasingly clear that it is aware of the need for more low-income housing.

In a recent New York speech, Harold Finger, a Housing and Urban Development assistant secretary, said this:

"It will not be enough for municipalities to simply pass open housing ordinances. . . . And it is not enough to change the zoning ordinances to permit a designated or floating area for low and moderate income families. We all must work to assure that housing is actually built in quantities needed and at prices that all of our people can afford."

And there are alliances being formed that 10 years ago few of us would have envisioned.

Thus we have the New Jersey Homebuilders Association and the National Committee Against Discrimination jointly sponsoring a conference in Somerville this month.

Its purpose? To bring an end to what one speaker called "selfish sovereignty."

Most of you are familiar with some of the more extreme arguments against this bill—that it would set up state zoning under a czar, that local zoning powers would be deeply eroded, that every municipality would be forced to provide low-income housing.

You are all fair-minded men and you know that these arguments are inaccurate and misleading.

S-803, as I said earlier, is an idea, and an idea based really on an old American dream—that a nation is composed of communities in which people of all nationalities and all economic standards can live together in relative harmony. I believe that if a community wants to practice these ideals the proposed legislation insures even-handedness in their application.

If we are to continue a pattern of relative affluence and well-being in the suburbs and poverty and disorder in our cities, if we are to admit to our communities as neighbors only those whose standard and style of living is equal to our own—then we made that dream a myth—and worse, a lie.

I don't think we can afford to let that happen. And I don't believe that you think so either. So let us begin with S-803 as an idea. It can be debated and amended and reshaped and rethought.

But we can't let its central theme get away from us.

In the end, the land is all we have. And we will never get any more. We dare not

waste any more land, or any more time, or any more opportunities to do the wise and the right thing.

Our time has come, too. It is a time to think. A time to act. A time not to fail.

CBS DOCUMENTARIES

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert two articles which complement each other in that they both detail distortions and inaccuracies utilized by CBS in producing documentaries supposedly designed to inform the American people.

The first article, which will appear in the forthcoming April issue of Air Force magazine, deals with the attempt to heighten public antipathy toward our Defense Establishment through the presentation of the documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon." Air Force & Space Digest Senior Editor Claude Witze does a fine job of dissecting the CBS dissemblers modus operandi for producing a doctored documentary.

The second piece is a portion of an investigation authorized by the House Committee on Appropriations into a previous CBS agit-prop effort entitled "Hunger U.S.A." which was aired nationwide in 1968. A reading of the excerpts from this report, which appeared in the Department of Agriculture appropriations hearings for 1970, part 5, pages 53 to 74, reveals that the type of misrepresentation restorted to by CBS in "The Selling of the Pentagon" is nothing new.

It is interesting to note that both "The Selling of the Pentagon" and "Hunger in America" were written and directed by the same two men, Mr. Peter Davis and Mr. Perry Wolff.

The damage done to a correct public understanding by deceptive documentaries of this type cannot be underestimated. As Strausz-Hupé and Possony have pointed out in their authoritative work "International Relations":

It is a popular and comforting supposition that a more or less intelligent person should be able to distinguish between truths and falsehoods. Unfortunately, there are very few people able to do so. This fact indicates a glaring weakness in our educational system. This weakness is, briefly, that the critical mind is not being developed and that, while facts are being presented, their interrelationship is rarely properly underscored; not to speak of dubious criteria for the selection of facts. The greatest danger is, as the modern sciences of general semantics and phenomenology attempt to show, that wrong methods of thinking are being taught and continuously applied. Discussion of this subject is not within the scope of this book, yet it may be pointed out that the main faults of our habitual thinking include the failure to demand sufficiency of cause, *i.e.*, that any explanation given is really valid, and that the cause indicated really explains the *entire* effect, while the effects should not be reduced to one inadequate cause; second, in-

adequate abstraction, consisting mainly in the omission of elements essential to comprehensive analysis; third, disregard of the time element; fourth, improper identification, *i.e.*, things are identified with each other which are by no means identical. *International Relations*, "Cold War Techniques II: Propaganda" page 383.

Since 1950, when this book was written, the educational system has greatly deteriorated.

Nevertheless, it is to be hoped that the next time a CBS documentary comes over the public air waves more people will be aware that gross misrepresentation of the subject matter being treated is not outside the realm of possibility.

The articles follow:

THE WAYWARD PRESS (TUBE DIVISION)

(NOTE.—Following is the complete text of the column "Airpower in the News," by Senior Editor Claude Witze, as it will appear in the forthcoming April 1971 issue of Air Force Magazine, the publication of the Air Force Association.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 15, 1971.—The winter issue of the *Columbia Journalism Review*, a quarterly published at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, is devoted almost entirely to a study of how the press has performed in covering the war in Vietnam. The only possible conclusion a reader of these eight essays can reach is that the press has done a deplorable job. No matter what epithets you might want to hurl at the political administrations in Washington and Saigon, at the military hierarchy, at the military-industrial complex, and at the doves or the hawks, even more heated epithets could justifiably be thrown at the purveyors of ink and electronic signals.

There is one examination of television's performance, written by Fred W. Friendly, a former president of CBS News, who indulges in a bit of self-flagellation, confessing that the "news media, and particularly broadcast journalism" must share the responsibility for public misunderstanding of the situation in Indochina. Speaking of the years when he, Friendly, was the man in charge at CBS, he says, "The mistakes we made in 1964 and 1965 almost outran those of the statesmen."

One thing missing from Mr. Friendly's recitation is any suggestion that the television medium lends itself in a peculiar way to distortion of fact. This reporter has nearly forty years of experience on newspapers and magazines, including more than a decade operating from the copy desk of a metropolitan daily. Television news was born and brought up within that same forty-year period. I have watched it closely and confess that I never was impressed by its impact until Lee Harvey Oswald was murdered on camera. No newspaper or magazine ever will duplicate that 1963 performance in Dallas. Yet, if I saw it today, I would demand confirmation that the event took place at all and that what we saw on the tube was not a clever compilation of film clips, snipped from a wide variety of source material and glued together to make a visual product that could be marketed to some huckster of toothpaste or gasoline, and then turn out to be a winner of the Peabody Award.

In support of this professional skepticism, we have the performance of Mr. Friendly's own CBS on February 23. The program was billed as a "News Special" and was called "The Selling of the Pentagon." It ran for one hour, with commercials, and featured a recitation of the script by CBS's charismatic Roger Mudd. Mr. Mudd did not write the script; he was burdened with it. The show's

producer works in New York. He is reported to be thirty-four-year-old Peter Davis, who says he and his staff spent ten months working on this "documentary." Mr. Davis does not appear to make any claim to objectivity in his work. He is making a charge: that the Department of Defense spends a vast amount of money on propaganda designed to win public approval of its programs. Armed with cameras, scissors, and cement, he proceeded to make his case.

This magazine has neither the space nor the desire to do a detailed critique of "The Selling of the Pentagon," but we have examined enough of it to demonstrate that it leaves CBS with a credibility gap wider than the canyons at Rockefeller Center. Here is an example:

At one point, early in the script, Mr. Mudd, the narrator, transitions to a new sequence in Mr. Davis' portrayal with a paragraph of four sentences. We will examine the sentences one at a time:

Mudd: "The Pentagon has a team of colonels touring the country to lecture on foreign policy."

The team to which he refers comes from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF), with headquarters here in Washington. There are four colonels on the team—two from the Army and one each from the Air Force and the Marine Corps. There is also a Navy captain, and, totally ignored by CBS, a foreign-service officer from the State Department. They are not "touring the country." They have a briefing on national-security policy that is given seven times a year, no more and no less. ICAF is not mentioned in the CBS script, and there is no reference to the mission of the college. A TV cameraman who visited the school could easily take a picture in the lobby of a wall inscription that says:

"Our liberties rest with our people, upon the scope and depth of their understanding of the nation's spiritual, political, military, and economic realities. It is the high mission of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces to develop such understanding among our people and their military and civilian leaders."

The quote is attributed to Dwight D. Eisenhower, who spoke those words at the dedication of the college in 1960. He understood the requirement, perhaps more clearly than any other man in our history.

The ICAF national-security policy briefing is designed for the education of Reserve officers from all branches of the armed forces, not primarily for the general public. The reason the team, including the State Department officer, gives it in seven locations each year is to reduce travel expenses by eliminating the necessity for Reserve officers to visit the college. None of this was explained by CBS.

Mudd: "We found them [the ICAF team] in Peoria, Ill., where they were invited to speak to a mixed audience of civilians and military Reservists."

Here we have a use of the word "found" that would not be permitted by a competent newspaper copy editor. CBS was told that Peoria was on the schedule, and the CBS camera crew spent three days at the seminar in that city with the concurrence and cooperation of the Defense Department, the ICAF, and the Peoria Association of Commerce. Before departing, CBS was given full information on the curriculum, the scheduling, the military and civilian participation, the costs, and the funding. The Association of Commerce was the sponsor, in this case, and was permitted to establish the rules under which civilians were admitted. Their seminar, billed in Peoria as the "World Affairs Forum"—a label not mentioned by CBS—covered all aspects of national-security.

city affairs. That includes economics, resources, technology, social problems, and military affairs, as well as foreign policy.

Mudd: "The invitation [to Peoria] was arranged by Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Co., which did \$39 million of business last year with the Defense Department."

The Peoria seminar was not arranged by the Caterpillar Tractor Co. It was arranged by the city's Association of Commerce, which provided the auditorium and other facilities. The Association has no defense contracts. A spokesman for the Association, contacted by this reporter, said his group shared the sponsorship with the 9th Naval District. There were two chairmen for the meeting. The civilian chairman was Charles B. Leber, who in his business life is an officer of the Caterpillar Tractor Co. The military chairman was Capt. Paul Haberkorn, USNR. He is the owner and operator of Peoria's Ace Hardware Store. The hardware store also has no defense contracts, which probably explains why it failed to get a mention on the CBS show.

Mudd: "The Army has a regulation stating: 'Personnel should not speak on the foreign-policy implications of the US involvement in Vietnam.'"

The ICAF team, consisting of five military officers and a State Department officer, does not speak on the foreign-policy implications of our involvement in Vietnam, which would be in violation of Army regulations. The regulations governing ICAF say the material used must be cleared for accuracy, propriety, and consistency with official policy. Both the State Department and the Defense Department have a hand in this routine clearance of all ICAF presentations.

In the CBS show, the camera moves from Mr. Mudd, following his recitation of the above inaccuracies, to one of the lecturers at Peoria. CBS does not identify the speaker in this paste-together of film clips, but he is Col. John A. MacNeil of the US Marines, a veteran of World War II and Vietnam. If the TV audience sensed that the next five sentences, out of the mouth of Colonel MacNeil, sounded somewhat disjointed, there was good reason for it. They came from four different spots in the camera record, and the sequence was rearranged to suit the somewhat warped taste of producer Davis. Sentence by sentence, the quotes go like this:

MACNEIL: "Well, now we're coming to the heart of the problem, Vietnam."

This appears on page fifty-five of the prepared, and approved, text of the briefing. Next sentence:

MACNEIL: "Now, the Chinese have clearly and repeatedly stated that Thailand is next on their list after Vietnam."

That one was cut out of what the Colonel was saying back when he was on page thirty-six and discussing an entirely different aspect of the presentation. Then:

MACNEIL: "If South Vietnam becomes Communist, it will be difficult for Laos to exist. The same goes for Cambodia and the other countries of Southeast Asia."

This is found on page forty-eight of the script. What is most important is that the statement was not original with Colonel MacNeil or the drafters of the briefing. It is a quotation. The CBS scissors-and-paste wizard deleted the attribution. Colonel MacNeil made it clear, in the words immediately preceding the above sentences, that he was quoting Souvanna Phouma, the Prime Minister of Laos. In other words, Souvanna Phouma said it: CBS distorted the film to make its viewers think Colonel MacNeil said it. It is the kind of journalistic dishonesty that a reputable newspaper would not tolerate. Many reporters have been fired for lesser indiscretions.

MACNEIL: "So, I think if the Communists were to win in South Vietnam, the record in

the North, what happened in Tet of '68 makes it clear that there would be a bloodbath in store for a lot of the population of the South."

To get this one, the CBS film clipper searched deeper into his filmed record. In the prepared script of the ICAF team, it appears on page seventy-three.

It is easy to see how this technique can be used to make a man say almost anything you want him to say. Once the right words are on tape, they can be rearranged, and were by CBS in this instance, to make a presentation sound inept, stupid, wrong, vicious, or to reach any conclusion that the film clipper wants to get across to his audience. What the speaker actually put onto the sound track cannot be recognized.

Another example of this in "The Selling of the Pentagon" comes out of Roger Mudd's interview with Daniel Z. Henkin, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Two minutes and four seconds of the interview were used out of forty-two minutes of filmed conversation. Here is one breakdown:

Mudd: "What about your public displays of military equipment at state fairs and shopping centers? What purpose does that serve?"

Now, this is not easy to explain, but there are two answers to that question from Mr. Henkin. One is his real answer and the other is the answer concocted by the CBS cutting room from the available tape. TV viewers only know the answer CBS put together. We will give you both.

Here is the answer from the transcript of the Mudd broadcast:

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

If the TV viewers thought that was a bit disjointed for a reply, and, more important, that it did not answer the question about displays at fairs and shopping centers, it was not Mr. Henkin's fault, because—except for the first sentence—that was not his answer to the question. In the transcript of the interview, the real answer appears, most of which ended up on the CBS cutting-room floor:

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

This reply, the real one, of course makes sense and is responsive to the question. The producer of "The Selling of the Pentagon," however, was less interested in responsive answers that made sense than he was in portraying Mr. Henkin as a bureaucratic buffoon. The Secretary, incidentally, is himself an experienced and sophisticated reporter of military affairs but can be portrayed otherwise with the television technique of clipping what amounts to a phony reply from his answer to another question. And the other question, TV viewers did not know, also ended up on the cutting-room floor.

It is not necessary to labor the point, al-

though there are several other instances. Mr. Henkin, in a letter to F. Edward Hébert, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said that after spending his life in the news profession he "could not be pleased by the fact that the program's producer [Mr. Davis] chose to rearrange my words. . . ."

Congressman Hébert himself stars in "The Selling of the Pentagon." He also is a former newspaperman and stands completely shaken by this experience with television, although he had been quoted earlier as considering network TV "the most vicious instrument in America today."

That opinion appears to have been reinforced. Lou G. Burnett, who is Mr. Hébert's press aide, testifies that he was contacted early in the CBS effort by one James Bronson of the network's New York office. Mr. Bronson said CBS was planning to do a documentary on the prisoner-of-war situation. He said the show would explore the plight of the POW and his family. He was seeking film clips that might contribute to this exercise. Mr. Burnett responded with alacrity because he knows his boss is deeply interested in the problem and eager to help the POW families. In New Orleans, he knew, station WWL-TV had a film clip from an old "Congressional Report" program, in which the Congressman had interviewed Maj. James Rowe, a former POW. The interview was in the form of a report to Mr. Hébert's constituents. Mr. Burnett, Mr. Hébert's press aide, had the film shipped from New Orleans to New York and helped CBS's Mr. Bronson round up other films dealing with the POW problem. The Hébert clip wound up in "The Selling of the Pentagon" and was offered as an example of how "sympathetic congressmen" are used by the Pentagon "to counter what it regards as the antimilitary tilt of network reporting."

Mr. Hébert's ire, it should be suggested, was aroused more by his depiction as a patsy for the Defense Department than it was by the misrepresentations used to obtain the film. The chairman is, of course, proud of his reputation as a stern critic of military transgressions wherever they occur. In many years as an inquisitor for the House Armed Services Committee, he has never been accused of being unfair, but often accused of being tough. From the time of his famous "Chamber of Horrors," which depicted military procurement waste and had officers squirming at their desks, to the most recent congressional inquiry into the My Lai incident, he has been one of the Pentagon's most uncomfortable hair shirts.

Mr. Henkin's office estimates that it expended 640 man-hours of labor assisting CBS in the production of "The Selling of the Pentagon." No reasonable request for help was denied. CBS reimbursed the government for the cost of one guard and one electrician employed during photography one day in the Pentagon.

Out of this day's effort came a short clip of a news briefing that was deemed suitable by CBS for inclusion in "The Selling of the Pentagon." The CBS crew filmed an entire DoD press briefing, at which Jerry W. Friedheim, a deputy to Mr. Henkin, responded to routine queries from the Pentagon's regular press corps. During the session, the reporters asked thirty-four questions. Thirty-one of them brought replies from Mr. Friedheim. In three cases, he was unable to be responsive. As the film was edited for broadcast, CBS used six of the thirty-four questions, including, of course, all three of the ones that could not be answered. Why couldn't they be answered? In one example, used by CBS, Mr. Friedheim was asked about the size of some warheads. He said he had nothing to give out on that. If he did have something, and gave it out, he could go to jail.

There are a number of small factual errors in the CBS script that represent nothing more than sloppy reporting. For example, narrator Mudd has a line referring to "30,000 Pentagon offices." There are only a few more than 26,000 persons employed in the Pentagon, all but the top executives sharing an office with many other people. An educated guess is that there may be 5,000 offices in the building.

One interesting fact, denied to viewers of "The Selling of the Pentagon" by CBS editors, is the origin of a clip introduced by Mr. Mudd as "an excerpt from a film called 'Road to the Wall' [in which] the Pentagon has James Cagney tell of a Communist plan that encompasses even more than the world." The excerpt was shown. What CBS did not disclose is that "The Road to the Wall" was produced by CBS itself in 1962 and that James Cagney was the CBS choice as star of the picture. Also, that CBS was paid about \$100,000 of the taxpayers' money to turn out the picture. At the time, CBS Films said in a press release from its offices—on Madison Avenue, of all places—that the picture would be "an historical treatment of the Communist Party in operation throughout the world—its doctrine, its pronouncements." In 1962 CBS was far from derisive about the project and was proud that "it will be distributed for showing at all military bases inside and outside the USA and will be backed with pamphlets, posters, and other informational material on communism."

Once all the facts about "The Selling of the Pentagon" are on the record, and someone has examined the clips on the cutting-room floor, it will be interesting to find out what Fred Friendly will write about it in the *Columbia Journalism Review*. From where we sit, watching the tube, the broadcast industry continues to carry its share of responsibility for public misunderstandings. The incredible thing is that the camera is not to blame. Its scissors, paste, and a collection of calloused consciences.

(Excerpt from Department of Agriculture Appropriations Hearings For 1970, Part 5, Pp. 53-74)

(Speaking: Congressman JAMES L. WHITTEN, Democrat of Mississippi.)

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my colleague.

THE COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM TELEVISION PROGRAM ON "HUNGER IN AMERICA"

You might refer to page 64 of the report concerning the CBS broadcasts. This is what the investigators say on this subject:

"The Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) featured a television program on May 21, 1968, entitled 'Hunger in America,' which program was shown again on June 16, 1968. According to the script of the broadcast, CBS News spent 10 months investigating hunger in America, and four areas of the country were selected for 'close examination of hunger conditions.' The geographical locations illustrated in the filmed program were San Antonio, Tex.; Loudoun County, Va.; Tuba City, Ariz.; and Hale County, Ala.

"The staff visited the geographical areas selected by CBS for its program and talked to the people interviewed on the program. The staff also attempted to develop additional background information pertaining to these people to determine the cause and extent of their hunger as alleged on the CBS program. The statements made by representatives of CBS about the conditions of persons interviewed on the program and the results of the staff's investigation are set forth for each of the four geographical locations.

"A. SELECTED AREAS USED BY CBS TO ILLUSTRATE 'HUNGER IN AMERICA'

"1. San Antonio, Tex.

"San Antonio was described on the program as a city celebrating its 250th birthday

with an international exposition, HemisFair 68, that had foreign pavilions, restaurants, amusements, and exhibits. It was stated that Texas Governor John Connally claimed the HemisFair had turned the downtown area 'from slum to jewel box.' The announcer for the CBS program, Mr. Charles Kuralt, stated that " * * * the jewels don't glitter very brightly on the other side of town where 400,000 Mexican-Americans live, half the city's population. Most of them are crowded into what city officials refer to as 'poverty tracks' [sic]. Mexican-Americans face a language barrier, and like most poor people, they suffer from lack of skills and unemployment. A hard time earning means a hard time eating. A quarter of San Antonio's Mexican-Americans, 100,000 people, are hungry all the time. CBS News correspondent David Culhane found out how hungry from a woman with six children and an unemployed husband."

"a. Interview with Mrs. Esther Medrano

"Mrs. Medrano was questioned by Mr. Culhane, who asked her if she had food in the house. She replied, 'No, sir. I haven't got anything.' Mr. Culhane then asked her what she told her children when they came home and there was no food in the house. Mrs. Medrano replied, " * * * we haven't got anything to eat and they just have to lay down like that until the next day and see if we can find something to eat.' She further commented that her children " * * * just come in and drink some water and go to bed."

"Mrs. Esther Medrano, 203 Mirasol Place, San Antonio, was interviewed by the staff on October 1, 1968. She advised that she had eight children, two of whom were married and were living away from home. Her husband was blind in one eye and had only 50 percent vision in the other eye. He had been a victim of eye trouble since he was 17 years old and, due to his eye condition, was limited in the type of work he could perform. Mrs. Medrano advised that her husband was able to find work only 2 or 3 days a week and earned approximately \$5 a day, and she formerly did domestic work about the same number of days each week for which she was paid \$5 a day.

"Mrs. Medrano advised the staff that Dan Medina, a social worker for 'Wesley House,' a private organization, brought the CBS representatives to the house where she was residing at the time the program was filmed. The house was located at 808 South Leona, San Antonio. She recalled that her electricity and gas had been turned off for nonpayment at the time, and it was necessary for CBS to obtain electricity from a neighbor to operate the camera equipment. She agreed to be interviewed and photographed for which CBS paid her \$15, the amount she would have earned as a domestic during the 3 days she stayed at home waiting for the CBS crew to arrive.

"Mrs. Medrano advised that her family had been on the USDA commodity distribution program but the children did not like the powdered milk and beans which were distributed. However, they ate them in order to have enough food to eat. At the time of the CBS interview she was receiving food from the 'Wesley House' because the family had been dropped from the commodity distribution program for some reason unknown to her. She stated that the family did not have food in the house when she was interviewed by CBS.

"Soon after her appearance on the CBS program, the Medrano family was placed on the welfare program of San Antonio for a temporary period, after which it was placed on the State welfare program. Under the present program the family received \$135 a month until September 1968, at which time the monthly payment was reduced to \$123 consistent with a statewide reduction in all welfare payments. The Medrano family now

participates in the food stamp program and receives \$132 in stamps for a purchase price of \$86 a month. The family rents a three-bedroom house in a public housing project for which it pays \$42.70 a month. Mrs. Medrano advised that the family was able to get along very well at that time through the income received from welfare checks and by working a few days each week. She said that prior to being placed on welfare there were times when the children did not go to school because they had no food. Now two of her children receive free lunches at school.

"Mr. Dan Medina, coordinator, Wesley Community Center, San Antonio, advised the staff on October 3, 1968, that he was contacted by CBS representatives in October 1967, and requested to identify known cases of hunger. He told them there were cases of hunger in San Antonio as evidenced by the number of people who came to the Wesley Community Center for food and other help. He had personally confirmed the lack of food many times by making spot checks in the homes and cupboards of those seeking help. He advised that instances of hunger were usually temporary and were generally more frequent during the winter months due to a slack period in employment. He remarked that CBS personnel appeared disappointed to find that the hunger he described was not obvious in the appearance of the people they met. He pointed out to the CBS representatives that because of their diets the poor people appeared fat and well-fed but actually they were victims of malnutrition because of starchy diets. Mr. Medina advised that families which experience temporary hunger conditions usually had other problems. For example, in the Medrano family, Mr. Medrano 'drinks a lot and at times would stay away from home 3 or 4 weeks at a time.'

"b. Interview with 'Jerry'

"A young boy, identified only as 'Jerry' on the CBS program, was interviewed by Father Ralph Ruiz, a Catholic priest. The boy said that he attended Southside Junior High School but had nothing to eat for lunch because he did not take his lunch nor did he have the 35 cents to buy lunch. He also said that he had only beans for breakfast.

"Father Ralph Ruiz was interviewed by the staff on September 30, 1968, and he advised that he was the contact in the west side slum area of San Antonio for hearings held by the Citizens Board of Inquiry and the CBS-TV crew that filmed 'Hunger in America.' He selected and produced witnesses at the hearings and led the CBS-TV crew to the poverty people. Father Ruiz refused to make known to the staff the identities of witnesses he produced for the hearings or the poverty people that were filmed by the CBS-TV crew. His reason for refusal was based on his belief that these people were living in misery and had been badgered enough by both the 'do-gooders and the curious.'

"Jerry was identified by the staff in October 1968 as Jerry Cantu, 16 years of age, who resided with his parents, Larry and Rose Cantu, at 1630 Santa Rita Street, San Antonio, at the time of the filming by CBS. Mr. Raymond G. Cheves, regional director, State welfare department, San Antonio, determined for the staff on October 3, 1968, that Jerry Cantu left school shortly after he was interviewed by CBS and was employed as a civilian at the Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio. He was reported to be living at 1407 San Rafael Street, San Antonio, with a sister.

"According to Mr. Cheves, the records of the State welfare department disclosed that on July 25, 1968, the Cantu family made application for participation in the food stamp program but the application was denied because of excess resources. The welfare files disclosed that Larry Cantu, the father,

was employed as a dishwasher at a restaurant in San Antonio and his income from this employment was \$247 a month. He was purchasing a house at 1639 Santa Rita Street which cost \$2,950 and in which he had an equity at \$1,680. He was also purchasing the house in which he lived at 1630 Santa Rita Street. This house also cost \$2,950. Neither Mr. Cantu's income nor the ownership of the house in which he lived would disqualify him for food stamps; however, his equity in the additional property at 1639 Santa Rita Street exceeded the allowable maximum of \$600 in other resources and was the basis for which he was denied food stamps.

"On October 3, 1968, it was ascertained by the staff that Jerry Cantu had recently moved to 1410 San Rafael Street. At the 1410 San Rafael Street address, a young girl identified herself to the staff as Mary Cantu. She advised she was 14 years of age and was living with Jerry Cantu, the father of her 6-week-old baby. She said that they were not married because Jerry had only turned 16 years of age on September 30, 1968. They planned to be married when Jerry received his next paycheck.

"Jerry Cantu was interviewed on October 3, 1968, at Brooks Air Force Base, where he was employed as a dishwasher for a private contractor. He recalled that some TV men were at his parents' home about 1 year ago and Father Ralph Ruiz, who was with them, asked him to appear on TV. Jerry Cantu claimed he answered Father Ruiz questions truthfully and explained he never had enough to eat at home. There were 15 children in the family (ages 8 months to 24 years) and when he lived at home with his parents he usually had only one meal a day, which was in the morning. He could not remember having had anything to drink at home other than water. He did not eat lunch at school because he did not have the money to buy lunch and there was not enough food for his mother to prepare a lunch for him. Jerry Cantu remarked that since he was employed at Brooks Air Force Base 9 months ago, he gained 45 pounds and gets all the food he wants to eat. His 'wife' and baby also have plenty of food to eat. He stated he is buying the property where he lives at 1410 San Rafael Street for \$4,000 and made a downpayment of \$90 from his last paycheck. He was obligated to make monthly payments of \$40. Jerry Cantu introduced his brother, Larry Cantu, age 19, who also was employed as a dishwasher at the Brooks Air Force Base. Larry Cantu advised the staff that on many occasions food was scarce at home and as soon as he could find another place to live, and when he could afford to move, he would leave his parents' home.

"c. Interview With Mary Garcia, a Social Worker

"The CBS program showed an interview with a social worker, identified as Mary Garcia, who was with a young girl, aged 11. The announcer opened the interview with Miss Garcia with the following statement:

"Hunger is never so devastating as in a child. Never so horrifying as in what it may drive a child to do. Social worker Mary Garcia sees many such children."

"Miss Garcia explained on the program that the girl had been picked up for soliciting for prostitution and she had quite a number of girls involved in this activity. She remarked that the reason the girls gave for soliciting was that they needed money to buy food because they did not have food at home.

"Miss Mary Garcia, assistant probation officer, Bexar County Probation Office, Juvenile Division, San Antonio, was interviewed by the staff on October 3, 1968. She stated that for 2 years prior to her employment as a probation officer began in June 1967, she taught physical education and special education in a San Antonio high school. She

further advised that very little of her college work or her previous employment had prepared her for a position as a probation officer and therefore she had had limited experience with cases similar to the one she discussed on the CBS program.

"Miss Garcia advised that the case of the 11-year-old girl, shown on the CBS program with her, had been referred by the juvenile court to the child welfare department before she could complete her investigation to locate and interview the parents to determine the true family circumstances. At the time of the interview on the CBS program the child had been placed in a home by the child welfare department but had been brought to the juvenile court hearing room specifically to be displayed on the program.

"Miss Garcia stated that the 11-year-old girl filmed by CBS had a 14-year-old sister, and both girls had been arrested in July 1967 when they solicited a San Antonio detective for prostitution. They claimed they had solicited in order to get money to buy food. Miss Garcia's records disclosed the two girls had been referred previously to the juvenile authorities in May 1967, after the father had complained they had run away from home. They were referred a second time, in June 1967, to the same agency on suspicion of soliciting and released when no witnesses appeared against them. The third referral occurred with their arrest in July 1967.

"Miss Garcia advised that her investigation disclosed that the girls' mother died in 1963 and they had a stepmother for a short period of time. She said that during her investigation of the case she went to the girls' home and found a 12-year-old brother alone in the house. None of the neighbors could furnish information concerning the whereabouts of the father. She searched the house and could find no food. She was unable to find anything concerning the father's employment. Miss Garcia stated that tests given the girls disclosed that both were mentally retarded.

"Through the child welfare department, San Antonio, it was learned by the staff on October 4, 1968, that the family had consisted of the parents, three girls, and two boys. The mother died in 1963, after which the father brought another woman into the house to live with him. The father, who was illiterate, mentally retarded, and addicted to liquor, was suspected of making his living by stealing. He had been apprehended with one of his sons for breaking, entering, and theft. The son was subsequently arrested for shoplifting, after which he was declared a delinquent and placed on probation. The third sister was declared a delinquent in 1963, put on probation, and placed in a foster home. In 1964, she was sent to a State school for the retarded. The records of the child welfare department disclosed that on September 26, 1967, after the 11- and 14-year-old sisters were transferred to the child welfare department, they were placed in a foster home. On October 14, 1967, the girls ran away and were located on October 19, 1967. On October 20, 1967, the 14-year-old girl was placed in a foster home, from which she ran away on October 21, 1967, but she was soon located. All three sisters are presently in State-controlled schools.

"The records of the child welfare department disclosed that during August and September 1967, the father left the 12-year-old son, who also was mentally retarded, alone in an apartment. The father paid the rent but did not furnish his son with food. The boy, fed by the neighbors, was afraid to stay in the apartment at night and slept on the neighbors' porches. When the father was finally located he was in possession of a late model pickup truck and was performing odd jobs. The father refused to attend his children's hearings in juvenile court and refused assistance in being taught a trade.

"d. Interview with Commissioner A. J. Ploch

"Commissioner A. J. Ploch, one of four county commissioners, Bexar County, which includes San Antonio, was interviewed on the CBS program and was asked about the children in San Antonio who were not receiving enough food and their possible inability to learn properly because of an inadequate diet. Commissioner Ploch replied that the problem was actually caused by the fathers who would not work and, as far as education was concerned, he did not believe that education, other than an eighth-grade education, was needed. Commissioner Ploch also remarked on the CBS program that 'You'll always have hunger * * * and * * * you've got to have Indians and chiefs.'

"Commissioner Ploch was interviewed by the staff on October 3, 1968, and he advised that portions of his interviews by CBS were cut from the film in an effort to portray him as a villain and as one not concerned about the poor people of San Antonio. He stated that the full text of his interview would have disclosed that he also remarked that there were many people with only an eighth-grade education who were successfully working as plumbers, carpenters, and tradesmen, and they were earning more money than some college professors. He contended that too much emphasis was placed on a college education and, as a result, training as a craftsman was neglected. Commissioner Ploch maintained that contractors in the San Antonio area were begging for laborers and, because some 'lazy fathers' would not work, the contractors were 3 months behind their schedule on jobs. He said he would stand by his statements that there will always be Indians and chiefs and some degree of hunger in Bexar County because of ignorance and indolence.

"Commissioner Ploch advised that when he was interviewed by representatives of CBS, he was led to believe that San Antonio would not be portrayed in its worst light. He further stated that because his interview was reported out of context and he was made to appear as an enemy of the poor, he received a number of threatening telephone calls at his home. In the interest of personal safety to his family and to himself, and at the suggestion of the chief of police, he was forced to vacate his home for approximately 10 days until interest in the program had subsided.

"e. A Dying baby

"Probably the most touching portion of the film, and one which CBS later said, 'moved the Nation to tears,' was the scene of a baby being given resuscitation in the hospital after which it appeared motionless. The CBS narrator, Charles Kuralt, made the following statement with respect to the scene:

"Hunger is easy to recognize when it looks like this. This baby is dying of starvation. He was an American. Now he is dead."

"Mr. Jack E. Coughlin, director of community relations, Bexar County Hospital District, which includes the Robert B. Green Memorial Hospital, San Antonio, advised on October 2, 1968, that the hospital scenes shown on the CBS program for the San Antonio portion were filmed at the Robert B. Green Memorial Hospital. Arrangements for the filming were made by Mrs. Vera Burke, former director of social services at the hospital, who had requested permission from the hospital authorities. Mr. Coughlin advised that when permission was granted to Mrs. Burke, it was generally understood that the filming would be confined to the pediatrics ward if she could obtain the concurrence from the doctors in that ward. Mr. Coughlin stated that after viewing the CBS program, he determined that Mrs. Burke had permitted the CBS crew to take photographs in the premature nursery, an area which is off limits to visitors.

"Mr. Coughlin stated that after a local newspaper had published a news article which indicated that the baby shown on the CBS program was a premature baby and did not die from starvation, the hospital administration made an independent investigation. The results of that investigation were stated by Mr. Coughlin to be as follows: 'The male baby involved was born at the hospital at 8:15 a.m. on October 24, 1967, and expired at 3 p.m. on October 29, 1967, in the premature nursery. The baby's weight at birth was 2 pounds, 12 ounces, and the gestation period was 28 weeks (approximately 7 months). The hospital records disclosed that Dr. Luis Rey Montemayor, the doctor on duty, recorded on the baby's chart that the child had a cardiac arrest and respiratory arrest on October 27, 1967, and two additional attacks on October 29, 1967, the last when he was pronounced dead. The death certificate, filed by the hospital on the baby, disclosed the baby died from septicemia, meningitis, and peritonitis, with the underlying cause being 'prematurity.'

"Mr. Coughlin produced copies of releases CBS had obtained from the parents of a number of children photographed in the pediatrics ward. Each indicated a payment of \$5 had been paid to a parent for the release. He advised that he had no evidence that CBS had obtained releases from the parents whose children were photographed in the premature nursery.

"Dr. Luis Ray Montemayor, who had entered private practice in San Antonio, was interviewed by the staff on October 3, 1968. He advised that he had obtained his education in Mexico and performed his intern work at the Robert B. Green Memorial Hospital. He recalled on occasion when he was attending a baby in the premature nursery in the hospital and was summoned by a nurse who said another baby in the same nursery was in distress and required immediate attention. He stated he rushed to the isolette to attend to the baby. He observed at the time that there were CBS cameramen and equipment in the premature nursery and learned that filming of babies had taken place. He stated that as soon as he started attending the baby he noticed the CBS camera crew move into his area and commence filming his efforts. He said that the baby had suffered a cardiac and respiratory arrest, one of several the baby had suffered since birth, and he administered resuscitation. For a short period of time it appeared that the baby would not respond, but he continued to work with it and it did respond. He said the baby died 2 days later when it suffered another series of attacks and could not be saved.

"Dr. Montemayor remarked that CBS was wrong in depicting that the baby died of starvation, that there was no evidence of malnutrition, but rather the baby was premature and the prognosis for survival at the time of birth was not good. He recalled that one of the CBS representatives questioned him concerning the 'malnourished babies he saw in the nursery.' Dr. Montemayor advised that he informed the CBS representative that the babies he saw in the premature nursery were small because they were born prematurely and the chances of survival for many of them were questionable. He said that the CBS representative for some unknown reason, wanted him to say that the mothers of the babies gave birth to premature babies because they were malnourished. Dr. Montemayor advised that while it was possible that malnutrition could be a contributing factor to a premature birth, there was no such evidence in the case of the baby photographed by CBS and shown on the program. Dr. Montemayor positively identified the baby he attended and which was filmed by CBS in his presence as the same baby identified by Mr. Coughlin from hospital rec-

ords. Identification was also made by the head nurse in the premature nursery and by a student nurse, both of whom were witnesses to the CBS filming.

"The parents of the baby were interviewed by the staff on October 4, 1968, in San Antonio, and they positively identified the baby shown on the CBS-TV program as their baby. The mother was in the hospital and witnessed the filming of her baby by CBS from the hall leading to the glass-enclosed isolette where she knew her baby was being cared for. The father had visited the baby on a number of occasions and saw the program broadcast. The parents claimed that CBS did not contact them for permission to use the film and the statements in the program about starvation were definitely untrue. The mother advised that she had fallen when she was in her 7th month of pregnancy and began experiencing pains, at which time she was taken to the hospital by her husband, and she gave birth prematurely. She stated that the availability of food had been no problem for her because she not only ate at her home but at her mother's home and the home of her mother-in-law. The father advised that he had won acclaim for his athletic abilities in high school and exhibited several trophies awarded to him in track and basketball competition. He is presently in his second year of college and has expectations of making the varsity basketball team. Upon graduation he plans to teach physical education.

"The grandmothers of the baby advised on October 3, 1968, that they both had steady jobs and felt that they had provided well for their children's health and did not believe they were ever malnourished. They advised that the daughter had recently lost her second child at 28 weeks of pregnancy, the cause of death being prematurity. They said the second child weighed approximately the same as the first child.

"On October 2, 1968, Mr. Kemper Diehl, a reporter for the San Antonio Express, advised he first brought to the attention of the people of San Antonio the facts concerning the baby that was reported to have died during the filming of the CBS program. Initially, another reporter for the newspaper, Arthur Moczygemba, had been informed by Mrs. Vera Burke at the Robert B. Green Memorial Hospital that the baby shown on the CBS program was a premature baby and there was no starvation involved. As a result of this information the editor of the San Antonio Express assigned Mr. Diehl to determine the facts. Mr. Diehl searched the records of the hospital and death certificates on file at the City Health Department which disclosed that three recently born infants had died during the period CBS was in San Antonio filming the program. Investigation disclosed that one of the babies was a girl, which was ruled out because CBS referred to the baby as a male. Of the two remaining babies, both were males; one weighed 7 pounds and 11 ounces and the other weighed 2 pounds and 12 ounces. Only the smaller baby was confined to the premature nursery. Mr. Diehl interviewed hospital personnel and was advised that the hospital background which appeared in the film clearly showed that the filming of the baby occurred in the premature nursery. The size of the baby was determined to be approximately two pounds, based on a pathologist's calculation of the approximate size of the baby as compared to the size of the hands of the doctor who was holding the baby at the time it was filmed. Mr. Diehl stated that after the baby was identified he interviewed the parents who also confirmed that the baby filmed by the CBS crew was, in fact, their baby.

"j. CBS Statement Concerning the USDA Commodity Program

"Mr. Charles Kuralt made the following comments concerning the commodity distribu-

tion program of the USDA during the narration of the portion of the film on San Antonio. He stated that San Antonio's answer to hunger for the last 14 years had been surplus commodities. Surplus commodities were foods that farmers could not sell and nobody else wanted. The USDA bought surplus crops from farmers and got rid of them by giving them to the poor. For farmers and the Government, commodities were a convenience; for the poor they were simply an inadequate dole. The commodity distribution program consisted largely of dumping excesses rather than providing essentials. The program had not changed since it was conceived in the 1930's.

"Secretary of Agriculture Orville F. Freeman publicly denounced the statements made on the CBS program. According to Secretary Freeman, the commodity distribution program had changed radically in that as late as 1960, USDA offered only five items of food for distribution, namely, lard, rice, flour, nonfat dry milk, and cornmeal, which foods had a value of \$2.20 per person per month, but, in 1961, the number of commodities and the amount of food for distribution were doubled. The program was improved still further by offering additional foods, and at the time of the showing of the CBS program a total of 16 items were offered to recipients. During the late summer of 1968 an additional six items were added, making a total of 22 items offered to the needy. An official of USDA advised that the dollar value of commodities now being distributed for each person per month was \$12.70 and, as of November 1, 1968, the commodities included dry beans, bulgur, butter, cheese, whole canned chicken, corn grits, cornmeal, scrambled egg mix, flour, fruit and vegetable juice, lard or shortening, chopped canned meat, evaporated milk, nonfat dry milk, peanut butter, dry split peas, instant potatoes, raisins or prunes, rice, oats or rolled wheat, corn syrup, and canned vegetables, with many of these foods having been nutritionally fortified.

"In rebuttal to the charge that the commodity distribution program consisted largely of dumping excesses rather than providing essentials, Secretary Freeman said that some of the foods distributed were items which were in oversupply but certainly could not be classified as foods 'nobody else wants' because they were identical in content and purity to foods purchased by millions of Americans in local supermarkets. He submitted that these foods currently provided the following percentages of full daily allowances recommended by the National Research Council: protein, 127.7 percent; calcium, 158 percent; iron, 91.4 percent; vitamin A, 69.5 percent; thiamine, 143.9 percent; riboflavin, 165.7 percent; vitamin C, 92.4 percent; and food energy, 77.6 percent.

"g. Filmed Scenes and Interviews Not Included in Program

"Mr. John E. Bierschwale, director of the San Antonio City Welfare Department, advised on September 30, 1968, that at the time the CBS crew was in San Antonio, the city operated a commodity distribution program for the needy. The city has since changed to a food stamp program. He said the CBS crew wanted to film a typical commodity distribution office and made arrangements to set up the cameras at one of the offices. CBS waited for a long line to form outside the office, but when this did not occur the CBS crew requested that the doors to the office be closed to allow a line of people to form. Mr. Bierschwale stated that he cooperated with CBS by closing the office without realizing that CBS intended to discredit the commodity distribution program. The doors were closed for 1 hour and 45 minutes to permit a line of about 20 people to form before the filming took place.

"Dr. Ramiro P. Estrada, a private physician and member of the staff at the Robert B.

Green Memorial Hospital, advised on October 2, 1968, that he was asked to take part in the CBS program but the filmed portion relating to his interviews was not used in the televised program. He said he met with CBS representatives and Mrs. Vera Burke prior to the actual filming. At the meeting, the CBS representatives indicated that they were interested in showing only advanced cases of malnutrition. They visited several homes where he examined the children while CBS filmed the interviews. Dr. Estrada stated the CBS representatives wanted him to say some of the cases of malnutrition were severe, whereas they were actually relatively minor cases. He advised that he told the CBS representatives he 'would not bend the truth' and they accused him of being evasive. Dr. Estrada indicated that it was apparent to him the CBS representatives were interested only in sensational-type material and they wanted him to say things with a more sensational impact than what he was willing to say.

"2. Loudoun County, Va.

"The CBS narrator reported that:

"Loudoun County, Va., is anything but a poverty pocket. It is headquarters for the so-called horsey set. The county contains hunt clubs, private schools, and aristocratic race meets that mingle the pedigree of the horses with those of their owners. The trappings of wealth are everywhere. Loudoun County is only 25 miles outside Washington, D.C. It is the home of distinguished legislators like Senator Everett Dirksen, celebrities like Arthur Godfrey. Society here is studied with American nobility—names like du Pont, Mellon and Whitney.

"Hunger is the last thing an outsider would expect to find; indeed it might be the last thing he would find. Yet hidden away in Loudoun County are thousands of shacks where tenant farmers lead a marginal existence. Loudoun County, like one-third of the counties in America, has no Federal food program."

"Mr. Kuralt introduced Dr. Stephen Granger, Loudoun County Medical Officer, as a man who knew and treated many of the tenant families.

"a. Remarks by Dr. Stephen Granger

"Dr. Granger mentioned on the program that the diet of tenant families was heavy on starch and light on protein. Because of the diet the children had a '*** kind of a hollow lifeless look—stringy hair, a pasty complexion, and a dead look about their eyes. There is a hopeless feeling that springs almost physically from these children.' Continuing, Dr. Granger said a poor diet affected brain tissue and the child's ability to think and to learn, a condition that was not reversible. 'Not by Christmas baskets, not by hot lunches when he starts school, or anything else, 1 year from now or 5 years from now.' Following the interviews with two tenant farmers in Loudoun County, Dr. Granger commented on people among his patients who looked old prematurely. He said premature aging may be caused by a number of medical problems, but malnutrition certainly played a big part. He claimed there were about 7,000 households in the area that had severe nutritional problems and that the people in these households rarely, if ever, ate a complete meal.

"Dr. Granger asserted that such people '*** with no past to be proud of and no hope for the future, seek immediate forms of employment.' With this statement he justified the presence of a late-model television in the house, empty pint bottles in the yard, and a late-model baby in the crib.

"Mr. Charles F. Turner, executive secretary, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, Leesburg, Va., advised the staff on October 10, 1968, that Dr. Granger initially informed him about the plans for CBS to make a film in Loudoun County. Prior to the actual film-

ing he met with CBS representatives who assured him that the program would be an objective analysis of malnutrition, that the subject matter would be handled in a general way, and that CBS would not be critical of Loudoun County. Mr. Turner stated he felt that CBS misrepresented the conditions in Loudoun County and, further, misrepresented the program objectives as stated to him.

"Mr. Turner stated that Dr. Granger's remark that 'There are about 7,000 households in the area that have severe nutrition problems' was inaccurate. A recent county survey, by actual count, disclosed the existence of 10,086 homes in the county, and Dr. Granger's estimate would indicate that 7 out of every 10 households in the county were suffering severe nutritional problems. Mr. Turner advised that he challenged Dr. Granger on his estimate after he saw the program and Dr. Granger, in a succession of attempts to clarify his comment, first said that he meant individuals instead of households, and then expanded his statement to include individuals in Loudoun and Fauquier Counties. Finally, he included individuals in Loudoun, Fauquier, and Prince William Counties.

"Dr. Stephen Granger, Children's Hospital, Washington, D.C., former Loudoun County Health Officer, was interviewed by the staff on November 20, 1968. Dr. Granger said he was contacted by Mr. Martin Carr of CBS who explained that the CBS film would depict hunger and malnutrition in the United States and Mr. Carr requested to meet with some white tenant farmers in Loudoun County who were believed to be suffering from malnutrition due to economic deprivation. Dr. Granger advised that a list of approximately 20 households was compiled and discussed with Mr. Carr. Mr. Carr was shown some of these households and the ultimate selection of households filmed was made by CBS.

"Reflecting on his comment on the CBS program relative to 7,000 households in the county having severe nutritional problems, Dr. Granger advised the staff that if he had it to do over again he would say 7,000 people in Loudoun County rather than 7,000 households. When he was questioned further concerning this estimate he said that the figure applied to the 'area' rather than the county, but refused to describe in a geographic sense his use of the term 'area.' He acknowledged that he had no statistical basis for his use of the figure 7,000, whether it be households or people. Dr. Granger was of the opinion that the program accurately depicted conditions in Loudoun County. He regarded the film as being of high quality—an excellent presentation showing a good balance in placing the responsibility for malnutrition on the county, State, and Federal Governments. Dr. Granger advised that his resignation as county health officer from Loudoun County was only coincidental with the release of the CBS program and the critical reaction the program received in the county.

"b. Interview with Mrs. Franklin Hopkins

"During the CBS program an interview with a Mrs. Franklin Hopkins was conducted by Mrs. Pauline J. Barrett, a Loudoun County Public Health Nurse, in which Mrs. Hopkins was questioned concerning the eating habits of her children. The questioning disclosed that Mrs. Hopkins had not decided what to prepare for lunch, that she had no baby food in the house for her baby, and that another child had only gravy for breakfast that morning.

"Mrs. Pauline J. Barrett, public health nurse, Department of Public Health, Leesburg, Loudoun County, advised the staff on October 11, 1968 that arrangements for her participation in the interview with Mrs. Hopkins were made by Dr. Granger with CBS. She was asked by CBS to conduct the interview in the same manner as she would in any home visit. The interview commenced with

a discussion of the children's diet and continued with a discussion of family supervision, care of teeth, and immunization shots. CBS used only that portion of the interview which dealt with the children's diet, because that was their primary interest. Mrs. Barrett was of the opinion that CBS neglected to bring out that fact that it was not normally the lack of food so much as not knowing or caring how to prepare an adequate diet which was responsible for the dietary deficiencies of many poor people. She did not consider Loudoun County unique nor was it better or worse than other counties she knew about. Mrs. Barrett noted that in her 6 years as a public health nurse in Loudoun County, the few cases of hunger she had seen were the result of parental neglect.

"Mrs. Helen C. Shorey, superintendent, Loudoun County Department of Public Welfare, Leesburg, advised the staff on October 10, 1968, that Franklin Roosevelt Hopkins had asked the welfare office for assistance in September 1967, when his wife was expecting their fifth child. He was employed at the time, with a monthly income of \$277.93. He was not eligible for assistance because of his income, but the welfare department paid the hospital bill for Mrs. Hopkins' maternity care pursuant to a ruling which permitted such payment for a family of six with an income under \$300 a month.

"Mr. Roland Hope, a dairy farmer who resided in Loudoun County, near Purcellville, Va., advised the staff on October 11, 1968, that Claude Hopkins and his family were tenants on another farm operated by him, also near Purcellville, at the time CBS filmed the program in Loudoun County. He identified the Mrs. Hopkins interviewed on the program as Mrs. Franklin Hopkins, the daughter-in-law of Claude Hopkins, his tenant, with whom the Franklin Hopkins family lived. He said that Claude Hopkins had sons living with him at the time he was a tenant. He thought Franklin Hopkins had been working on a highway crew in the neighborhood of Hamilton, Va., at the time of the filming of the program. Mr. Hope advised that his basic pay for tenant farmers, including the Hopkins family, was \$200 a month, and in addition he furnished a house, electricity, firewood, a gallon or more of milk a day, and between one fourth and one half of a beef twice a year. He stated that the better farmhands received the larger portion of beef. He also provided garden space but commented that it had been his experience that tenants seldom planted a garden even after he prepared the land for them. Mr. Hope stated he had a constant need for farmhands but was only able to get Franklin Hopkins and his brothers to work occasionally. He advised that all of the Hopkins men had a drinking problem and Franklin Hopkins frequently did not show up for work for a couple of days after receiving his pay.

"Mrs. Franklin Hopkins was interviewed by the staff on October 11, 1968, at Lovettsville, Va. The Hopkins family moved to this location following the filming of the CBS program. Mrs. Hopkins stated that the farm where she now resided was owned by Mr. Asbury Smith. Her husband, Franklin Roosevelt Hopkins, worked for Mr. Smith and was paid \$90 every 2 weeks. In addition, they were furnished a house which had indoor plumbing, electricity, and furnace heat. They were provided the fuel for winter months, milk every day, two hogs and feed necessary to raise them, and a quantity of beef. Mrs. Hopkins said she had received clothes for her daughter from a relative of Mrs. Smith. When asked if she had enough food for the family, Mrs. Hopkins stated she did but could always use more.

"With respect to her appearance on the CBS program, Mrs. Hopkins advised that Dr. Granger and Mrs. Barrett arrived at her home with the CBS film crew without making prior

arrangements with her. Mrs. Hopkins explained that her comment about not having baby food in the house was due to the fact the baby was only 2 weeks old and not old enough for solid food. She said she had the money to buy baby food if the baby had been old enough for solid food. Relative to her statement that one of her children had only gravy for breakfast, Mrs. Hopkins said the family had gravy and biscuits for breakfast, a standard breakfast for them because they preferred it. Mrs. Hopkins advised the staff the family had everything it wanted in the way of food at the time her interview was filmed, including meat remaining from a side of beef previously given to the family by the landowner. She said the CBS film crew was aware of the food because one of them opened the refrigerator during the visit and saw the food.

"3. Tuba City, Ariz.

"CBS reported that 'The deserts of Arizona and New Mexico are nice places to visit, but the Navajo Indians have to live there. Living in a desert, just staying alive, is very hard for the 125,000 members of the largest tribe in the United States. The West was theirs once. They were nomads and their home was vast. Now they have an arid reservation. Dr. Jean Van Duzen of Tuba City, Ariz., has practiced among the Navajo Indians for the past 14 years. She continually faces the medical problems caused by lack of food.'

"Dr. Van Duzen commented that the people she saw every day appeared as though they ate mostly starches. The older people tended to be rather fat and dumpy and the children were just plain undernourished. She stated that surplus commodities only provided 40 percent of the caloric needs of the people and did not make any allowance for protein, vitamin, and mineral needs.

"Scenes filmed at Tuba City, Ariz., included unidentified Indian hogans and a visit to the Public Health Service hospital for the Navajo Reservation. Dr. Van Duzen exhibited several children in the hospital who allegedly had Kwashiorkor, which she described as '... the most severe form of protein calorie malnutrition. This is a disease that was seen first in South America and Africa. It's not supposed to exist in the United States, but it does.' She also exhibited children who allegedly had Marasmus, which she described as a '... total calorie and protein malnutrition.' She said children who had Marasmus became that way because they had '... nothing, practically nothing but water, and very quickly they get into great trouble and frequently they die.' She went on to state that one-third of the children admitted to the hospital for Marasmus die.

"Dr. Van Duzen, chief of pediatrics, Tuba City Hospital, advised the staff on September 24, 1968, that she did not know why Tuba City was selected by CBS for its program but she cooperated with CBS after permission had been granted by her superiors. The Navajo families contacted by CBS were selected by her and Wilson Grey, a health education aid and formerly a driver-interpreter at the time CBS visited the hospital. She stated that they visited five or six Navajo camps on the reservation and at each camp filmed one hogan. She also conducted the CBS camera crew through the Public Health Service hospital and exhibited several children who had been admitted to the hospital for various illnesses, most of whom had been underfed.

"Dr. Van Duzen advised the staff that when the CBS representatives visited the hospital there were several cases of Kwashiorkor and Marasmus, but at the time of the staff's visit she had no cases of Kwashiorkor and had only two cases of Marasmus. Dr. Van Duzen stated that usually the cases of Marasmus involved babies 2 to 2½ months of age where the mothers had been breast feeding the babies, the milk had

dried up, and they were not getting any food. The babies were brought to the hospital only after a considerable period of time had elapsed and it was difficult to save them. She stated that the Navajo mothers were reluctant to bring their babies to the hospital when their milk dried up because to admit this fact was an admission that they were incapable of functioning as a mother. She advised that within the past 5 years, she had 28 cases of Marasmus in the hospital and, of these, 14 died. The death rate was exceptionally high because the babies were in poor health, including almost total dehydration, when they were admitted.

"Dr. Van Duzen stated that Kwashiorkor appeared in children from 1 to 2 years of age. In most cases the children had been weaned and were given whole milk after which they developed diarrhea. The mother thought the milk caused the diarrhea and the child was then taken off milk. Consequently, the child received little nourishment. Another factor to be considered in Kwashiorkor cases is that in the Navajo families the children traditionally eat after the adults and receive what food is left, if any. If the family ate together, the children had to fend for themselves. She advised that the typical Navajo mother was totally unknowledgeable about nutritional and medical needs and would bring a child to the hospital only after the illness had continued for a substantial length of time.

"Mr. John P. Sipe, agency social worker, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Tuba City, advised the staff on September 23, 1968, that the day after the CBS program appeared on television he received a telephone call from his superiors instructing him to make a report on the Navajo families shown on the program. Mr. Sipe advised that the CBS program was not shown in Tuba City and he had not seen the film. After considerable investigation, including interviews with Dr. Van Duzen and Wilson Grey, he identified four families visited by the CBS representatives but he could not say if they were included in the televised program. Information concerning the four families was furnished by Mr. Sipe as follows:

"a. Mr. and Mrs. Jimmy Kerley

"In 1967, the Kerley family lived at Cameron, Ariz. Mrs. Kerley was formerly married to the brother of Jimmy Kerley, first name not known, who was an alcoholic. She left the brother to live with Jimmy Kerley, also an alcoholic. There were four children by the two fathers in the home. In November 1967, when CBS was filming the program in Tuba City, the Kerley's infant child was in the hospital. At the time of the filming the parents were separated, but Mr. Kerley was working in Flagstaff, Ariz., and contributed to the support of the children. The mother and children received surplus commodities, but the family did not receive welfare assistance because there was no financial need.

"In December 1967, Mr. Kerley was in jail, and Mrs. Kerley, who also had a drinking problem, was placed on general assistance by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and was given \$178 month. During the period of separation the Bureau of Indian Affairs worked with the family in an effort to bring about a reconciliation. In January 1968, Mr. and Mrs. Kerley were reconciled and married. On March 26, 1968, Mr. and Mrs. Kerley enrolled in training programs at the Bureau of Indian Affairs Employment Center, Roswell, N. Mex., where they resided and reportedly were progressing well.

"b. Mr. and Mrs. Yodell Billah

"Mr. and Mrs. Yodell Billah, who live in the area of Red Lake, Ariz., had 10 children. One child was married and resided away from home; one was in Vietnam; two were in a Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school; two resided at home and attended Red Lake Day School; two were in foster homes under the Indian placement program sponsored by

the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; and one was of preschool age. The other child was unaccounted for. The husband was a shepherd, but performed odd jobs and participated in tribal work projects. The husband had 2 years of education but had no job training. At the time of the filming by CBS in November 1967, the family did not receive assistance because the husband was working and had not applied for assistance. The family has since commenced receiving surplus commodities and, because of a recent injury, the husband applied to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for general assistance. The social services agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, had no information that indicated there was any malnourishment in the family.

"c. Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Woody

"Mr. Andrew Woody and his wife were 63 and 42 years of age, respectively. They had eight children, ranging in age from 6 months to 20 years. Their eldest daughter, along with her husband and infant child, lived with them. At the time they were filmed by CBS in November 1967, the Woody family received social security and aid to families with dependent children totaling \$220 monthly, the maximum paid under the Arizona State statutory grant. The daughter's husband was employed by the branch of plant management, Tuba City agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, where he earned over \$2 an hour. According to Mr. Sipe, there was no malnutrition in this family.

"d. Mr. and Mrs. Boyd Nez

"Mr. and Mrs. Boyd Nez were grandparents, who lived in a family camp at Cow Springs, Ariz. Their daughter Anna Nez, her husband, and their child lived in the same camp but in a different hogan. CBS first filmed Anna Nez with her child and then filmed the grandparents with Anna's child. Boyd Nez and his wife were 68 and 66 years of age, respectively. Both received old-age assistance totaling \$128 a month. Anna Nez' husband had an income from odd jobs and livestock which ranged from \$2,000 to \$2,500 per year. The grandparents also received surplus commodities at the time they were filmed by CBS. The family reportedly ate as a group and there was no apparent hunger problem. The grandparents advised Mr. Sipe that they received a total of \$40 for posing for CBS and were promised more money and some lumber which they never received.

"Mr. Sipe advised that the Navajo families he was able to identify as having been filmed by CBS had in common the fact that they resided in traditional dwellings, namely hogans, and spoke little or no English. Mr. Sipe stated that the families had limited education and no job training. He further said that they were well known to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and were receiving services from various Federal and State programs.

"4. Hale County, Ala.

"CBS reported that:

"It has never been easy to be a Negro in Alabama. Times have often been bad, and they've never been good. But there's always been cotton—to plant, to chop, to pick, and to plough. Cotton has been a misery, but at least it's been a meal ticket. Now it's not even that. The machines have taken over, and a field that once needed 100 Negroes today barely supports three. Ten years ago machines harvested only 2 percent of Alabama's cotton. This year they will harvest more than 80 percent.

"The Negroes must look elsewhere for jobs, and the jobs are not in Alabama. Some go North. Many others remain, often because they are so poor, so tired, and so hungry that they can't even get up and go. In the long history of Black Belt deprivation there have never been times as bad as these.

"Last spring the Field Foundation sent six prominent doctors to investigate hunger in

Mississippi. One of these was Dr. Raymond Wheeler, who has lived and practiced in the South all his life.

"Doctor Wheeler was asked by CBS to visit Hale County, Ala., during the filming of the segment in that area and he conducted the interviews with local participants.

"a. Interview with Mrs. Louise Zanders

"The interview of Mrs. Zanders conducted by Dr. Wheeler, as set forth in the transcript of the program, was as follows:

"Dr. WHEELER. You have how many children to feed?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Ten.

"Dr. WHEELER. Ten children.

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Yes.

"Dr. WHEELER. Are there times when you don't have enough food in the house to go around?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Yes, sir; lots of times.

"Dr. WHEELER. There are times when—

"Mrs. ZANDERS. I just have to make out with what I have. Give each one of them a little of what I have.

"Dr. WHEELER. What did you have for dinner today?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. I didn't have any dinner.

"Dr. WHEELER. You're going to have a baby before long?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Yes, sir.

"Dr. WHEELER. What kind of food do you eat?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Rice, chicken sometimes.

"Dr. WHEELER. What else do you eat?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. That's all, and water.

"Dr. WHEELER. Mrs. Zanders, what does your husband do for a living?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. He gets jobs in hayfields.

"Dr. WHEELER. In hayfields?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Yes.

"Dr. WHEELER. How much does he make when he's working?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. From \$3 to \$4 a day.

"Dr. WHEELER. \$3 to \$4 a day?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Yes, sir.

"Dr. WHEELER. And he hasn't worked now in 3 or 4 weeks?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Yes.

"Dr. WHEELER. Do you get food stamps?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. No, sir; because I'm not able to get them.

"Dr. WHEELER. Why not?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. I ain't got them this month. They cost \$70 and I don't have it.

"Dr. WHEELER. Have you asked for any help from anyone in raising the money to buy those stamps?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. No, sir; there ain't no need.

"Dr. WHEELER. Why?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. They ain't going to give it to you.

"Dr. WHEELER. Have you been down to the welfare department and talked to them, or has your husband?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. No, sir; the last time I went to welfare the lady told me—said if you have a living husband that they can't give you no help.

"Dr. WHEELER. Even if he's not working?

"Mrs. ZANDERS. Yes, sir.

"Following the interview of Mrs. Zanders by Dr. Wheeler, Mr. Charles Kuralt, the CBS narrator, remarked that 'Three weeks after talking to Dr. Wheeler, Mrs. Zanders gave birth to a severely malnourished baby. Two days later the baby died.'

"The staff interviewed Mrs. Louise Zanders on September 27, 1968, at her farmhouse near Faunsdale, Ala. She advised that in the fall of 1967 a 'white person' stopped at her home and asked some questions about hunger and asked to take pictures for a TV program. In November 1967, a camera crew accompanied by Dr. Wheeler, arrived and took pictures inside and outside her home for 3 days, working from approximately 8 a.m. to 7 p.m., with only a break for lunch. During this time, Dr. Wheeler asked her many questions while the camera crew took pictures, and the interview with Dr. Wheeler was recorded several times.

The CBS crew gave her \$39 while they were at her home.

"Mrs. Zanders stated that her husband, her mother, and 11 children resided on 4½ acres of land they rent. They paid \$189 per year rent, payable 'when the crop comes in.' She claimed to have purchased food stamps on and off since September 1967. The food stamps were very helpful and her family had enough food and did not go hungry. She said her husband planted corn, cotton, okra, peanuts, and potatoes, but the only crop they sold was cotton as they used the other products themselves. It was observed by staff members that the house where the Zanders resided was in extremely poor condition and appeared on the verge of collapse. Two lean hogs were observed enclosed in an area near the house and Mrs. Zanders said the hogs belonged to them and would be killed during the winter, if they could be fattened. The Zanders also owned two mules, a calf, and a few chickens. She was asked about her water supply and pointed to a well about one-half mile away as being the closest source. It was noted during the interview that four or five children were in and about the house and upon inquiry Mrs. Zanders advised that they were not in school because they did not have the proper clothes and she needed them to carry water. Her husband obtained occasional work in the fields and her mother received \$26 a month in old-age assistance payments as well as \$70 a month from the Veterans' Administration. An older son, who was married but did not live with his wife and child, paid her from \$10 to \$20 a week from the wages he received from a packinghouse.

"Mrs. Zanders had not seen the CBS program and the transcript of her interview was read to her. She remarked that if the CBS program said her baby died from malnutrition it was not true, and she would 'tell it like it is.' According to Mrs. Zanders, at about 3 p.m. on December 23, 1967, she experienced labor pains and was admitted to the Hale County Hospital at Greensboro, Ala., by Dr. Chester Singleton, her doctor. Sometime after admittance, the doctor told her that the baby was very large and was in a breech position. Around midnight she was transferred to Druid City Hospital, Tuscaloosa, where Dr. William Standeffer performed an operation and delivered the child. She continued that she never saw the baby but was informed that the baby was stillborn and that it weighed about 12 pounds. According to Mrs. Zanders, many of her children were large at birth.

"The death certificate on file at the Bureau of Vital Statistics, Montgomery, Ala., disclosed that the birth was a stillbirth, with delivery made by a cesarean section operation by Dr. Standeffer on December 24, 1967. The weight of the female child was 12 pounds, 5 ounces; the length of pregnancy was 40 weeks; and death was due to prolonged labor at another hospital.

"Dr. Standeffer advised the staff on September 26, 1968, that Mrs. Zanders was admitted to Druid City Hospital around Christmas 1967. She had been in labor a long time and had been admitted from another hospital. Upon examining Mrs. Zanders he determined that the baby had already died so he removed the body by a cesarean section operation. The baby was very large and showed no signs of malnutrition. It was his opinion that death was due to prolonged labor. He said that Mrs. Zanders did not show any signs of being malnourished.

"The records of the Druid City Hospital disclosed that Mrs. Zanders was a patient in the hospital for a total of 25 days; she was seen by two obstetricians and one urologist, and received five X-rays and numerous medications. Her hospital bill of \$1,284.40 had not been paid.

"Mrs. Virginia Glass, director of pensions and security, Greensboro, Ala., advised on September 26, 1968, that her records disclosed

that Mrs. Zanders inquired in November 1965 about welfare assistance but did not make application as she was informed that she was ineligible because Mrs. Zanders had a small income and there were two able-bodied people in the household.

"Mrs. Barbara Drury, supervisor, food stamp program, Hale County, Ala., advised that the Zanders family first applied for food stamps in July 1967, at which time the family income was \$181 per month, making it eligible for \$128 in stamps at a cost of \$70. In view of the fact that this was the first month for the family to participate, the cost was only half price, \$35. Mrs. Drury stated that the Zanders family had been recertified a total of nine times since it was first certified in July 1967. The recertifications were caused by changes in the monthly income earned by the family and changes in the number of people in the household. Food stamp costs for the family had ranged from a low of \$22 a month in February 1968, when the family only had an income of \$60, to a high of \$102 in June 1968, when the family income was \$317.42. Mrs. Drury stated that Mr. Zanders reported on August 19, 1968, he had lost his job due to lack of transportation. His income for August 1968 had been \$132.40. In September 1968, he was entitled to purchase food stamps, valued at \$130, for \$58, but he received a voucher from OEO for the \$58 and the food stamps did not cost the family any money for the month. Mrs. Drury advised that the purchase price for food stamps was paid by OEO for a number of families in Hale County during September 1968 in order that poor families could use their money to purchase school clothes for their children.

"b. Interview with Mrs. Sally Lee Carlisle

"Mrs. Sally Lee Carlisle of Faunsdale, Ala., was also interviewed on the CBS program by Dr. Raymond Wheeler. Prior to introducing Mrs. Carlisle, Mr. Charles Kuralt, CBS narrator, stated that Dr. Wheeler 'talked to a woman whose family has been sharecroppers ever since they stopped being slaves. The woman and her husband and 14 children and grandchildren still live on the farm, but it does not support them any more.' In response to questioning by Dr. Wheeler, Mrs. Carlisle indicated that she had a garden in which she raised okra and other things, but could not raise corn to feed hogs, chickens, and turkeys because the landowner had sold the corn acres to the Government. She was unable to buy food stamps every 2 weeks because she did not have the \$33 necessary for the purchase price. Her husband worked for the city and earned only \$3.50 a day. Mrs. Carlisle concluded with general comments dealing with her thoughts that they are not treated as well as they were formerly treated, probably because of school integration and increased voting by members of her race. She spoke of the young people moving to the North where they were getting better jobs and better treatment.

"Mrs. Sally Lee Carlisle was contacted by the staff on September 26, 1968, at her home near Faunsdale where the family had resided since 1964. The home was a run-down cabin located in the middle of a cotton field and had no electricity or plumbing. The family had no toilet because the one they had formerly used had rotted and fallen down. Water was carried from a spring located approximately one-fourth mile from the house.

"When Mrs. Carlisle was contacted by the staff there were 10 children residing at home, four of which were her own, and six belonged to her daughter Ruby, who was residing either in New Jersey or New York and worked as a domestic. Mrs. Carlisle's husband had a steady job working for the city of Uniontown, Ala., and, according to her, earned \$3 a day. Mrs. Carlisle received approximately \$25 each week from Ruby for support of the children and \$20 each week from two grown sons who lived at home and worked in town.

Mrs. Carlisle stated that she and some of her children picked cotton occasionally and earned a little over \$2 a day.

"Mrs. Carlisle advised that the family had purchased food stamps since November 1967, and paid \$46 for \$128 in stamps. The family had three hogs, which they intended to butcher during the winter months, and were raising 10 pigs for later use or sale. She advised that they had not raised a garden in recent years because the weather had been too dry. The family attempted to grow some cotton but the yield was not good.

"Mrs. Carlisle advised that since the family had been on food stamps her children had not been hungry. She was able to purchase 4 gallons of milk each week and two of her children received free lunches at school. For the others, she packed peanut butter sandwiches and a 'little sweet cake' and gave each a nickle for milk.

"Mr. John Turpin Vise, the Carlisle's landowner, advised the staff on September 27, 1968, that at the time he purchased the farm in 1966, the Carlisle family was a tenant. He told the Carlises they could plant all the cotton they wanted, for which he would receive one-third of the yield as his share. He also told the Carlisle family they could plant any other truck crop, such as okra, and there would be no charge for the land use. Mr. Vise said that okra can bring approximately \$200 an acre in a good year.

"Mr. Vise stated that in 1967 the Carlisle family planted 15 acres of cotton but only produced one bale of cotton for the entire field. Average cotton yield for this type of soil ranged from 1/2 to 1 1/2 bales per acre. Mr. Vise stated that the Carlisle family did not pick all the cotton that was raised. Mr. Vise stated that as a result of the cotton crop experience, he told Wade Carlisle that he should give up farming and stick to his job in town. He agreed to permit the Carlisle family to stay on the property for a monthly rent of \$5 but he has yet to receive his first payment. Mr. Vise advised that he found employment for the two grown sons at a local poultry plant at \$1.65 an hour, and when they work they are good workers but they do not report for work regularly.

"Mrs. Virginia Glass, director of pensions and security for Hale County, Ala., advised the staff on September 26, 1968, that Mrs. Carlisle applied for welfare in 1966 for seven grandchildren living with her and received aid to families with dependent children assistance until Ruby, her daughter, returned from the North where she had gone to seek employment. Mrs. Carlisle was notified that because Ruby had returned to Hale County, the mother of the children would have to apply for assistance, but Ruby never applied. As a result, payments to Mrs. Carlisle were discontinued.

"On September 26, 1968, Mrs. Barbara Drury, supervisor, food stamp program in Hale County, advised the staff that Mrs. Carlisle first applied for food stamps in July 1967, at which time the income for the family was reported to be \$166.16 a month. She was certified to purchase \$142 in food stamps at a cost of \$66. The certification continued until January 1968. On February 5, 1968, the Carlisle family was recertified for the purchase of \$146 in food stamps at a cost of \$74, based on a monthly income of \$208.66. On March 5, 1968, the family was recertified for the purchase of \$150 in food stamps at a cost of \$82, based on an income of \$234.66. The family purchased food stamps for only one-half of March 1968, and did not reappear at the food stamp office until July 17, 1968. Mr. Carlisle was out of work at the time due to an illness; Ruby had another child which had been added to the household; and a son had entered the Jobs Corps. During July 1968, the family was recertified for \$120 in food stamps, at a cost of \$32 but purchased only one-half of this amount because it was after the 15th of the month. On August 2, 1968,

the Carlisle family was recertified for \$128 in food stamps, at a cost of \$46, based upon a monthly income of \$109.77. For the month of September 1968, the \$46 purchase price of food stamps was paid by OEO, which enabled the family to use its money to help outfit the children for school.

"On September 27, 1968, Mrs. Jeanette R. Hinton, town clerk, Uniontown, Ala., advised the staff that Wade Carlisle, Jr., who resides near Faunsdale, had been employed as a handyman by the Uniontown Utilities Board since April 1967. His starting salary was \$4 per 8-hour day, and, about 5 months ago, he was given a raise to \$5 per day. Mr. Carlisle claimed six withholding exemptions, and his wages averaged between \$22.50 and \$27.50 per week.

"Relative to Mrs. Carlisle's statement on the CBS program concerning their inability to grow corn because the landowner sold the corn acres to the Government, and her consequent inability to raise hogs, chickens, and turkeys without the corn, the Secretary of Agriculture has observed that the records of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service disclosed that the Carlises never did grow corn on the land they rented from Mr. John Turpin Vise. The records confirmed the fact that Mr. Vise had diverted his corn acreage under the feed-grain program, but met with his tenants, and, as required, offered to share with them the payments received under the feed-grain program. Actually, Mr. Carlisle was not eligible to share in this agreement, because he had never grown corn on his rented land. Mr. Vise voluntarily offered, in lieu of sharing the Government payment under the feed-grain program, to give land, rent-free, to the Carlisle family for the commercial production of vegetables, and they accepted the offer. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that the Carlisle family could have grown sweet corn without violating the Government agreement, if they had wished to do so."

REPORT ON FEDERAL FOOD PROGRAMS FOR NEEDY PERSONS

I have read this part of the report to indicate the complete lack of objectivity in these TV programs on alleged hunger conditions.

The balance of the report will be included in the record at this point.

CONNECTICUT LIFE INSURANCE WEEK

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, it might be said that the most important feeling a man can have is the knowledge that his family is safe and secure. This can only be attained by hard work and careful planning for the future. But who will provide for the family in the event of death? Education, medical costs, and all the daily necessities of life have to be paid for. Too often families are crushed financially, because they have not planned for the economic burdens following an untimely death. It is for this reason that life insurance has played such an important role in our society.

Life insurance today is a growing business and is a thriving industry. It offers a wide range of benefits and services to the community as well as the policyholder. Participation in education, environmental programs, and library assistance programs are just a few of the

many ways that the life insurance industry is playing a role in public service.

Despite the size of the life insurance industry and the importance of its function, there still remains an unfortunate lack of knowledge on planning long-range insurance coverage. Life insurance is too important to be neglected or misunderstood.

It is for this reason that the residents of Connecticut join the insurance industry in celebrating Life Insurance Week from March 28 through April 3. In Hartford, the insurance capital of the world which I am proud to represent in this great body, life insurance underwriters have dedicated the entire week to try and teach the people of the community the benefits and services that they can receive.

I sincerely believe that the life insurance industry is worthy of the respect of this distinguished body.

THE 1971 BOB MATHIAS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that there are now two Bob Mathias' working and scurrying around the Capitol Hill area. The first, of course, is Congressman BOB MATHIAS, the former Olympic decathlon champion, who represents California's 18th Congressional District. The second Bob Mathias is a 15-year-old page working at the U.S. Supreme Court.

Two branches of our Federal Government now have a Bob Mathias, the legislative and the judicial. I just wonder if somewhere in that vast Federal bureaucracy there is not another Bob Mathias, to make the triangle complete.

I learned of this fact through an article entitled "The 1971 Bob Mathias" appearing in the March edition of the Star Gazer, a magazine for Washington Evening Star carriers. This article tells about a young Bob Mathias who is a page, an A-student, a star athlete, and a newspaper boy. Young Bob, who is in his sophomore year of high school, has been a page since September.

An interesting comparison can be drawn between the two Mathias'. The former champion applies the same enthusiasm and dedication to his job as Congressman that I am sure were needed for him to win two Olympic gold medals. It appears from this article that young Bob exhibits the same qualities in his activities and desire to become a lawyer.

I am pleased to share this article with my fellow colleagues:

THE 1971 BOB MATHIAS

Through a rigorous training schedule and a grim determination, a 17-year-old American, Bob Mathias, became the youngest decathlon champion of the Olympic Games in London back in 1948. Today in Washington, D.C. another determined, teenaged Bob Mathias is on a demanding training schedule that may lead him to another sort of greatness.

The 1971 Bob Mathias is a 15-year-old Star Boy (139-325) and one of three pages as-

signed to the Supreme Court. He is an A student, a star athlete and has a strong urge to become a lawyer. As far as he knows, he's no relation to the decathlon champ. However, even with all the rest going for him it isn't easy.

"My day begins at 4:45 a.m.," says Bob. "Because I have to be at the Capitol Page School on the third floor of the Library of Congress by 6:15 every day."

Bob, who is in his sophomore year of high school, takes biology, English II, French I and geometry. ("English and geometry are my favorites"). By 10 a.m. his classes are over and Bob goes to work.

When the Supreme Court is in session, the pages sit behind the bench, ready to aid the judges by carrying messages. On days when the court does not meet, Bob might work for Chief Justice Warren Berger, or the Marshal of the Supreme Court, T. Perry Liptitt. His duties for these men may take him out of the building and across town on errands to law offices.

For his work, young Mathias is paid \$6,500 a year. Half his wages are held in trust until his graduation from the page school.

"Most of what I keep goes into a bank, too," Bob pointed out. "All of this is for my education in law."

"My parents and I had an interview with the Marshal of the Supreme Court. Based on that and my school record I was enrolled in the Capitol Page School last September."

How does a boy become a page? When three of the four pages graduated last June, the Supreme Court went to their schools searching for replacements. Bob was attending one of those schools, John Carroll High School in the District. By virtue of his grades he was selected as a candidate.

Bob and the other Supreme Court pages attend the classes with 66 other pages from the House and the Senate. Throughout the year they also form athletic teams on which Bob is active.

"I'm a guard on the basketball team and we're doing pretty well now. Our standing is 5 wins and 2 losses in our league." Bob's part in a recent game against Harker Prep was carried in the Evening Star which recounted a strategy that won the pages the game, 56-52. Bob scored 7 of those points.

With all of this activity there's not much time for outside interests, but the Star is still a major responsibility.

"Fortunately my brother Jim backs me up and is now breaking in on the route. I've been a Star Boy since I was 11 and I'd sure hate to pass the route to a stranger."

The only thing that seems to be lacking in Bob's busy life at this point is girls.

"We may go co-ed soon, though. There's a sub-committee now studying the appointment of three girl pages. I'm sure they'll make the right decision."

PRESIDENT NIXON'S DECISION ON LIEUTENANT CALLEY SHOULD BE PRAISED

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that President Nixon's decision to grant to Lt. William Calley the comfort of military quarters pending the review and possible appeal of his conviction and sentencing will be received with shouts of applause and thanksgiving by millions of patriotic Americans.

I wish to extend to President Nixon my own sincere thanks and congratulations.

TRIBUTE TO GSA

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker in the past few days a newspaper article appeared suggesting that the GSA had bent and twisted the law in order to improperly give a contract to a Baltimore firm in the construction of the Hirshhorn Museum.

It has been my impression in the last 2 years that the GSA is one of the finest run agencies in the Federal Government. I have been consistently amazed that a Government service agency is actually performing services and performing them thoroughly, properly, and on time.

I have frequently commended the Honorable Robert L. Kunzig, Administrator of the GSA, for his outstanding performance of a very difficult duty and his management and operation of one of the largest governmental units in this country.

I asked Administrator Kunzig to give me the answer to the misleading suggestions of the newspaper article. He gave the facts in the case showing that every material allegation concerning the award of the contract had been approved in advance and in writing by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The GSA was required by law to issue this contract to the lowest bidder, and the watchdog of the Government, the GAO, approved every action. Any award to any other bidder, besides being illegal, would have cost the Government almost \$2 million in addition.

I again, commend Administrator Kunzig for his outstanding leadership in the operation of the General Services Administration and I include in the Record his answer to the unfounded charges:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1971.

Mr. CLARK MOLLENHOFF,
Chief, Washington Bureau,
Des Moines Register and Tribune,
National Press Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLARK: I am most distressed to learn that you have written a syndicated article concerning the award by the General Services Administration (GSA) of the contract to the Piracci Construction Company. The article, at best, is undeservedly critical of GSA and, at worst, implies a conscious twisting of procurement laws and regulations to the benefit of a particular company.

Clark, you are well aware of the circumstances surrounding the Piracci award for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden based on various discussions and reports which we furnished you at your request when you were at the White House. I find your article distressing because of its omissions—omissions which would present the entire story and show that the award was correct and required under the law.

Nowhere in the article do you mention that the Federal Procurement Regulations, which have the force and effect of law, provide specifically for an increase in a low bid by virtue of a proven mistake.

Nowhere in your article do you state that the increase in the bid of Piracci Construction Company was authorized by the Comptroller General of the United States, as re-

quired by these same regulations, and of which you were well aware.

Nowhere do you state that the eligibility of the Piracci Construction Company to receive awards of Government contracts had been upheld by the Comptroller General of the United States. Then and then only did GSA award the contract. Of this, too, you were well aware.

Nowhere in your article do you state that, under the applicable law and regulations, GSA had no basis on which *not* to make an award to the Piracci Construction Company, and no authority to award at a price less than their bid price as corrected. This, too, was discussed with you when you were at the White House.

In other words, Clark, a correct award under the law was made to the Piracci Construction Company and was approved *in every facet* by the Comptroller General, the watchdog of the Federal Government. The GSA could not have acted otherwise without violating the law. An award to a higher bidder, besides being illegal, would have cost the taxpayers almost two million dollars.

I'm very disappointed, Mr. Clark.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. KUNZIG,
Administrator.

FIFTH DISTRICT RADIO REPORT

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the great honor of having as my special guest on my radio report to the residents of the Fifth Congressional District, Congressman WILLIAM G. BRAY.

Congressman BRAY is a noted authority on Vietnam and is a student of military law. His views on the Lt. William Calley case are extremely interesting and informative and should be read by all Members of Congress.

The radio transcript follows:

RADIO REPORT No. 10

MARCH 31, 1971.

ANNOUNCER. This is another Washington Report from your Congressman Bud Hillis, who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana.

Congressman Hillis who is your guest today?

HILLIS. Well, I have the good fortune today to have with me a colleague from Indiana, Congressman Bill Bray of the Sixth District of Indiana. We certainly want to welcome you to this radio report Congressman Bray.

BRAY. I am certainly happy and proud to be here with my good friend and colleague Bud Hillis.

ANNOUNCER. If I can interject a question, Congressman Bray, we just have the sad situation regarding the My Lai incident and the sentencing of Lt. Calley. What are your views on this situation?

BRAY. In fact, I do not want to comment on the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the verdict in the case. As an old trial lawyer who has tried many, many law suits in my time, I do not comment on the verdict until the matter is proceeded on beyond that. I do want to say that it is a most unfortunate matter and I am deeply worried over this entire My Lai incident.

I won't place the blame, perhaps where it belongs, that is as to the handling of this case. No one could say that it has been handled well.

The Secretary of the Army was well aware of this incident in My Lai six months before it hit the press. The reason I know that is that I am on the Armed Services Committee and have been for the last 18 years, and we received letters on this matter.

The Armed Services Committee, not being a publicity committee as everyone well knows, sent this matter to the office of the Secretary of the Army. Nothing was done. At that time this matter could have been handled without all the motions and troubles that are going on now. A proper mental study could have been made of Lt. Calley—it was not done.

It is a very sad affair, and I am not going to be a Pollyanna and say that it will not do damage. It will do damage to the moral of the fighting men, it will do damage to the prestige of our country. But our country has gone through rougher times than this and it came out fine.

I do want to point out very briefly certain things about this trial. This trial is not over by any means—it is merely beginning.

Perhaps because of recent innovations we have made in procedure in military law, there is no court in the world where the rights of the individual are protected and have as many chances for review as there are in military procedure. This did not used to be the case. In fact, I participated after the war in the appeal of a very noted case and finally after six years of effort, the soldier was restored to duty, given an honorable discharge and paid all the money due him.

Major General Orwin C. Talbott, the convening authority of the court at Fort Benning, Georgia, will study this with his Staff Judge Advocate. He can set it aside if he wants to, he can make changes, he can reduce it to manslaughter, reduce the sentence by the court or by a number of other means decrease the sentence.

Then the Army Court of Military Review automatically looks into the sentence approved by the convening authority. That is by the second authority.

Then it goes to the Court of Military Appeals here in Washington which I have been interested in for many years. In fact, some unfortunate cases of World War II brought about this Court of Military Appeals. The Armed Services Committee, which I am proudly a member, has watched over this court for a long time and it is a very fine court.

In the event of a death sentence, it would have to be approved by the President of the United States.

I assure you that this case is going to be one that many of us are going to follow through on and try to see that ultimate justice is done. I, for one, am not at all happy about this case.

ANNOUNCER. Congressman Hillis, I have heard this case has been referred to as a parallel to the Nuremberg Trials following World War II. Could you comment on that and discuss it with Mr. Bray?

HILLIS. Well, of course, I well remember the Nuremberg Trials—I was in Germany myself in the service at that time. I don't think that there is a parallel here. I think that perhaps this points out the hazards—the Korean conflict and this conflict—that you can get into a limited war situation.

I want to ask Congressman Bray, I think you have been to Vietnam. Do you find the problem of identification of the enemy—who is an enemy alien and who is a civilian—to be a difficult one.

BRAY. I have been in Vietnam many times—eleven as I recall. I was first over there with the French Army before the United States was involved except in an advisory capacity and/or the handling of supplies.

I like the Vietnamese people and there are many fine people there. But there are situations where it is impossible to know friends from enemies. For example, cases of children

four and five years old—whom naturally the American soldier would like to love, pat him on the head, and give candy to—throwing grenades.

It is very difficult. We are dealing with a Communist world. Especially, the Oriental Communist world is very difficult for Americans to understand.

I do not feel that it has anything to do with the Nuremberg Trials. In fact, many errors were made in the Nuremberg Trials and I think most people realize that there is no connection at all with that.

Of all the enemies of America, at home and abroad, we have many of them, the most vicious ones, here in America, I am ashamed to say some of them have been holding high positions. They will do anything in the world to injure and destroy the prestige of their government, and they want to make hay out of this at the very best.

So pray for the American people to have confidence in their country, confidence in American heritage and American greatness.

ANNOUNCER. You just raised an interesting point, Mr. Bray, in regard to not knowing who is a friend and who is a foe in Vietnam. I think one of the things that Americans have heard very little of in recent years is the atrocities committed by the other side. Can you comment on that?

BRAY. Oh yes. There is no comparison. In fact, in Hue there were literally thousands of women and children who were destroyed and murdered in cold blood and buried in a mass grave. This was planned and ordered.

In fact, there are literally hundreds of incidents every year where they come in—not a matter of battle—kill women and children in their beds and take and mutilate their bodies, and I have seen the results of that.

You must realize the environment in which the American soldiers live. They see their friends murdered, women and children murdered who only want freedom with no desire of a battle at all, and half their platoon destroyed by people pretending to be friends.

I've been in battle—never that type of battle exactly—but the fear and pressures of battle can do awful things to people.

ANNOUNCER. Congressman Hillis, do you find concern over the My Lai case to be very widespread throughout the House and the Congress as a whole?

HILLIS. Well, first I would say it is my opinion that it is widespread throughout the country and as a result is widespread throughout the Congress, and Congress is a responsive body to the people of the United States.

We are receiving a tremendous amount of communication about this, and that is why I was so interested in what Congressman Bray had to say about the review of this case and that proper steps will be taken in the future to review it completely.

ANNOUNCER. This has been another Washington Report from your Congressman Bud Hillis, who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana. Congressman Hillis welcomes your comments. Write to:

Congressman Elwood H. Hillis, U.S. House of Representatives, 1510 Longworth Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

We especially urge you to write Congressman Hillis this week for a special report entitled "Where does the Calley case go now?"

TRIBUTE TO S. SGT. JOHN R. CHAMPLIN, KILLED IN ACTION

HON. M. C. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Audrey Smith Champlin has just recently

received notice that her husband, S. Sgt. John R. Champlin—a career soldier, had been killed in action.

Sergeant Champlin thus becomes another of the valiant men—and the 118th northern Kentuckian—who has given his life in defense of his country and in protecting the free world.

The sympathy of thousands of other families who have paid this sacrifice goes out to Mrs. Champlin. To her also goes the sincere gratitude of those of us whom her husband died protecting.

The recent Kentucky Post article, which reports the loss of S. Sgt. John R. Champlin, follows:

TANK HIT KILLS BOONE ARMY VET

(By John Harris)

Enemy gunfire blasted a tank in Vietnam last Friday and killed S. Sgt. John R. Champlin, 42, a career soldier from Boone County.

Sgt. Champlin, the tank commander, had served 10½ years in the Army.

"A sergeant told me my husband's tank took a direct hit and it blew up," said his wife Audrey Smith Champlin.

Mrs. Champlin, a nurse at Good Samaritan Hospital, Cincinnati, lives at Union.

Sgt. Champlin was a Boone County native and attended Constance School before entering the Army in 1948.

"He had just come home from service in 1951 when he was recalled due to the Korean Conflict," Mrs. Champlin said.

He served in Korea and Germany and was on his second duty tour in Vietnam.

"I got a letter Monday that he had written on the 10th," Mrs. Champlin said. "He said they were on the move so fast after the North Vietnamese that he had written one part one day and finished it the next."

At that time he was at Khe Sanh near the Laotian border.

Sgt. Champlin was wounded in April 1966, in Vietnam when his buddy stepped on a mine. It exploded, killing the buddy, and showering Sgt. Champlin with shrapnel.

For this he had been awarded a Purple Heart. He had received many other medals, including a Bronze Star for valor, and the Commendation Medal.

"They had told him he might be out of Vietnam by May and he was looking forward to that," Mrs. Champlin said.

He had visited at home last September before returning to Vietnam.

Sgt. Champlin is Boone County's 12th victim of fighting in Southeast Asia and the 118th for northern Kentucky.

Other survivors are two brothers, William, of Taylorsport, and George, of Hebron.

And six sisters, Mrs. Grace Hodges and Mrs. Janie Kirby, Hebron; Mrs. Bessie Brunner, Florence; Mrs. Thelma Wirick, Lawrenceburg, Ind.; Mrs. Pauline Melvin, Erlanger, and Mrs. Minnie Smith, Lebanon, O.

Stith Funeral Home, Florence, is in charge of arrangements.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. BYRNE OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I take this time of the House to express the pride that those of us from Philadelphia feel in the courageous and outstanding leadership that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE) displayed yesterday in lead-

ing the fight to continue divinity student exemptions.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is a senior, and we all know highly valued, member of the Armed Services Committee. But he had the courage to oppose the committee when he felt the national interest demanded it. He had the courage to keep fighting for what he believed was right even though the vote in his committee was overwhelmingly against him.

And his leadership was so astute, his motion on the floor of the House was so persuasive, that his amendment carried by a sweeping majority of 114 to 29.

Not only those of us in Philadelphia but all Americans who believe in encouraging a strong religious influence in American life owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JAMES A. BYRNE. Because of the leadership of JIMMY BYRNE religious groups of all denominations will be assured that young men who experience a special call to the service of God will not be interrupted in the long and difficult path to the cloth.

I applaud the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I commend him for again demonstrating his unique brand of leadership. I know that religious leaders throughout the Nation are in his debt today.

Many Americans will remember JIMMY BYRNE in their prayers tonight. Those prayers are richly deserved; I am sure they will be heard in the right place.

FUTURE LEADERS OF AMERICA

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the extreme pleasure of participating in an Eagle Scout Recognition Dinner in my district. This program, entitled "Future Leaders of America," was unique in that the honored Eagle Scouts invited leaders in the fields which they desired to enter to act as their sponsors. There resulted a mutual exchange of admiration and respect—by the Scouts who were able to communicate with acknowledged leaders in the Scout's area of interest, and by the sponsors who were able to observe first hand the qualities of excellence which these young men exhibited.

I would like to share with my colleagues some of the sentiments expressed at this function by Maj. Howard B. Landeau, U.S. Air Force:

We honor tonight the 58 young men who have achieved during this past year the highest goal in Scouting—that of an Eagle Scout. These Eagle Scouts we honor tonight range from 13 to 17 years of age. When I was informed that Scouting had over 5 million registered Boy Scouts and less than 1 percent of these 5 million has had the desire, motivation, or ability to attain the remarkable goal—that of "Eagle", it was quite obvious to me that each of you are a rare and special breed of young American.

If only 50 percent of the Eagle Scouts here tonight through this program attain their vocational desires and all 500 councils

adopting this program achieve the same percentage, it could mean that in 4 to 6 years this country can be certain of from 20,000 to 50,000 dedicated Americans through this program each year.

When God made the eagle, he gave him a barren cliff for a home, where he would have to fight the elements and his enemies constantly in order to survive. He gave him an independent spirit.

As the eagle symbolizes the spirit of self reliance and perseverance that makes America great, so does the eagle represent the achievements that make a Boy Scout great.

When a boy becomes an Eagle Scout he has scaled the summit of scouting. He has reached the pinnacle of achievement.

An Eagle Scout must excel in four fields. He must earn a specified number of merit badges (25) and must possess outstanding citizenship, leadership and spiritual qualities. He must have learned to become part of a team working toward a common objective and at the same time he must have developed the individual initiative that lifts him above his fellows and marks him as superior.

The task is not easy. Starting at the age of eleven, a lad becomes progressively a Tenderfoot, Second Class, First Class, Star, Life and then an Eagle Scout. Along the way, as he develops character and moral strength, he also becomes proficient in camping, swimming, nature, conservation, public health, firemanship, cooking, lifesaving, personal fitness, safety and first aid. He also must have worked actively as a leader in meetings, outdoor activities and service projects while a Life Scout, he must live up to the Scout Oath, the Scout Law, the Scout Motto and the Scout slogan; he must do his best to help in home, school, church and community; and he must learn to take care of his own possessions and respect the property of others. To summarize—an Eagle Scout has received the type of training that will enable him to live a meaningful life of unselfishness and happiness.

Strength, character, desire and motivation; a winner among scouts. What better candidate can we ask for as a future leader of America!

GOOD MARKS GIVEN THE OUTGOING MAYOR

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, shortly after our fine Mayor Ius Davis of Kansas City decided not to run for another term, the Wall Street Journal selected him to be featured in one of its series dealing with urban government. The article which was reprinted in the Kansas City Star follows:

GOOD MARKS GIVEN THE OUTGOING MAYOR (By Dennis Farney)

It seems deceptively manageable from this height, the city rolling away in an orderly grid below the skyscraper Tom Pendergast built. But for the man on the 29th floor—characteristically reflective today, his face crinkling into a wry smile—there's a different view from City hall.

"I don't really run a government," quips Mayor Ius W. Davis. "I run a loose tribal democracy."

Ike Davis will be stepping down next month. The 53-year-old banker and lawyer took office eight years ago, when city government here seemed near paralysis; he leaves with observers rating him as one of Kansas City's most effective mayors. Some of the accomplishments they cite:

Rebuilding City hall's professional staff, gutted between 1959 and 1963 when remnants of the old Pendergast machine regained power. Passing a public accommodations ordinance and making it stick in a bitter referendum, the first major city to do so. Winning voter authorization of some 230 million dollars in bonds; launching construction of an international airport and dozens of lesser projects. Fundamental gains, if not a breakthrough, against this city's chronic revenue shortage.

But the talk of "tribal democracy" is revealing, as is the assessment by Councilman J. D. Robbins of Mr. Davis's performance: "A strong mayor in a weak-mayor type of government." Both comments refer to a governmental structure that has shaped the mayor's whole approach to his job.

POWERLESS TO LEAD

It is an interlocking structure—federal, state, county, city—that diffuses power and hedges against power. It does this so effectively that a Kansas City mayor, though officially the leader of the city, could be almost powerless to lead. This didn't happen with Ike Davis, which says something about his skill as tribal leader and the demands of the times in which he governed.

A key to the structure is Missouri's state constitution, still reflecting a simpler time and rural past. Mayor Davis calls it "almost antiurban" because it requires Missouri cities to work very hard to do some relatively simple things. For example, in some states a city council can simply authorize the sale of a special-assessment bond to extend a sewer or pave a street; here the council must win a two-thirds vote in a city-wide election. More important, the constitution requires a four-sevenths vote before the city can sell a revenue bond and a two-thirds vote to authorize a general obligation bond.

When Mayor Davis took office the constitution also was forcing the city to rely heavily on the property tax, while limiting the amount of the city's tax levy for operating purposes. Kansas City was (and is) at the state ceiling, so property tax revenues were growing only as fast as the tax base grew—about 8 per cent a year. Kansas City couldn't increase revenues by raising property assessments, either; only the county has that power.

Further, Kansas City doesn't fully control its own police force. In the 1930s, with boss Pendergast running the police and City hall from his office at 1908 Main street, the state took over effective control and never gave it back. Today the Legislature, not the council, decides how much Kansas City policemen should be paid. Then the city decides how to meet the payroll.

The reform-minded Citizens association swept the Pendergast machine from City hall in the 1940 election; except for the 1959-63 administration, the association has controlled City hall ever since. With association government has come strict adherence to Kansas City's 1925 charter has some hedges of its own.

The charter decrees nonpartisan elections for mayor and council, depriving Mayor Davis, a Democrat, of some political clout with the city's decidedly partisan representatives in Jefferson City and Washington. It specifies a weak-mayor, city manager administrative system, diffusing power at City hall. (The mayor has only one of 13 council votes; the council sets policy and hires the manager; the manager executes policy.) And it allows a determined minority of voters to force a referendum on controversial council ordinances, making council leadership more difficult.

The object of all this was to replace patronage politics with businesslike government, and this is pretty much what has happened. But safeguards against evil men doing evil can work equally well against good men doing good. When combined with restrictions

at other levels of government, the hedges in the charter can help produce "tribal democracy": A system under which political representatives lack authority to do what they think needs doing.

So it isn't surprising that Ike Davis could walk into City hall one morning and confess that he felt "like the college kids" that day—that the structure of government wasn't adequate to the task. ("I'm not down," he told a reporter who said he certainly look down. "I'm just not exuberant.") Nevertheless, everyone agrees, Ike Davis led. How did he do it?

MYSTIQUE AND THE STAR

One factor is the mystique that surrounds nonpartisan government and the Citizens association here. The association has never forgotten—and its ally, The Kansas City Star, has never let voters forget—that it is the organization that replaced "spoils politics" with "charter government." (So potent have been The Star's editorial lambastings of "political" candidates over the years that "The Kansas City Star" or, alternatively, "The Great White Father at Eighteenth and Grand" is often an issue in city elections.)

So closely is the association identified with "good government" publicly, so closely do individual association council members identify with "charter government" privately, that the organization has remained a strong and relatively cohesive force in city life for more than 30 years. Since the association enjoyed big council majorities throughout the Davis years, the mayor always had a solid bloc at least predisposed to his leadership.

And the nature of urban problems in the 1960s helped thrust Mr. Davis into that leadership. In quiet times, perhaps, the administrative-oriented city manager system can make a stronger manager the prime mover in City Hall. But the 1960s were not quiet times. Riots in the inner city after the assassination of Martin Luther King, the continuing revenue crisis and the difficult choices it posed, the rise of issues like public accommodations and open housing—all were political questions that demanded political leadership. And Mayor Davis, despite his lone council vote, was the logical leader.

Howard Neighbor, a political scientist who has studied Kansas City's municipal politics believes Mr. Davis' hand was further strengthened by the growing impact of federal urban programs. Mayors everywhere, he explains, are becoming increasingly responsible to two constituencies: the local voters and the federal administrators who dispense money cities need. As go-between, a mayor in even a weak-mayor system "can acquire a substantial degree of political power, just because he's there."

But none of these factors would have made much difference without what Councilman Robins calls Mr. Davis' "sheer force of personality."

That description might seem an ironic one for lanky, scholarly looking Mr. Davis, because political observers generally rank "personality" as his weakest point. Even The Star, unequivocally backing him in 1963, had to describe Mr. Davis editorially as "somewhat professorish" while conceding that his opponent was "a natural leader." As mayor, Mr. Davis usually looked a bit too stiff and formal on television. Jokes Bruce Watkins, a councilman during the mayor's first term: "He's the only politician I know that never smiles."

But Mr. Robins makes it clear he's using "personality" in a particular way—not as charisma but rather as personal strength and "just sheer ability." And as Councilman Robins and Mr. Watkins discuss the mayor, certain descriptions keep recurring: A man who came across warmly, forcefully face-to-face, who always had the facts, who kept his word and never ducked a fight. "I hate to see Ike Davis leave," says Mr. Watkins, "because it's going to be a different ball game."

"Too many people here are more interested

in bricks and mortar than in human needs," says Mr. Watkins, who's now county Democratic chairman and head of a black political organization. But Mayor Davis "really cared about people . . . By his deeds and the money he had available he did everything he could to eliminate human suffering." He adds: "Members of the council had confidence in him. . . . I will never in my life question his integrity."

Mr. Watkins cites the mayor's leadership on a bitter issue he might easily have finessed: sustaining the council's public-accommodations ordinance when voters forced a public referendum. Opposition was clearly widespread, and in one strategy session in the mayor's office someone mentioned that anti-ordinance placards were popping up in taverns all over town. Mr. Watkins remembers that the mayor pounded his desk and declared: "I'll be damned if I'll let tavern operators dictate the moral tone of this city." The ordinance survived by about 1,614 votes out of almost 100,000.

That referendum was only one of 19 separate campaigns (bond elections, referendums and other issues) that Mayor Davis took to the people in eight years—a total that illustrates as well as anything the nature of Mr. Davis' "tribal democracy."

Taking office with the city heavily tied to an inflexible property tax, Mayor Davis carried the fight to the Legislature and won the right to submit an earnings tax to a vote of the city. Voters approved the new tax in 1963.

PROGRAM FOR PROGRESS

But the earnings tax didn't completely solve the money problem—not with inflation eating away at city revenues, with residents pressing for increased city services and the city eager to build a new airport and begin dozens of other costly projects. So the ensuing years found Mayor Davis leading repeated bond and taxing campaigns, inside the council and out. Then, late in 1969, the mayor and council presented voters with a "Program for Progress" that embodied all the goals of the Davis years.

There would be a broadened, flexible tax structure: a new sales tax (authorized by the Legislature after another lobbying effort), a double earnings tax, but halved real estate and utility tax rates. Existing city services would be expanded and new ones added. A 143-million-dollar bond package would authorize projects ranging from fire stations to parks and rapid transit. There were 24 separate proposals in all, and if they failed, Mayor Davis said, "We'll only be able to move from hour to hour." Every one failed.

Observers attributed this partly to an anti-tax mood that seemed to pervade the country at the time. And, they think, Mayor Davis' many other campaigns had worn out his welcome. Voters were now grumbling about their "high-tax mayor," and when Mr. Davis opened last spring's baseball season, the fans booed him. Last October, he announced he wouldn't run again.

He might have quit there. Instead, he led the fight within the council to resubmit the doubled earnings tax to the voters; and he refused to postpone the election when some council members became worried it would jeopardize their re-election bids. Last December, a year after the Program for Progress failed, the doubled earnings tax carried almost 2 to 1.

So the Davis years are ending with a victory, and the feeling here is that the mayor will be a hard man to replace. Mr. Davis wouldn't agree with that, of course, but he does wonder how, given the present structure, any Kansas City mayor can fully meet his responsibilities. Change keeps coming faster, and elected representatives are supposed to lead, he says. The problem is, "We're still not really sure we believe in representative government."

A SILENT SPRING

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Mike Green, who writes for the McClatchey Newspapers, has written a moving, sensitive, and perceptive mood piece on Washington, kids, war, and peace. It is really good.

A SILENT SPRING

(By Mike Green, Washington Staff Writer)

WASHINGTON.—The antiwar doves return here in flocks each spring now as certainly and regularly as the swallows return to Capistrano. It is a mark of the prolonged national agony accompanying a seemingly never-ending war.

On the political domestic front, the Indo-China War, like the Earth, now has its own seasons, and time is told by the changing faces as younger brothers and sisters replace older ones who came here in earlier springs when a different President occupied the White House and the war, too, was much younger.

The new peace replacements will occupy the open spaces where their predecessors of one, three, six years ago stood in vigil outside the strange, foreign enclaves of executive and military power and on the steps of the U.S. Capitol, where the shuffling steps of the young who protest the war are now as familiar a sight in April as the arrival of the tourist hordes.

The ghosts of American history associated with this city also appear now in forms from out of the more recent past. They can be summoned in that quiet, panoramic view available from the rear steps of the lighted U.S. Capitol, looking down at the city from above, any cold and crowdless night.

To the right is the famous avenue that has borne the bodies of our national military past, Pershing to Eisenhower, and the Unknown Soldier, the angry tread of bonus marchers and the armies that paraded off to glory and paraded back from it again, its fallen carried on caissons, in slower step, after a moral sleep in which, as Aeschylus wrote, pain which could not forget fell drop by drop upon the heart until, in our despair, against our will, had come wisdom through the awful grace of God.

But the more recent memories are now the most real to one who has been an observer in Washington during recent years, as the war itself is still real. In the shadows of night still file the ghosts of the 1969 March Against Death when the young and old carrying candles had lit the night sky from Arlington Memorial to the White House and all down Pennsylvania Avenue to the foot of the Capitol, where each marcher dropped a card with the name of an individual dead Vietnam GI in an open coffin, and there had been the flashing of the peace sign and the singing of songs.

Then again that cold October, on the other side of the Capitol, the young had sat on the steps nearly all of one night while the House met late to debate whether or not to debate the war and finally decide not to. There had been the songs then, too, the guitars, the young faces shining in a crimson moon with zest and life, the flashed peace sign, and all of it.

In the spring of 1970 after Cambodia and Kent they were everywhere around the Capitol then, not for a night but weeks this time, and the mood was different.

Darkness, my old friend—Simon and Garfunkel sing—I've come to talk with you again . . .

It was like that in the Sounds of Silence that intermittently accompanied the new annual trek of the young after Cambodia.

This spring, they again are coming. Not all the same young, but the new young, the replacements, and this time something else, too, marking still another mood and another changing of the seasons of protest.

This time, Vietnam veterans against the war are descending on Washington to play a major role in the spring peace offensive. They will occupy Washington and the grounds around the Capitol for the better part of a week, telling it like it is as they have known it. No mere peaceniks, these, but long-haired youths with scars and battle ribbons, the older brothers of the new young who will come.

They will add their own chapter to the history that has accumulated around this Capitol building in recent years. They are the Americans who, as Walter Lippmann wrote after World War I, came back home after having gone out to make the world something or other it did not become.

Later in April and in May other protesters will be flooding in, the black, the poor, the pacifist, the radical.

What they can accomplish they themselves do not know. The record of the seasons of protest against the war since the protest began years ago at some now vague and forgotten date sometimes seems piled high with futility.

But they will come, and sing "Blowin' in the Wind" again, the song that first asked a decade ago how many seas a white dove must sail before she can sleep in the sand.

And they will be back again, asking the same question next year, too, for as many seasons as it takes, driven now by neither hope nor despair, but taking their place as part of an inexorable annual movement that has become as regular a part of our national and political nature as the elemental migration of swallows.

AIR BAGS: SAFETY OVERKILL

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of discussion is centering on the possible use of air bags to protect automobile passengers. The degree of regulation in this field is under debate and very likely will at some point in the near future demand the attention of each of us in Congress.

The following article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, appearing recently in the Detroit Sunday News, is both thought provoking and analytical. It lends itself in a most constructive way to the present dialog, as follows:

AIR BAGS: SAFETY OVERKILL

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Government decrees setting rigid deadlines for new standards of auto safety are very kindly meant. Big Brother is trying to help us stop killing each other on the highways at the rate of 55,000 a year. We should cheer.

But when 40-year-old Douglas Toms, head of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, decrees that no car may be sold after July, 1973, without "passive restraints" that would protect riders in head-on crashes up to 30 miles an hour, it is possible that Big Brother is showing a degree of arrogance that can cause us all trouble.

A passive restraint does not mean belts

of any kind, for these require the cooperation of the passenger. The only device that seems to have promise is a system of air bags that explode into full inflation in three-hundredths of a second from the time of impact.

These can be built. Toms estimates the cost at \$50 a car. The auto makers say they would cost several times as much.

Toms, who came up as a traffic engineer, never designed a car or tried to sell one. But whether Toms is estimating on the low side out of ignorance or whether the auto makers are estimating on the high side because they really don't want to do anything is unimportant compared with the feasibility of air bags.

In an article in a recent issue of Business Week, Prof. Ernst Fiala, research director at Volkswagen, is quoted as saying:

"The kick of the bag skin as it makes contact with driver and passengers is about six to seven times as strong as a soccer ball kicked by a professional soccer player. When you're firing four large air bags, you can reasonably expect that the car will be a wreck. In a way, it's safety overkill."

If one-half of 1 percent of the bags are faulty and explode on the open road, this would mean, in a 10-million-car year, 50,000 such explosions. Drivers would be able to step on the brakes but could not reach the steering wheel.

Chrysler Vice-President Sidney Terry says: "Here's the bureau saying we must put something on our cars that is not yet developed and has a lot of problems. It sets a deadline. It says we will be liable if it doesn't work."

Thomas Feaheny, of Ford, says: "There is no way we can produce air bags with reliability. If our petitions for reconsideration are not honored, we'll have to produce a very unreliable system."

The Department of Transportation has come up with many both simple and exotic ideas for auto safety. Some we should hall with joy.

Beginning with the 1973 models there will be bumpers that really can stand a bump. They won't look so hot but they will save us insurance money.

There are great possibilities in a rear-view periscope set in the roof. Spillproof gasoline tanks and no-fade, no-skid brakes certainly are in order.

Moreover, the insurance companies are cooling the hot rods. Nobody needs a 300-horsepower engine unless he's driving dangerously and insurance rates are beginning to price the tigers off the road.

But some far-out ideas with which the Department of Transportation is toying are more suspect. Take the drunk-baffling lock, a combination of numbers which would have to be dialed in correct sequence before the car could be started. Must nuns and Baptist missionaries buy them?

Or the howler which begins at 80 miles an hour. Or the gizmo that won't let you turn on the ignition until you're trussed in your shoulder harness. Is there anyone who understands the principle of a screwdriver who couldn't make such things inoperative?

Toms swears that few of the safety devices he is demanding need add to the cost of the car. Manufacturers say that the cost may run between \$500 and \$1,000. Who is right?

We say "safety first" but we don't really mean it. The safety of any rapidly moving vehicle is a matter of compromise.

Oddly, the U.S. government, itself, is subsidizing 100-mile-an-hour trains between Washington and New York which cannot be as safe as 60-mile-an-hour trains.

We could build a jet plane with a highlift, high-drag wing that could land in a 40-acre field in an emergency. But it would take 20 hours to cross the country and no one would ride in it.

The trick is to find that degree of govern-

ment regulation that will protect us from our own foolishness and any gross neglect by manufacturers and yet that we can pay for and will live with. The Department of Transportation cannot create engineering miracles by executive order.

NATURAL GAS SHORTAGE

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last October I announced on the floor of the House that I intended to introduce legislation that would amend the Natural Gas Act and lead toward the easing of the power shortage. In January, my colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOHN MURPHY, introduced H.R. 2513, the Natural Gas Amendments of 1971. Today, along with several other of my colleagues, I want to join in the sponsorship of this bill. This bill has the backing of the producers, the pipelines and the distributors. Members of the Federal Power Commission have indicated in public statements general support of the principle of the legislation. It is significant that the distributors are supporting this bill since their interest is aligned with that of the consumer.

For many years now representatives of the oil and gas industry have predicted and warned that the Federal regulatory scheme of natural gas was going to produce a scarcity of this clear and most popular fuel. Unfortunately, this prediction has come to pass. This winter and in the past few winters there has been a scarcity of fuel in several large cities. The unjust and unsupported allegations by some critics of the industry that an artificial gas shortage exists today created by producers holding back gas supplies in the hope of higher future prices has been refuted in a public statement by Federal Power Commission officials. The simple truth is that there is a gas supply shortage because there is lack of incentive for the producer to look for new supplies. Let me give you some statistics to back this up. It is estimated by the U.S. Geological Survey that the undiscovered gas reserves in the contiguous 48 States are 1,550 trillion cubic feet, more than 70 times the 1969 domestic production. However, the ratio of discovered reserves to annual production has dropped from 32.5 to 1 in 1946 to 13 to 1 in 1969. Between 1956 and 1968 wildcat drilling dropped 40 percent, geophysical activity dropped 56 percent, and total wells dropped 43 percent.

In 1968, for the first time, there was more gas consumed than found, with the result being that reserves were reduced by 5.6 trillion cubic feet. In 1969 the deficit increased to 12.3 trillion cubic feet. The results for 1970 are not in yet, but it is anticipated that there will be a further reduction of our discovered reserves.

FCC Commissioner Brooke has stated that major interstate gas pipelines virtually ruled out new customer attachments for the winter of 1970-71.

The Economic Report of the President

this year further documented the fact that there is a real shortage of natural gas. The report said:

There appears to be a shortage of one major energy fuel, natural gas; that is, its production is clearly falling short of desired consumption at current prices. Current prices for interstate sales have been kept low by the Federal Power Commission, which sets these prices under law. Not only have prices been too low for desired consumption to be met, but they appear to have also retarded development of new gas supplies. The only satisfactory solution of this problem is to allow the price, at least of new gas not previously committed, to approach the market clearing level.

H.R. 2513 in itself will not raise the price of gas. The price of gas will be subject to FPC approval along with other provisions of the contract. However, once the contract is approved the contract will not be subject to change and the producer will know what price he will receive for his gas and for how long he will be obliged to supply gas. These are certainties that he does not now enjoy. Under present controls, the producer who sells to an interstate pipeline does not know what price he will receive for his gas, how long he will receive a particular price, how much gas he must deliver or how long he must continue to make his deliveries. Once he has begun deliveries the provisions of his contract are subject to change and revision by rulings of the FPC. To make matters worse the producer often has to go through long, drawn out hearings, sometimes lasting years before his price is established and then he has no certainty for the FPC can come along and reduce his price.

With a regulation system like this, no wonder there is a scarcity of gas. How can we expect businessmen to be interested in investing their capital and time under such conditions. Although H.R. 2513 would not raise the price of gas alone, it would provide certainty for the gas industry. The bill would require all contracts covering gas deliveries, except for small contracts, to be submitted to the Commission. The FPC would either approve the contract, making it binding; approve it subject to stipulated conditions, acceptance of which would validate the contract; or disapprove the contract, voiding it.

Although H.R. 2513 will not free the gas producer from regulation it will give the industry some element of contractual certainty. An element that any businessman needs in order to operate. Why would anyone want to risk his capital in a business where he does not know what price he will be paid or how long he will have to perform.

Under H.R. 2513, existing contracts would continue to be subject to the Natural Gas Act. However the FPC could not reduce prices under these contracts once it has approved them.

Let me point out a little history on how the natural gas industry got into such regulatory straits. In 1938 Congress passed the Natural Gas Act to regulate interstate transmission lines. The gas producers were subject to State regula-

tion and the act contained language which was thought to exclude gas producers from regulation under the act. Until 1954 the FPC took the position it did not have the power to regulate the natural gas producers. In 1954 the Supreme Court in a split decision ruled that the Natural Gas Act did require the FPC to control the well head prices charged for gas by the producers who sell to interstate pipelines. This decision imposed on the FPC the heavy burden of regulating the prices of a competitively produced commodity using a law designed to regulate a public utility and to fix these prices on the basis of the traditional cost of serve utility rate base method. It has been pointed out that this was the first time in the United States that price controls had been imposed in peace time on a competitively produced commodity.

It is past time that we corrected this situation. We have already waited much too long. Many want to revert to the old days when there was no regulation of producer prices but regardless of whether this is wise or not it does not appear politically possible.

As I have said before the quickest and most feasible solution to the problem has two parts. One is that the price set by the FPC must be at a level that will balance supply with demand. The second portion is that the producer must be assured that he has a firm contract. The bill I and others are joining the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) in will assure the producer of a firm contract.

Mr. Speaker I urge that for the well being of all citizens, Government, industry, consumers and would-be consumers that Congress act favorably and quickly on H.R. 2513.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, facts and figures belie the optimistic reports which forecast a sudden resurgence in our present stagnated economy. Caught between rising unemployment and high inflation, the American citizen is understandably doubtful things are miraculously going to change. He takes such predictions with more than a grain of salt, no matter who makes it.

The facts are unemployment has almost doubled in 2 years, increasing from 3.4 percent in January 1969 to an average of 6 percent over the past 3 months. That means 5 million people are out of work. Hand in hand with increased unemployment is increased inflation. Consumer prices have gone up an average of nearly 6 percent a year, compared to the average increase of slightly more than 2 percent in the previous 8 years. Our economy

is stalled. At the end of last year there was a \$70 billion difference between what we were producing and what we were capable of producing.

While every American might not be in a position to quote facts and figures, he does know things are not good. He has been given a lot of verbal assurance things will change but he sees no evidence of it. Our fiscal and monetary policies have not been altered so much from the policies which brought about the present situation and the administration's economic plan readily accepts a 5-percent unemployment rate.

It is for these reasons I have introduced legislation to spend \$2 billion into reactivating and revitalizing economic development programs which have proven their value and worth. The legislation will, among other things, reestablish the accelerated public works program of 1962, which, I believe, was most effective in reversing economic trends similar to those of today.

Provisions within the bill would provide funds to break the logjam of public works projects which now are poised and ready for construction. It would put people back to work immediately. The funds could go to areas hardest hit by unemployment and where projects can be started and completed within 12 months after approval.

The proposed bill also calls for authorizing a 2-year continuation of the Economic Development Administration programs, the Regional Development Commission, and the Appalachian Regional Development program. The EDA and ARD authorizations are due to expire June 30, and I believe it is imperative we continue these job-making programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all agree we must get our economy moving again; we must get our people back to work. My bill is a push in the right direction.

NOT WORTH A PAPER CUP

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, every day some clever retailer comes up with a new gimmick to defraud the consumer. One of such gimmicks is the service contract agreement offered to the consumer shortly after he buys a new appliance or similar products. Under this agreement, for which the consumer often pays a significant fee, the retailer agrees to repair the product free of charge if it breaks down during the period covered by the agreement. Often the service agreement overlaps the warranty period under which the manufacturer is required to repair a defective product free of charge. So, in effect, the consumer is paying extra for the services he is already entitled to under the warranty.

Art Buchwald's column of March 25 in the Washington Post illustrates in his classically humorous and ironic manner the true meaning of these service agreements. The article follows:

NOT WORTH A PAPER CUP
(By Art Buchwald)

In the world of planned obsolescence, the service contract plays a most vital role. There is hardly anything you can buy now that doesn't have a service contract to go with it.

The other day I went into my favorite department store to purchase a paper cup dispenser. It cost \$1.50.

As the man was writing up the sales slip he said, "Would you like to have a service contract with this?"

"What for?" I asked.

"Well, it could break down and you would have to call someone to fix it. If you take out a service contract, which will only cost you \$40 for the year, we would send someone to your house free of charge."

"But why would you sell a paper cup dispenser that would break down in less than a year?"

"Please don't get me wrong. I'm not saying that this paper cup dispenser will break down. We've sold several of them that have needed no servicing at all. But our experience has been that the majority of our dispensers do cause trouble after frequent usage. Where did you intend to use this paper cup dispenser?"

"In the children's bathroom. They don't seem to ever rinse their glasses after they brush their teeth."

"Then you'll certainly need a service contract. These paper cup dispensers were not built to stand the punishment of children using them every day."

"But there is a guarantee with the paper cup dispenser."

"That's only if it's used by a senior citizen three times a week. Of course, you don't have to take the service contract—it's strictly optional."

"But we know a dentist who installed one of our paper cup dispensers in his office and it broke down. It kept dispensing three paper cups at one time. He didn't have a service contract, so it took three months before we could get to him. By the time our man repaired the dispenser the dentist had used \$645 worth of paper cups, not to mention the \$25 we had to charge him for the house call."

"But," I said naively, "it seems so unfair to sell someone a new product and then inform him it's liable to break down."

"On the contrary. We would be dishonest if we sold you the product and *didn't* inform you it would break down. These service contracts are for the protection of the customer."

"Two weeks ago a lady bought one of these paper cup dispensers and after two days it wouldn't dispense any paper cups at all. She had to keep leaning over and trying to drink directly from the faucet. Fortunately she had a service contract with us and we sent over a man right away. It turned out a sprocket spring behind the rejecter lever had slipped out of the three-way hook. He replaced it in an hour and all the lady had to pay for was the new parts."

"Except for a bad back she developed trying to lean over the faucet, it only cost her \$12."

"I still don't understand why a reliable store like this would carry a paper cup dispenser that won't hold up."

"Well, frankly sir, we're not too fond of these paper cup dispensers ourselves. We don't even make any money on them."

"Then why do you sell them?" I asked angrily.

"Because," he said primly. "We make all our profit on the service contract, stupid."

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, and I recently completed a comprehensive study and review of the many and various contributions of the Federal Government to education in the country today.

With this background data we have had a detailed itemization of the educational expenditures proposed for the fiscal year of 1972. The following tabulation is based upon the budget figures. It shows that total obligations amounted to \$7,064,789,000 during fiscal 1970. This figure will rise to a total of \$9,329,367,000 during the current year, fiscal 1971, and to \$11,230,607,000 during fiscal 1972. The tabulation follows:

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Appalachian Regional Development Programs: Vocational education facilities.....	10,605	24,988	24,000
---	--------	--------	--------

Grants are made to States and local districts within the Appalachian region for the construction and equipment of vocational education facilities in Appalachia. Vocational education facilities are key elements for the training and upgrading of potential and existing labor force entrants in skills required in commercial and other vocations.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Philippine education program: Science high school project.....	951		
Assistance to students.....		605	
Land reform education.....		1,282	
Total obligations.....	951	1,887	

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Extension Service: Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses: Payments for cooperative extension work under the District of Columbia Public Education Act.....	360	672	768
Advances and reimbursements: Cooperation with Department of Defense on extension program work in rural defense information and education program.....	298	286	286
Teaching materials developed and provided State Extension services under cooperative agreement on a cost-sharing basis.....	33	65	65
Forest service—Permanent appropriations: Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico.....	125	84	100

The States of Arizona and New Mexico are paid a share of the national forest receipts for school purposes.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Peace Corps, miscellaneous trust funds: School partnership program.....	235	300	310

Miscellaneous contributed funds received by gift, devise, bequest, or from foreign governments are used in furtherance of the Peace Corps program.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

The Panama Canal—Canal Zone Government: Operating expenses—Civil functions: Education.....	15,297	16,182	16,746
--	--------	--------	--------

This provides for the operation of schools, kindergarten through college, for the dependents of Canal Zone residents, the dependents of U.S.-citizen Government employees residing in the Republic of Panama, and, on a space-available basis, certain other residents of the Republic. There are two school systems; one for U.S. citizens, the other, which is conducted in the Spanish language, for Panamanians and other non-U.S. citizens. There also are specialized facilities for the handicapped.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Capital outlay—Civil functions: Education: Improvements and replacements to educational facilities.....	155	431	360
Air condition Rainbow City junior-senior high, elementary school complex.....			210

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Health Services and Mental Health Administration: Mental health—Manpower development: Training grants and fellowships.....	118,335	116,350	113,300
Direct operations.....	5,678	5,810	5,765
Total.....	124,013	122,160	119,065

Training grants and fellowships. Grants are made to training institutions for training in psychiatry, psychology, psychiatric nursing, psychiatric social work, and other mental health disciplines, such as the rapidly developing paraprofessional mental health worker field.

Experimental and special programs and continuing education in mental health are supported as well as specialized training in such areas as alcoholism, drug abuse, crime and delinquency, and suicide prevention. Fellowship awards are made on the basis of individual merit to persons involved in mental health research.

Direct operations. This supports Institute staff who are responsible for planning and administration of the national mental health manpower program including mental health

manpower studies and the development of training programs for paraprofessionals. A limited amount of funds will be used to support contracts to train individuals to work with drug abusers. This also supports the training activities of the National Center for Mental Health Services, training and research, and a program for training psychiatrists for careers in the Public Health Service.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

National Institutes of Health:

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
National Cancer Institute—Grants:			
Fellowships.....	4,499	3,798	3,348
Training.....	13,066	10,774	8,358

Postdoctoral and special fellowships and career award and career development fellowships will be supported.

Grants are awarded to accredited schools for training in such fields as surgery, pathology, radiobiology, radiotherapy, and internal medicine; and grants are awarded to research training centers for individual traineeships.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

National Heart and Lung Institute—Grants:

Fellowships.....	6,904	6,871	6,195
Training.....	22,052	17,643	13,592

Fellowship awards will be supported. For undergraduate cardiovascular training, funds will provide assistance to schools of medicine, osteopathy, and public health.

Funds will provide for grants for graduate cardiovascular and pulmonary research and clinical training.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

National Institute of Dental Research—Grants:

Fellowships.....	1,614	1,601	1,367
Training.....	5,355	5,206	4,285

Funds for fellowships are used for support of clinical and basic research training. Applications under this program are for special fellowships, postdoctoral fellowships, career development and career awards.

Training funds are the principal means of meeting the need for dental research and academic personnel in the dental schools to teach clinical and basic sciences, and to conduct research.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases—Grants:

Fellowships.....	6,757	5,740	5,094
Training.....	16,703	15,072	11,475

Fellowships are awarded to private postdoctoral research training and career development opportunities to individual investigators working in the diverse fields related to the mission of this Institute.

Graduate training grants are awarded to

CXVII—595—Part 7

academic institutions to establish or improve programs to prepare increased numbers of independent and competent clinical research investigators and teachers in research training.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke—Grants:

Fellowships.....	2,713	2,782	2,595
Training.....	14,204	14,300	11,456

Fellowships will be supported. Grants are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to train teachers and clinical investigators in neurology and otology. Traineeships will be awarded to individuals for specialized postgraduate training.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases—Grants:

Fellowships.....	3,908	3,749	3,504
Training.....	11,413	8,972	7,330

National Institute of General Medical Sciences—Grants:

Fellowships.....	18,836	18,454	15,142
Training.....	44,395	43,746	38,385

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development—Grants:

Fellowships.....	3,960	3,786	3,653
Training.....	12,283	10,142	9,085

Postdoctoral and special fellowships, career awards, and career development fellowships will be supported.

Training grants will be supported.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

National Eye Institute—Grants:

Fellowships.....	855	1,676	876
Training.....	2,959	2,998	2,225

Fellowships are awarded to provide postdoctoral research training to individual investigators working in the field of vision research. Awardees are provided an opportunity for training in a wide variety of scientific disciplines related to research on the eye and visual system.

Graduate training grants are awarded to academic institutions to establish or improve existing programs to prepare more advanced laboratory scientists for research careers in disorders of the visual system.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences—Grants:

Fellowships.....	215	264	264
Training.....	3,622	3,117	3,283

Under the fellowship program, postdoctoral, special, and research career development awards are made to graduate students and scientists for training in the field of environmental health sciences.

The graduate research training program

supports the availability of high quality training opportunities in environmental health. The goal is to increase the number of highly qualified scientists primarily concerned with environmental health.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Research resources—Grants:

Fellowships.....	106	126	126
Training.....	317	352	352

Fellowships will be supported. Grants are awarded to institutions for training in laboratory animal medicine.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences—Grants:

Fellowships.....	531	1,077	739
Fogarty scholarships.....	131	170	170

Health education loans

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
Health professions education fund:			
Loans to health professions schools.....	6,479		4,223
Interest.....	2,040	4,121	213
Cancellations to schools.....			
Total obligations.....	8,519	4,121	4,436

The Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 amended Title VII, Part C, Public Health Service Act, to establish a revolving fund from which schools may obtain loans to provide loans to health professions students.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 esti- mate	1972 esti- mate
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Nurse training fund:

Loans to schools of nursing.....	4,252		
Payment to Government National Mortgage Association to retire participation certificates.....		1,618	
Interest.....	744	2,038	2,039
Cancellations to schools.....			540
Total obligations.....	4,996	3,656	2,579

The Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 amended Section 827, Public Health Service Act, to establish a revolving fund to provide loans to student nurses.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
--	----------------	------------------	------------------

Grants Management Fund:

Office of Education.....	513,926	520,000	530,000
--------------------------	---------	---------	---------

Office of Education:

Elementary and secondary education:			
Aid to school districts:			
Educationally deprived children services.....	1,339,014	1,500,000	1,500,000
Supplementary services.....	130,810	143,393	143,393
Library resources.....	42,500	80,000	80,000
Equipment and minor remodeling.....	36,854	50,000	
Dropout prevention.....	4,981	10,000	10,000
Bilingual education.....	21,250	25,000	25,000
Follow Through.....			60,000
Strengthening State departments of education.....	29,750	29,750	33,000

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Planning and evaluation.....	8,825	8,825	3,825
Total obligations.....	1,613,984	1,846,968	1,855,218

Aid to school districts: *Educationally deprived children.* Grants are made to State and local educational agencies based on the number of children from low-income families to provide compensatory services for educationally disadvantaged children. Incentive grants are made to States putting forth a greater effort than the Nation as a whole in public support for elementary and secondary education; and special grants are made for urban and rural schools serving areas with the highest concentrations of children from low-income families. Greatest emphasis in 1972 will be placed on preschool and elementary school children from attendance areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families. *Supplementary services.* Grants will be made to States for developing programs which serve as models for improving and supplementing the regular school curriculum. Emphasis will be given to projects designed to meet the Right to Read goal for the 1970's. Grants are made to States for procurement of *Library resources*, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for use by students and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. These funds help provide the basic tools needed in a broad effort to improve reading ability.

Dropout prevention. Grants are made to local school districts for innovative projects in poverty area schools leading to new methods and techniques for reducing the incidence of dropouts.

Grants are made to local educational agencies for exemplary pilot and demonstration projects in *bilingual education* for children who come from low-income families.

Follow Through is an experimental compensatory education program designed to develop and test new ways to educate disadvantaged children in the early primary grades. The resources of the school, the parents, and the community are brought together in programs to meet the child's instructional, physical, and psychosocial needs.

Strengthening State departments of education. The leadership ability of State educational agencies is improved by grants to assist them in developing systematic and technically proficient planning and evaluation activities, and in stimulating and supporting research and statistical and technical assistance for local school systems. Funds are also provided to permit the development of a comprehensive educational planning and evaluation unit within each State.

Funds are made available to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for planning and evaluation of succeeding year programs and projects.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance and operations.....	507,645	536,068	425,000
Construction.....	12,480	28,113	25,000
Total obligations.....	520,126	564,181	450,000

Maintenance and operations. Payments are made to assist in the operation of schools in

areas where enrollments are affected by Federal activities. Under certain circumstances, payments are made to other Federal agencies to make arrangements for education of children where local school districts do not assume responsibility. For 1972, payments will continue to be concentrated on those districts where Federal impact is greatest. Highest priority will be given to school districts with large enrollments of children whose parents both live and work on Federal property and do not contribute to local school revenues.

Payments are made to assist in *construction* of schools in areas where enrollments are affected by Federal activities.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Emergency school assistance:			
Special educational personnel and programs.....		57,500	
Community participation programs.....		7,500	
Equipment and minor remodeling.....		7,900	
Federal administration and technical assistance.....		1,953	
Total obligations.....		74,853	

The Office of Education provided emergency assistance in 1971 to schools and non-profit organizations to aid in solving the problems of desegregating educational institutions previously segregated on a de jure basis. The assistance was provided on a project grant basis for local educational agencies which are implementing desegregation plans under Federal court order, or plans approved under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Education for the handicapped:			
State grant programs.....	29,183	34,000	35,000
Early childhood projects.....	3,000	7,000	7,500
Teacher education and recruitment.....	30,398	33,100	35,145
Research and innovation.....	21,850	30,350	31,805
Planning and evaluation.....	424	550	550
Total obligations.....	84,865	105,000	110,000

State grant programs. Grants are made to States to assist in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of programs and projects for education of handicapped children at the preschool, elementary, and secondary schools levels.

Early childhood projects. Centers were supported which provided educational, diagnostic, and consultative services for preschool handicapped children and their parents.

Teacher education and recruitment. Grants are awarded to stimulate the training of teachers, supervisors, speech correctionists, researchers, and other professional and sub-professional personnel in fields related to the education of the handicapped.

Research and innovation. Grants and contracts are awarded for the development of new curricular materials, teaching techniques, research and development centers, and other research and demonstration projects.

Planning and evaluation. Funds are made available for grants, contracts, or other payments for planning succeeding year activities or projects, and for conducting evaluation studies.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Vocational and adult education:			
Grants to States for vocational education.....	360,316	389,707	384,173
Vocational research.....	10,135	59,489	36,000
Adult education.....		55,000	55,000
Planning and evaluation.....	894	900	900
Total obligations.....	371,345	505,096	476,073

Matching grants are made to the States for vocational education programs, including the construction and remodeling of facilities. At least two-fifths of these grants must be used for programs for children from low-income families, the physically and mentally handicapped, and postsecondary courses. In 1972, the States will be given the flexibility to use these grants for programs which previously were funded in separate categories. These programs include research and training, consumer and homemaking education, special problems for the disadvantaged to help attack the problems of youth unemployment and delinquency, cooperative education programs which combine work experience with formal education, and work-study programs which provide financial assistance needed for disadvantaged students to stay in school. Funds are also used to support the national and State advisory councils on vocational education.

Vocational research. Grants are made to colleges, universities, and other institutions to develop new models for upgrading vocational education programs and for stimulating new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for school dropouts and youth who graduate from high school lacking employable skills. Grants are also made for the development of curricula for new and changing occupations and to provide the information essential to make necessary improvements and changes for more effective vocational education programs.

Adult education. Grants are made to the States for support of basic educational programs attended by adults sixteen years and older who wish to overcome English language limitations, prepare for occupational training and more profitable employment, and participate more effectively in our modern society.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Higher education:			
Student assistance:			
Grants and work study payments.....	316,855	336,078	971,300
Subsidized insured loans:			
Interest.....	112,392	143,200	245,000
Reserve fund advances.....	69	2,000	2,234
Program administration.....	1,678	2,219	6,800
Direct loans.....	194,235	243,000	5,000
Special programs for disadvantaged students.....	44,749	50,035	50,100
Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions.....	30,000	33,850	38,850
Construction:			
Subsidized loans.....	3,793	21,894	39,993
Grants.....	73,489	44,490	
State administration and planning.....	5,973	6,000	3,000
Federal administration.....	4,972	2,424	2,397
Language training and area studies.....	15,282	8,000	15,300
University community services.....		9,500	9,500
Aid to land-grant colleges.....	21,961	12,680	2,600
Undergraduate instructional equipment.....		7,000	
College personnel development.....	58,813	56,820	36,954
Planning and evaluation.....	843	900	900
Total obligations.....	885,104	980,090	1,829,928

The Administration will submit legislation to the Congress to extend or revise existing higher education programs whose authorizations are scheduled to expire at the end of 1971. The following relates to that proposed legislation:

Student assistance. A basic revision of existing student aid programs will be proposed to insure that no qualified student who wants to go to college will be barred by lack of funds. Under this proposal, a single student aid package—consisting of grants, work-study payments, and subsidized loans—will be provided to lower income undergraduate students. A National Student Loan Association will also be proposed to provide funds to banks and colleges for loans to students at all income levels, its capital to be raised from the private market. Colleges could use funds obtained from NSLA to make both federally subsidized and federally guaranteed but unsubsidized loans to students.

Reserve fund advances are made on a matching basis to State and nonprofit private loan insurance funds to guarantee student loans.

Under the proposed legislation, special programs for disadvantaged students would be continued. These include: the upward bound program to motivate high school students to attend college and improve their academic preparation, the talent search program to identify youths with exceptional potential for a college education and publicize available sources of financial aid, and special remedial and other services for enrolled college students to encourage and assist them in continuing their higher education.

Institutional assistance. Grants are awarded to raise the academic quality of developing colleges, to encourage study of modern languages and world affairs, to assist universities in meeting community needs, and to facilitate construction of facilities. Aid to land-grant colleges includes only the permanent appropriation in 1972. Those predominantly negro colleges which have received funds under the annual land-grant program will now receive equivalent support from the developing colleges program. In addition, an increase of \$5,000,000 has been provided for the developing colleges program for the specific purpose of aiding predominantly negro colleges. Annual interest grants, to reduce the costs of loans from non-Federal sources for the construction of academic facilities, are awarded to colleges, universities, junior colleges, and technical institutes.

College personnel development. Grants are awarded to universities for fellowships leading to a doctorate for prospective college teachers. Grants and contracts provide full costs of institutes and other training programs to train college teachers, administrators, and educational specialists, especially at two- and four-year colleges.

Planning and evaluation. Funds provide for long-range planning of higher education programs and for program evaluation, particularly the interrelationships and impact of programs on the higher education community.

Personnel training and development. Grants are made to States, higher education institutions, and local education agencies and other organizations to improve the preparation of all educational personnel; to support local schools in making better use of staff time and instructional materials; to meet critical shortages of educational personnel; to upgrade the quality of teaching at the preschool through postsecondary vocational levels; and to improve teacher education programs at the graduate level.

Teacher Corps. Grants are made to colleges, universities, and local school districts to support projects which provide teams of experienced teachers and teaching interns who are available to serve, upon request, in schools located in neighborhoods with concentrations of low-income families.

Career opportunities and urban-rural school programs. Grants are made to States, higher education institutions, and local education agencies to help attract persons from low-income urban and isolated rural schools, veterans, and college graduates into education careers in schools serving low-income populations.

Planning and evaluation. Funds are available for grants, contracts, or other payments for planning succeeding year activities or projects and for conducting evaluation in education professions development. In addition, studies will be conducted on crucial problems in the areas of special education, early childhood personnel, and the need for special services for disadvantaged students.

will be placed on early childhood education, reading, organization and administration, and higher education programs. Funds will also be directed to environmental education, drug abuse education, and nutrition programs for school-aged children. A total of \$5,000,000 will be used to continue support of the Sesame Street program.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Research and development:			
Educational research and development.....	60,397	60,577	62,000
Experimental schools.....		12,000	15,000
National achievement study.....	2,400	4,500	6,000
Demonstrations.....	1,000	2,250	2,250
Evaluations.....	2,580	4,000	4,000
Dissemination.....	6,672	8,500	8,500
Training.....	6,325	3,250	4,000
Statistics.....	1,729	3,000	3,250
Construction.....	11,291		
Total obligations.....	92,394	98,077	105,000

Experimental schools. This program tests, develops, and demonstrates ways to improve the learning of children in actual school situations. Support will be provided to schools which will implement, in a comprehensive manner in one school setting, both ideas already verified as feasible by prior research as well as ideas yet to be evaluated. Over the next several years the program will generate a series of experimental school sites that will represent a full range of alternatives to current educational practice.

National achievement study. This national assessment provides information on the educational attainment of the population.

Demonstrations. The Anacostia community school project in the District of Columbia, a model approach to urban education, is supported from these funds. This project has emphasized community participation and a special reading program. In 1971-1972 it will also stress adult basic education, early childhood education, staff development, vocational education for both in-school and dropout students, and outside evaluation. Ideas and practices initiated by the project will be disseminated nationally.

Evaluations. Funds are available for grants, contracts, or other payments for planning and evaluation studies. In 1970-1971, studies focused on the disadvantaged, post-high school job and education experiences of students in large metropolitan areas and the role of private vocational schools in meeting the Nation's manpower requirements. In 1972 greater emphasis will be placed on continuing major ongoing studies, such as those on the disadvantaged, and initiating studies in higher education, the "right to read," and the dissemination process.

Dissemination. In 1970, local educators were encouraged to use exemplary programs for improving their systems. Two major dissemination methods which will be supported to achieve this goal are the installation of exemplary practices and products in "lighthouse" schools throughout the Nation, and the development of a delivery system which moves practices and products from research and development into the schools.

Grants are awarded for training manpower to carry out educational research, development, dissemination, and evaluation activities. Awards are also made to develop materials for use in these programs. Most personnel are trained through a consortium of institutions to provide a broad spectrum of relevant experience; short-term programs will recruit members of minority groups for training in innovation and evaluation techniques.

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Libraries and educational communications public libraries:			
Services.....	35,047	40,709	18,000
Construction.....	5,095	11,520	
College library resources.....	9,816	9,900	5,000
Librarian training.....	3,969	3,900	2,000
Cataloging by the Library of Congress.....	5,811	6,854	
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	5,403	11,588	4,000
Planning and evaluation.....	89	400	400
University community service programs.....	9,474		
Adult education.....	49,488		
Total obligations.....	124,192	84,871	29,400

Public libraries. Grants are made to the States on a matching basis for the promotion, development, and extension of public library services; interlibrary cooperation; State hospital, prison, and other institutional library services; and services for the physically handicapped. Grants were made in 1970 and 1971 to the States on a matching basis for construction of library buildings.

College library resources. Grants are made to institutions of higher education for acquisition of library books and materials.

Grants are made to higher education institutions for training and upgrading librarians to staff school, public and academic libraries.

Grants are provided for the establishment and expansion of educational television and radio facilities covering all phases of education from preschool through adult. Funds may not be used for construction or repair of structures to house such facilities.

Planning and evaluation. Funds are available for grants, contracts, or other payments for planning succeeding year activities or projects and for conducting evaluation studies in community education.

Educational research and development. These funds support a variety of research and development activities. In 1972, priority

In thousands of dollars

	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Education professions development: Personnel training and development.....	72,472	67,900	59,700
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas.....			
Teacher Corps.....	21,634	30,800	37,435
Career opportunities and urban-rural school programs.....	22,127	35,100	36,665
Planning and evaluation.....	476	2,000	2,000
Total obligations.....	116,709	135,800	131,800

Contracted studies and related services are used to support the measurement of the progress and the status of education in the Nation. The work includes the collection, compilation, analysis, and dissemination of statistics; work on standard educational terminology; and continued research in statistical survey methods and sampling techniques.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Educational activities overseas (special foreign currency program):			
Grants to American institutions.....	1,170	3,144	3,000

Foreign currencies which are in excess of the normal requirements of the United States are used to support research and training projects abroad sponsored by American institutions. The bulk of funding supports training abroad for American educators and prospective teachers of foreign language and area studies in order to provide them with essential study and experience in another culture.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
School systems.....	13,625	14,066	15,332
Higher education.....	8,979	9,018	7,545
Instructional resources.....	5,161	5,237	5,820
Planning, research, and evaluation.....	8,390	7,723	8,613
Executive direction and administration.....	9,846	11,127	11,669
Total obligations.....	46,001	47,171	48,979

The Office of Education administers grants-in-aid and provides technical assistance and statistical services to State education agencies, institutions of higher education, and libraries. It also supports training and recruitment of educational personnel, experimentation and development to improve education, and planning and evaluation of educational programs. This appropriation provides for management, staff services, and related expenses required in accomplishing the mission of the Office.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Civil rights education:			
Training and advisory services.....	16,939	16,000	
Technical services and administration.....	2,020	3,151	
Total obligations.....	18,959	19,151	

Training and advisory services. Support has been provided through university centers, State education agencies, and grants to local school boards for dealing with problems arising from the desegregation of schools.

Technical services and administration. Federal staff provided technical assistance and consultative services to local school boards on the development and implementation of desegregation plans and administered grants and contracts for activities described above.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Student Loan Insurance Fund:			
Collection fees on insured loans.....		1	1
Loss on insured loans.....	175	410	522
Loss on reinsured loans.....	496	816	952
Total operating costs.....	644	1,227	1,475
Collectable insured loans defaults.....	1,215	3,176	4,522
Collectable reinsured loans defaults.....	2,045	3,823	4,618
Total capital outlay.....	3,260	6,999	9,140
Total program costs, funded.....	3,904	8,226	10,615
Change in selected resources.....	2,022	-221	5,110
Adjustments in selected resources.....		1,196	
Total obligations.....	5,926	9,201	15,725

Under the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, the Office of Education received authority to insure loans to students in eligible institutions who do not have reasonable access to State or private nonprofit programs of student loan insurance. The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 merged the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act into the Higher Education Act insured loan program, and in addition to extending the Federal insurance program, authorizes the Office of Education to reinsure loans guaranteed by State and nonprofit private agencies at 80% of default by student borrowers.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Higher education facilities loan fund:			
Interest expense on participation certificates.....	11,282	11,147	11,000
Interest expenses to Treasury.....	21,275	19,000	22,000
Administrative expenses.....	4	5	5
Total operating costs, funded.....	32,561	30,152	33,005
Change in selected resources.....	-2	-2	-2
Total operating costs.....	32,559	30,150	33,003
Construction loans to higher education institutions.....	98,247	80,000	12,000
Change in selected resources.....	-94,047	-80,000	-12,000
Adjustments in selected resources (loan obligations).....	574	35,000	
Total capital outlay, obligations.....	4,773	35,000	
Total obligations.....	37,332	65,150	33,003
Advances and reimbursements:			
School systems.....	2,814	2,845	2,775
Higher education.....	3,264	3,399	3,911
Planning, research, and evaluation.....	658	658	658
Executive direction and administration.....	225	225	225
Total obligations.....	6,961	7,127	7,569
Social and Rehabilitation Service:			
Work incentives—Training and incentives:			
On-the-job training.....	604	1,560	10,536
Institutional training.....	59,715	91,480	127,190

Each activity includes costs of training, incentives, and related program services. On-the-job training. This provides cost of on-the-job training, both regular and full

cost. Included in this activity are supervision, counseling, vocational training, and all other manpower services required to rehabilitate welfare clients through on-the-job training.

Institutional training. This provides for classroom training, vocational education, and workshop training in clerical, service, and semiskilled to skilled occupations, vestibule training, and employment preparation. In addition, remedial education is provided to many participants.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Research and training—Training:			
Rehabilitation.....	27,634	27,700	14,650
Community services.....			4,000
Aging.....			1,850

Rehabilitation. Grants and contracts will support the training of personnel in professional and technical fields in vocational rehabilitation, including teaching grants and traineeships to educational institutions, and research fellowships to individuals.

Community services. Grants are made to institutions of higher learning to strengthen and expand their resources for training individuals in the field of social welfare, and to individuals for training in the fields of child welfare services for families, children, and young adults in all areas of social functioning and in community planning to meet the social needs of people.

Aging. Training grants will be made for the purpose of providing specialized training on problems of the aging and providing the requisite skills for personnel preparing for or engaged in planning and administering facilities for and services to older people.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Assistance to refugees in the United States: Education.....	20,454	26,538	29,838

Selected training is provided to equip the refugees for employment and resettlement. Also, provision is made for Federal payments to help meet part of the added cost related to refugee children in certain public school systems where the number of such children represents a sizable portion of the enrollments. Loans are made to needy college students, including those pursuing vocational courses (rather than training leading to an academic degree) in accredited proprietary institutions.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Special institutions:			
American Printing House for the Blind:			
Educational materials.....	1,329	1,442	1,505
Advisory committees.....	75	75	75
Total obligations.....	1,404	1,517	1,580

Grants are made to this nonprofit institution to supply educational materials and tangible apparatus for education of the blind,

to blind children in schools for the blind, in public schools, and in private nonprofit institutions, and multihandicapped children and adult trainees at rehabilitation centers.

Funds are also provided for staff and other expenses of committees which advise the Printing House and approve materials and aids to be manufactured and supplied through the Federal appropriation.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

National Technical Institute for the Deaf:			
Operations:			
Academic program.....	1,626	2,407	2,595
Administration and support services.....	1,359	1,573	1,892
Construction:			
Planning and site development.....		236	
Buildings.....		15,900	
Total obligations.....	2,985	20,116	4,487

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare entered into an agreement with the Rochester Institute of Technology for the establishment, construction, and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf. Its purpose is to provide a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

National Technical Institute for the Deaf: Construction.....		5,700	
--	--	-------	--

The 1971 budget request for construction of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf was based on 1969 price levels. The proposed supplemental appropriation would compensate for the increase in construction costs since 1969 and permit the Rochester Institute of Technology to advertise for bids.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Model secondary school for the deaf:			
Operations:			
Academic program.....	221	1,393	1,549
Administration and support services.....	209	809	953
Construction:			
Planning and site development.....	137	1,184	
Buildings.....			14,458
Total obligations.....	567	3,386	16,960

In 1971, the first full year of operation of the educational component of the school, emphasis was placed on the development of the individualized instruction program and curricular materials, on the refinement of administrative procedures, and on the training of staff. For 1972, continued efforts will be directed toward overall program development and the expansion of computer-assisted instruction and television-based systems. Greater emphasis will be placed on evaluation and research based upon prior years' experience and long-range goals.

The 1972 appropriation will provide the

funds necessary for the construction of the permanent facilities.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Gallaudet College:			
Operations:			
Academic program.....	3,486	4,123	4,946
Administration and support services.....	2,940	3,382	3,731
Construction:			
Planning and site development.....	2	743	
Buildings.....	338	1,585	3,880
Total obligations.....	6,766	9,833	12,557

Gallaudet College is a private, nonprofit educational institution providing an undergraduate higher education program for the deaf, a preparatory school for deaf students who need such training to qualify for college admission, a graduate school program in the field of deafness and adult education for deaf persons. It operates the Kendall School for deaf children (primarily from the District of Columbia) and a preschool program for very young deaf children. Gallaudet also has programs in research on deafness and on ways and means of assisting deaf persons in more adequately relating to a predominantly hearing environment. Federal funds provide slightly more than three-fourths of Gallaudet's operating costs.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Howard University:			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Academic program.....	39,324	43,679	50,130
Freedmen's Hospital.....	15,683	16,819	17,700
Construction.....	1,485	37,865	6,045
Total obligations.....	56,492	98,363	73,875

Academic program. The University is a private nonprofit institution consisting of an undergraduate college, a graduate school offering the master's degree and the degree of doctor of philosophy, and thirteen professional schools. Federal funds provide 60.48% of the total operating costs for the academic program.

Freedmen's Hospital. The hospital furnishes inpatient and outpatient care and a facility for training of physicians and nurses and other professional and technical health personnel. Federal funds provide 71.9% of the total operating costs.

Construction. The Federal Government has undertaken to finance a major construction program, including the erection of a number of new buildings and alterations and repairs to the existing physical plant.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Departmental Management:			
Advances and reimbursements—Cost finding principles in higher education.....		283	
Office of Education: Emergency school assistance—Emergency School Aid Act.....	425,000	1,000,000	

Legislation has been proposed to authorize the Office of Education to provide assistance to schools and nonprofit organizations to aid

in solving the problems of desegregating school districts previously operating under dual systems. In addition aid will be provided to schools voluntarily alleviating the problems associated with segregation and to racially impacted schools.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Higher education: National Foundation for Higher Education.....			100,000
---	--	--	---------

Legislation will be proposed to establish the National Foundation for Higher Education to support innovation and reform in institutions of higher education. The Foundation, an independent Federal agency, will provide funds to colleges and universities that wish to try out new educational concepts and techniques. It will also assist in the development of national policy in higher education.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Research and development: National Institute of Education.....			3,000
--	--	--	-------

Legislation will be proposed to establish the National Institute of Education as an agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The institute will be a national focus for education research and experimentation in the United States. Working with researchers, school officials, teachers, scientists, humanists, and others, it will help identify educational problems, develop programs to alleviate these problems and assist school systems to put the results of educational research and development into practice. The \$3,000,000 requested will be for planning and initial operating and staffing expenses.

In thousands of dollars			
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Housing production and mortgage credit—Federal Housing Administration:			
College housing—Loans and other expenses:			
College housing loans; loans for student center, dining and infirmary facilities; loans for student nurses and interns housing.....	184,493	151,274	87,216
Change in selected resources.....	-114,028	-81,274	-17,216
Total capital outlay obligations.....	70,465	70,000	70,000
Interest on borrowings.....	31,080	37,333	68,811
Administrative expenses.....	1,175	1,050	
Inspection expense.....	300	210	210
Interest accrued on participation certificates.....	120,490	90,379	49,379
Other expenses.....	551	468	910
Total operating costs, funded.....	153,596	129,440	119,310
Total obligations.....	224,061	199,440	189,310

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Limitation on administrative expenses, college housing loans:			
Payment to administrative operations fund.....	1,175	1,050	
Community development planning and management:			
Community development training programs:			
Grants to States.....	2,445	4,000	3,010
Fellowship grants.....	509	500	490
Total program costs, funded.....	2,954	4,500	3,500
Change in selected resources.....	543	-1,000	-500
Total obligations.....	3,497	3,500	3,000

Community development training grants are made to States for training subprofessional and professional personnel employed, or soon to be employed, by public or private nonprofit organization in the fields of housing or community development. Training of low-income persons in the management of low- and moderate-income housing may be included. Training programs are designed by States to meet their needs and are conducted in cooperation with Federal agencies, local governments, universities, nonprofit organizations, and urban studies centers. The Secretary is authorized to render technical assistance to States in the development of these programs and to compile and distribute training packages which States find useful in administering their programs.

Urban fellowships are intended to attract new students at the graduate level into urban studies fields, in order to increase the supply of trained personnel working with State and local agencies.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
1970 actual			
1971 estimate			
1972 estimate			

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Public land management:			
Bureau of Indian Affairs:			
Education and welfare services:			
Educational assistance, facilities, and services.....	118,138	144,774	163,840

The Bureau operates Federal school facilities where public schools are not available or cannot meet the special needs of Indian children. Financial assistance is extended to public schools enrolling Indian children where tax-free Indian lands result in financial problems for the local districts and where other special problems exist that are not covered by Federal impact legislation, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grants are made to Indian students attending college. Federal school plans include increased enrollment in boarding and day schools and in dormitories housing public school students; adequate base funding of the Indian education program; and for training of Indian paraprofessional staff in Federal schools.

Funds for the Adult Education program provide educational opportunities and services across the total range of human educational needs in order to help the adult Indian become a more effective and efficient functioning human resource in the modern so-

ciety and help him realize his potential as an individual.

Funds for the community development thrust provide programs and services in the development of social skills necessary for a community's assumption of initiative and responsibility in the setting of community goals and the solving of community problems.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Indian education for the disadvantaged.....	8,320	14,971	12,600
Indian education, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title VI-A, Public Law 89-10.....	44	17	
Indian education, Teacher Corps.....	242		
Indian education, educational centers and services.....		231	
National Defense Education Act.....		42	
Indian education, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title II, Public Law 89-10.....		61	
Fish and wildlife and parks:			
National Park Service—Miscellaneous permanent appropriations: Educational expenses, children of employees, Yellowstone National Park.....	122	114	177

Revenues received from the collection of short-term recreation fees to the park are pupils who are dependents of persons engaged in the administration, operation, and maintenance of Yellowstone National Park.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
1970 actual			
1971 estimate			
1972 estimate			

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Federal Bureau of Investigation:			
Salaries and expenses—			
Training.....	5,546	6,737	7,642

A Bureau-wide personnel training program is provided. The Bureau, upon request, assists in providing various types of training to State and local law enforcement agencies.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
1970 actual			
1971 estimate			
1972 estimate			

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Advances and reimbursements—			
Training: Other agencies.....	4		
Federal prison system:			
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Federal prison industries fund—Vocational training expense.....	2,720	4,175	5,734

The vocational training expense limitation finances the vocational training program within the Federal Prison System. Advances in vocational education that have proven successful outside the prison system have been adapted to function within an institutional setting. These advances include the use of an integrated curriculum combining practical academic and vocational education and training in a number of closely related skills having special relevance to emerging job opportunities. Shifts are continually being made in industrial and vocational training programs to reflect changing demands in the labor market, thus providing

inmates with the best chance to secure post-release employment. Releasees are aided in finding employment by an employment placement service which functions as an integral part of the vocational training activity.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
1970 actual			
1971 estimate			
1972 estimate			

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Limitation on administrative and vocational training expenses, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated:			
Administrative expenses (excludes depreciation).....	881	977	1,093
Vocational training expenses (excludes depreciation).....	2,720	4,175	5,734
Total obligations.....	3,601	5,152	6,827

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—Salaries and expenses:			
Academic assistance.....	21,001	21,252	29,750
National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.....	2,626	10,348	17,100
Training (law enforcement).....			900

Academic Assistance. Funds for curriculum development, program evaluation, internships, and grants to law enforcement officers and other students enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in an approved program leading to a degree.

The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice develops and demonstrates new or improved approaches, techniques, systems, equipment, and devices to strengthen and improve law enforcement, and disseminates information about advances in law enforcement science and technology.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
1970 actual			
1971 estimate			
1972 estimate			

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Salaries and expenses:			
Academic assistance.....	1,200		
Training.....	400		

A supplemental appropriation will be requested to fund new activities under the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970 which authorizes expanded training, and academic program development (among other things).

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
1970 actual			
1971 estimate			
1972 estimate			

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Manpower administration:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Training program development and administration:			
Institutional training administration.....	2,450	2,654	2,662
Apprenticeship services.....	7,033	7,223	7,758

Institutional training administration. This activity provides for the program development and administration of classroom skill training programs by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Apprenticeship services. Employers and unions are provided technical assistance and advisory services in developing, installing, and conducting programs of apprenticeship and allied industrial training. Assistance in the administration and improvement of apprenticeship and other training is provided

to employers in private enterprise and public institutions directly or through local joint labor-management committees.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Manpower training services:			
Private sector on-the-job training.....	86,605	118,399	255,500
Public sector on-the-job training.....	3	55,280	143,000
Institutional training:			
Regular.....	286,819	288,000	293,600
Job Corps.....		116,268	203,600
In-school-work support:			
In-school.....		63,468	72,100
Summer.....	14,916	91,320	175,200
Post-school-work support.....		102,342	171,873

Private sector on-the-job training. This activity covers the program costs of providing employment and training in the private sector to unemployed, disadvantaged persons and to upgrade persons in low skill occupations. It includes direct costs to employers and the cost of administering the projects by State agencies and through national contractors. The Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program included in this activity is operated in conjunction with the National Alliance of Businessmen. Its key feature is the concept of "hire first and then train."

Public sector on-the-job training. This activity secures, within merit staffing principles, permanent employment for the disadvantaged and stimulates upgrading of employed persons in the public sector.

Institutional training. The objectives of these programs are to increase the employability of the unemployed and underemployed through classroom occupational training and remedial education supplemented by supportive services. The regular institutional program places emphasis on aiding veterans, Indians, and disadvantaged individuals who do not require special intensive assistance. The Job Corps assists disadvantaged youth to become responsible, employable, and productive citizens by providing a full-service training and development program away from their culturally deprived home and community environment. The program has residential urban and rural conservation centers and nonresidential centers which serve as skill training centers permitting the youth to remain in or near their home community.

In-school work support. This program assists disadvantaged students of high school age to remain in school by providing part-time and summer work experience.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Agency for International Development—International Manpower Institute for Training and Education.....	209	213	252

Post-school work support. This activity includes programs which provide meaningful work experience and training to the disadvantaged unemployed. Operation Mainstream focuses on poor adults in rural areas who have little opportunity for full-time employment. The out-of-school program provides young high school dropouts with skill training opportunities, work experience, income, and other supportive services to enable them to return to school or to find regular employment.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 estimate	1971	1972

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs:			
Advances and reimbursements—Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities:			
Agency for International Development.....	207	219	219
Health, education, and welfare.....	38	38	38
Other accounts.....	4	10	10
Educational exchange:			
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities:			
Exchange of persons.....	20,998	25,008	27,947
Aid to American-sponsored schools abroad.....	1,500	1,650	1,600
Cultural presentations.....	596	550	750
Multilateral organizations activities.....	485	529	533
Program services.....	6,345	6,693	6,585
Administrative expenses.....	2,375	2,525	2,585
Total obligations.....	32,299	36,955	40,000

These programs are designed to further national objectives through mutually beneficial cooperative programs with other countries.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Mutual education and cultural exchange activities (special foreign currency program):			
Exchange of persons.....			4,145
Aid to American-sponsored schools abroad.....			500
Cultural presentations.....			50
Program services.....			305
Total obligations.....			5,000

This appropriation will provide for the excess foreign currency costs of the educational exchange program of the Department of State, previously financed by the Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities appropriation, and for the unexpended balance previously appropriated for this purpose under International educational exchange activities (special foreign currency program).

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

International educational exchange activities (special foreign currency program):			
Exchange of persons.....	211	170	
Aid to American-sponsored schools abroad.....	100		
Total obligations.....	311	170	

The remaining unexpended balances will be included in the Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities (special foreign currency program) appropriation in 1972.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West:			
Operating expenses.....	1,941	1,941	2,191
Scholarships and grants.....	3,319	3,319	3,809
Total obligations.....	5,260	5,260	6,000

The operation of the Center to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific is being carried out through a grant to the University of Hawaii. The University operates the Center which provides grants, fellowships, and scholarships to qualified persons to engage in study or training at the Center.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Educational exchange permanent appropriations: Educational exchange fund, payments by Finland, World War I debt.....	356	386	386
---	------------	------------	------------

Any sums paid by Finland to the United States as interest on, or principal of, the debt are credited to this fund to finance programs authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 in relation to Finland and its people.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

Educational exchange trust funds:			
U.S. dollars advanced from foreign governments.....	356	297	286
Contributions, educational and cultural exchange.....	104	98	94
Total obligations.....	460	395	380

Funds advanced by other governments are used to send experts abroad to perform requested services, to give foreign nationals scientific, technical, or other training, and to perform technical or other services in this country.

Funds contributed by foreign governments, international organizations, and private individuals and groups are used for the purposes of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION			
Operating expenses: Training, education, and information.....	15,170	12,925	12,175

This program includes specialized training courses; graduate fellowships and traineeships; assistance to schools, faculty, and students; operation of the Puerto Rico Nuclear Center; training in materials safeguards; dissemination of scientific and technical information; and operation of nuclear science and technology demonstrations and exhibits, including costs for participation in the United Nation's Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.

In 1972, the cooperative use of specialized atomic energy laboratory facilities and staff in assisting the educational programs of colleges and universities throughout the country will continue.

Training in materials safeguards will be provided in order to detect and deter possible diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful to unauthorized use.

To broaden knowledge and understanding of atomic energy, information will be provided at both a technical and popular level. Results of scientific research and technical

developments will be made available to other Government agencies and to the public.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Plant and capital equipment: Facilities and equipment for training, education, and information.....	682	1,088	1,141
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION			
Research and development: Direct program—Supporting activities: Sustaining university program.....	22,099	13,000	10,000

This program included grants for graduate studies in interdisciplinary space-related fields.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION			

Readjustment benefits— Education and training: Post-Korean war veterans.....	938,775	1,282,501	1,761,990
Sons and daughters.....	45,289	56,640	66,380
Wives and widows.....	6,639	9,775	10,840
Total.....	990,703	1,348,916	1,839,210

Readjustment benefits (additional)—Educa- tion and training: Post-Korean war veterans.....	285,300		
Sons and daughters.....	8,050		
Wives and widows.....	150		
Total.....	293,500		

Medical care: Direct operating costs, funded: Maintenance and operation of VA facilities—Education and training.....	89,636	107,463	107,981
Capital outlay, funded: Maintenance and operation of VA facilities—Education and training.....	300	2,000	900
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses: Operating costs, funded—Post- graduate and in- service training.....	2,809	3,599	4,000
Capital outlay, funded— Postgraduate and in- service training.....	311	81	600

Postgraduate and inservice training. This provides for tuition and registration payments, lecturer fees, travel expenses, and training materials incidental to continuing education programs for professional medical and administrative staff.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay: General fund loans—Higher education facilities.....	9,112	3,000	

Appropriations for loans from the U.S. Treasury are made available for financing school construction and for education facilities for the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Federal payment to the District of Columbia: Assistance for financing capital outlay pro- gram—Capital grants for higher education facilities.....			5,000

The Federal Government would make direct grants for construction of the physical facilities of the Washington Technical Institute and the Federal City College.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION			

Salaries and expenses: Specialized research facilities and equipment.....	6,504	5,800	5,800
Science education support.....	120,180	100,641	77,300

Specialized research facilities and equipment. Under this program, the Foundation helps colleges, universities, and other institutions obtain major specialized facilities and items of equipment which are needed for the effective conduct of research. Science education support. The Foundation will continue to support science education program elements which provide science training opportunities for secondary school teachers and course content improvement for science courses, largely at the precollege and undergraduate levels.

	In thousands of dollars		
	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
Advances and reimburse- ments: Science education program.....	606	686	
Grand total.....	7,064,789	9,329,367	11,230,607

OBSERVATION
HON. HAROLD RUNNELS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, during the course of a political campaign, we are so rushed at times that all facts are not checked as completely as we would wish. In one such case, I have had time to reflect and do my homework.

I refer to some remarks that I made about the Liberty Lobby, a Washington political institution located at 300 Independence Avenue SE.

Since the election I have had an opportunity to study the organization, talk with its officials, and read their "articles of faith." I have also seen an application form used by an individual who wishes to become a member of the board of policy.

Liberty Lobby is governed by a board of policy which consists of people who pledge a minimum of \$1 per month. In addition to receiving the published material, members of the board partici-

pate in selecting issues which the Lobby will support or oppose in the Congress. Before he can become a member, however, the individual must sign an oath that he believes in the Constitution of the United States and places the interests of the United States foremost.

It is my conclusion that the Liberty Lobby is a pro-American, constitutionalist, centrist group.

In drawing this conclusion I am not unaware that some Liberty Lobby critics try to claim that the organization follows some continental philosophy of government. Since no person has come forth with any proof of such a contention, and in view of the public record established by the lobby, I am prepared to say that my campaign remarks must be modified.

**REPRESENTATIVE HARRINGTON
MAKES STRONG CASE FOR AL-
LOWING THE DRAFT TO EXPIRE
THIS YEAR**

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) to H.R. 6531 that that would have ended the draft on June 30, 1971. His amendment, if adopted, would remove the most divisive force in our country today.

Only by ending conscription can we hope to reestablish the sense of national unity that has made America a truly great nation.

I commend the initiative of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I include at this point his separate views to the committee report in opposition to the continuation of the draft:

**SEPARATE VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL
J. HARRINGTON IN OPPOSITION TO THE CON-
TINUATION OF THE DRAFT**

Governments and bureaucracies have a disheartening habit of resisting change in their method of operation once a particular system has been established.

Despite basic changes of circumstances under which a particular system grew up, the mood toward changing the system ranges from reluctance to refusal.

And so it is with the draft. Until recent years, the United States conscripted young men to maintain the nation's defense only when war had been declared or was imminent. Mandatory military service except in time of emergency is alien to the basic philosophy upon which this country was founded.

That the draft has become a way of life in this country since World War II is not to say that we must continue to passively accept it.

We should not accept it. The draft should be ended.

Such a move would not be precipitous in light of the exhaustive study conducted by the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force (the Gates Commission) which recommended that the draft be abolished when its statutory authority expires June 30, 1971.

In establishing the Gates' Commission President Nixon said "to achieve the goal of an all-volunteer force we will require the best efforts of our military establishment. . . ." This committee has not been presented any substantive testimony that suggests we should not ask the military establishment to make those "best efforts" now.

Fears have been expressed that an all-volunteer armed force might create a military elite endangering our democratic institutions and that pay incentives would tend to attract the poor, especially from minority groups. This assumption will not bear the weight of testimony presented to this committee. Nor have black leaders accepted this reasoning. The Rev. Dr. Ralph D. Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, recently said:

"Such condescending noblesse oblige is not only unappreciated, it is downright repugnant from the point of view of the black soldier who is ordered to die to preserve a 'freedom' that he has never known."

Militarism and social and economic inequality pose dangers in our society, but continuing the draft is no solution.

Continuing the draft does dilute Congressional control over the military and the war-making power. With a volunteer military system, a President seeking large numbers of men for foreign military involvement would be required to return to Congress for authority to reactivate the draft.

I support the Committee amendment to increase military pay substantially, especially for first termers. This is a matter of equity, since pay for first term men is now seriously out of line, due to reliance upon the draft to obtain manpower. The Gates Commission believed such pay increases would not significantly alter the composition of the armed forces. Young men in most income groups might now find short or long term military service an attractive prospect.

Again, the committee has been shown no evidence that pay increases would bring about a disproportionate number of blacks in the armed forces. If anything, the pay increases may only slow a little-noticed phenomenon of recent years—the sharp drop in the number of blacks re-enlisting in the Army. Blacks are now a smaller percentage of the persons in the armed forces (9.5 per cent) than of the general population (12.5 per cent).

Two provisions of the committee bill are particularly objectionable:

First, the harsh and punitive section which extends the period of service for conscientious objectors from two to three years. Instead of increasing the service period, the Committee should have made provisions for selective conscientious objectors. Under present law and court interpretations, a draftee who subscribes to the centuries-old "just war" doctrine recognized by several religious groups and believes the war in Southeast Asia is unjust must pay the price of prison or exile for his convictions.

Second, without benefit of even one line of testimony regarding force levels, this bill sets at 2.6 million men the number who can serve on active duty with the armed forces. The committee has received no evidence that this high number of personnel is needed.

The draft is shot through with inequity, ambiguity and inconsistency. It is an administrative nightmare benefitting those with the money or information who obtain draft counselling or legal assistance. Registrants are deprived of due process, and traffic violators have greater access to counsel and fair procedures.

The draft means increasing division at home and death in Vietnam. Its end would assist in the process of re-establishing Congressional control over the war-making power, and would terminate an inequitable and unjust system.

FLORIDA'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding citizen-participation programs for young people of our country, is the Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The VFW, as all Americans know, is one of our Nation's most outstanding veteran's organizations. I am proud that I, as a member of the Hollywood, Fla., VFW Post No. 2500, have the honor here today not only to pay tribute to the VFW and its members, but to compliment the many young people who participated in its Voice of Democracy program throughout the country.

Other veteran's and civic organizations also have outstanding Americanism programs for our American youth, but to me, the Voice of Democracy program of the VFW not only gives to the young people throughout the Nation the opportunity to study and look in depth at the true greatness of our country, and in their own way extoll these virtues of ours which emanate from a free people who are in the long run, the heart and soul of America.

We have often heard the expression that "competition is the spice of American life." And so it was with the thousands of young people throughout our Nation who participated in this outstanding program.

It is heartening indeed, at this time when a small but vocal segment of today's youth by word and deed mock the idea of patriotism, to see the many young American students who have great pride in our American system of government and in the future that it holds out to all if one would participate more actively in citizenship responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Christopher J. Stephens, who was the Florida winner, lives in my congressional district. Chris Stephens is a student of Plantation High School and was sponsored by the city of Plantation, Fla., VFW Post No. 5405. He competed with more than 19,000 other students throughout Florida before he was named the winner. Each student that competed should be congratulated, and I would be remiss if I did not take the time to congratulate every one of them today, and so I do so now.

And, to Christopher J. Stephens, the Florida State contest winner, I offer my special congratulations for a job well done, and to my colleagues and to each of their State winners and contestants who participated in this great VFW contest, I say congratulations to you and thanks to the VFW.

With you young people as our leaders of tomorrow, the people of our Nation need have no fear for America's future.

Mr. Speaker, the winning speech of Christopher J. Stephens is as follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY PROGRAM

(By Christopher J. Stephens)

We, the founding fathers of the United States of America, being of sound mind and body, do will the following to all the fu-

ture generations of Americans with the hope and desire that they too will love and cherish their country as we do.

ITEM NUMBER ONE

We give to all forthcoming Americans an attitude which we call the American Spirit. This Spirit is an idea which was born in men's minds when they fled the persecution and cruelty found in their native lands, to settle in America. This Spirit is what guided them and gave these men the courage to cross dangerous waters, to risk disease, starvation and death all so that they could hold true to this attitude, this Spirit, that had become part of their lives. And now you are probably asking us, "What is this Spirit, this attitude which we consider so important?"

The American Spirit is a belief that states that no government shall have the right to dictate what other men shall say or think, and no one shall be forced to adopt religious beliefs that he doesn't hold with and that no one shall decide his future but himself. The American Spirit believes that every man . . . be he black, yellow, red, white, Catholic, Jew, or Protestant shall never be denied his right for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This Spirit is what sets Americans and their country apart from all other people and nations in the world, and it is this Spirit that enables any American in a foreign land when asked his nationality to stand up, throw his head back and say, "Mister, I'm an American."

ITEM NUMBER TWO

We, the founding fathers of the United States, will our last and most important item to the coming generations. This item is the foundation of America. This item is what has built our nation. This last item is what lighted the fires of hope and faith in men throughout the world and has kept them burning. This one, all-important item is Freedom.

Freedom to travel where one wants without the need for permission, Freedom to say what you think, Freedom to choose your religious beliefs, Freedom to publish our ideas and present them to others, in short, Freedom from the fear of reproachment or oppression by the government.

This one small but mighty word, Freedom, is why people settled in and built the United States. This one small word is what sets the United States above every country in the world, and it is this one word for which Americans have and will die for. This then is our heritage which we have passed on to you. It is one of America, but, more importantly, it is one of Freedom, the concept which built this proud nation. This heritage of Freedom is the most precious thing we can give to you in the future.

We hope that you shall never let the fire of Freedom, its wonders and its joys ever be snuffed out through indifference or apathy, for if you do you will lose your heritage and you will lose America.

The decision on how to use your heritage of Freedom is in your hands. We pray you make the correct one.

Signed,

George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, Paul Revere, and Samuel Adams.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 150th anniversary of Greek

independence; but the roots of Greek democratic political thought go back to Socrates and Plato centuries before the birth of Christ. Every facet of our civilization has been touched by the foundations laid in ancient Greece. Hellenic culture has influenced every nation of the world—in the arts and literature, politics, political thought, mathematics, love of liberty—by Aristotle, Aristophanes, Euripides, Aeschylus. The list is virtually endless.

The rich heritage of Greece is in no small part responsible for the shaping of our own democracy. It is not surprising then that America's affection and admiration for the Greek people and Greek contributions to our Nation are displayed in the names of many of our cities such as Troy, Syracuse, Ithaca, and Corinth to name a few.

Greeks and Americans share a very special bond—that of love of liberty. For this reason the events of the recent past in Greece are the concern of all who treasure the precious essence of liberty and democracy. We pray for a new birth of unity and the restoration of civil liberties for the Greek people.

THE CALLEY CASE— PREMEDITATED?

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, today I received a most perceptive and moving letter from a Vietnam veteran in Indianapolis concerning the tragic case of Lt. William Calley. This veteran, Page E. Gifford, has lived through the same agony of war that Lieutenant Calley lived through and is able to comment on the case far better than any of us, for none of us—not even those who are veterans of other wars—can really know the reality of Vietnam like someone who has had to fight it.

Mr. Gifford's letter follows:

MARCH 29, 1971.

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANDGREBE: Moments ago, I learned that Lt. William Calley had been found guilty of premeditated murder in the My Lai incident. Notwithstanding my loathing for the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the military concept of the judicial system in general, I am shocked and astounded at this decision.

I am an Army veteran who spent ten months in Vietnam and one in Cambodia, was twice decorated with the Bronze Star, and was honorably separated from Military Service in November of 1970. I was not at My Lai, and I am not privy to all the information that were the members of the board which tried Lt. Calley. But I have experienced a plethora of exposure to the Vietnamese peoples, both enemy and "friendly", and I have participated in combat against both of these groups. During these times, I was forced to consider certain circumstances, as was Lt. Calley. And since, I have asked myself and others various questions as concerns the situation which Lt. Calley faced. I now ask you to consider and to ask, as I have done.

How are we to reconcile, to rationalize,

and/or to explain the direct contradictions inherent in the coupling of the moral obligations of human beings not to destroy one another, and the ironclad axiom that deems that a soldier will not disobey an order? Military men for years have been subject to the most rigorous mental training and the strictest discipline with regard to following the orders of superiors. This has been the rule in the United States Military since its inception. Nevertheless, concurrently, we accused and convicted German warriors, and now Lt. Calley, of following that very course. At what point do moral and professional responsibility diverge? Where is the line at which a man may stop being a soldier and start being a human being—and if there is such a line, why is the soldier not informed of it before he encounters such a situation as did Lt. Calley?

How can we condemn and convict a man for the premeditated murder of "innocents" when he, through no lacking of his own, not only did not know who the enemy was, but not even why he was fighting them, except to preserve his own life and that of other Americans. This is a poor excuse for his being there in the first place. In addition, as Lt. Calley pointed out in his own defense, there is little, if any, method by which the enemy can be distinguished from the "friendly". Indeed, all U.S. fighting men, from the basic trainee to the West Point Cadet are infused with the need for suspicion of the Vietnamese civilian.

Finally, and perhaps most pertinent of all, what ilk of military and moral system have we that permits us to divine judgment between the wholesale slaughter of one kind of human being (the soldier) from another (the civilian); and by one method (M16 rifle-fire) from another (aerial bombardment)? Have we chosen this moment to save our consciences and that of all History for the multitudinous killings of non-combatants?

I am unconvinced that Lt. William Calley was responsible for the slayings at My Lai. I am unconvinced that, given his responsibility, he should have stood a Courts Martial. But if he was responsible, and since it was deemed that he be tried, I am totally assured that he is not guilty of murder, premeditated or otherwise, but only of being a soldier.

You, as a Legislator and Statesman, of course, are not involved in this judicial and military matter. I ask only that you consider that which I have set forth above, that you might apply to it your powerful and heeded voice.

Respectfully and sincerely,

PAGE E. GIFFORD.

ALASKAN OF THE YEAR

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, each year the State of Alaska honors a man who has served the State with particular distinction and represents the values of leadership and independence so closely associated with the 49th State. In past years, the "Alaskan of the Year" citation has been awarded to great Alaskans who are familiar in the Halls of Congress, Senator Ernest Gruening and Senator E. L. Bartlett.

This year the award went to the man who, along with Senators Gruening and Bartlett, saw the State of Alaska through its earliest days. The man is Alaska Gov. William A. Egan, and I want to share

Alaska's pride in this man with the Members of Congress and the Nation. A recent editorial from the Anchorage Daily Times speaks eloquently for all Alaskans regarding Governor Egan:

ALASKAN OF THE YEAR

Back in 1962, at a dinner here in Anchorage, the speaker rose to say:

"Alaska has been generous to Bill Egan and his family."

It was a subjective assessment of a lifetime in Alaska, because the speaker was Bill Egan himself.

"We have enjoyed good lives and good health," Mr. Egan said. "We have established friendships that have been both rich and enduring."

"And the people of Alaska have been especially good to us."

Those comments of nine years ago have vitality again today because Alaska once more has honored Bill Egan, serving again—as he was then—as governor of the 49th State.

Before hundreds of close friends and admirers, Gov. William Allen Egan, a son of Valdez and a leading figure in Alaska politics for nearly three decades, was honored Friday night as "Alaskan of the Year."

His selection from a group of five finalists for the honor came as no surprise, despite the tremendous accomplishments and contributions made to Alaska by the other four nominees.

He thus became the third of Alaska's Democratic "Big Three" to be so honored.

Earlier, Alaskan of the Year honors had gone to the other two members of this Democratic triumvirate—Sen. E. L. Bartlett and Sen. Ernest Gruening—who with Mr. Egan dominated Alaska political life in the transitional days between territorial status and statehood, and the years beyond.

Sen. Bartlett received the honor in 1968, just eight months before his death. Sen. Gruening, now retired from active politics after his defeat in the 1968 primary election, was honored last year after a career of great distinction in the service of Alaska.

A year ago the history book seemed closed on all three of these outstanding Democratic leaders. Mr. Egan, after two terms as governor beginning with the advent of statehood in 1959, had been retired from office in a Republican election sweep led by Walter J. Hickel.

But he proved himself to be only down—not out. He came back last year to win a vigorous nominating campaign in the primary election and then swept to victory by a near-landslide in November.

Since December, when he resumed office, Mr. Egan has been head of state at another critical period of Alaska's history—as he was in the early days of statehood a dozen years ago, as he was in the crisis days that followed the great earthquake of this very same date seven years ago.

The honor bestowed on him Friday night was one presented for a long and dedicated career of leadership and public service. Republicans as well as Democrats participated in the salute, recognizing Mr. Egan's place in the hearts of his fellow Alaskans.

Virtually all of Mr. Egan's adult life has been in public service. And in almost all of his public service career he has been not just a member of the squad, but the captain of the team.

In comments made in an address at the University of Alaska 10 years ago, Mr. Egan summed up the position in which he finds himself today.

"If a man earns and achieves a position of leadership, he must keep faith with those who have entrusted him with that responsibility," he said.

Clearly the people of Alaska, who have so often strongly endorsed Bill Egan, have demonstrated time and again their belief that he has kept the faith—and has earned the accolade of Alaskan of the Year.

PARDON LIEUTENANT CALLEY

HON. PATRICK T. CAFFERY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, the Calley case is a dark day in the history of this country. I have written to the President and have asked him to pardon Calley and I intend to do everything within my power to see that Lieutenant Calley is given justice.

However, at this time of great emotion it is important that we keep our heads and not play into the hands of our enemies. The Calley affair is one of the most serious national events in recent times because it threatens to tear this country apart, from the inside.

We must regroup our forces and summon our strength to make certain that the Calley incident is not used by our enemies to tear this country to pieces.

We are disgusted. We feel we have been attacked by our own people. But we must not break. The Calley case has welded all Americans into a common cause and I know that your anger and mine is running very deeply. But let us make sure that we do not turn on our own country and destroy it. That is just what our enemies would like to see us do.

The American people are demanding that Lt. William Calley not be made a scapegoat. I stand here today to speak for my people and in the presentation of this demand I will argue with all the force at my command that what is really at stake is the soul of our country. There is not an American, there is not a father or a mother, there is not a soldier or any man in arms whose heart does not go out to Lieutenant Calley and who does not feel for him the most deep and profound sympathy because we feel that in condemning Lieutenant Calley to a life of imprisonment, the court-martial is condemning us all.

The Calley verdict has caused disgust for the Asian war, disgust for military justice and disgust for our foreign policy. It makes us feel that our own military has let us down. It makes us feel that, for years, after our own men have fought and died for this country in Southeast Asia, it was all in vain.

Was it really the country on trial or was it just Lieutenant Calley on trial? Our rage and our grief and our sympathy are really not going out to just Lieutenant Calley. Has it been in vain? We grieve because we feel that this military court has condemned our country.

The jury of six soldiers, veterans all, men who have been through the stern agony of combat and who have devoted their lives to the cause of this country, a colonel, four majors, and a captain, have decided that Lieutenant Calley committed a crime, that he committed murder, and should be punished. It is not my place to judge whether Lieutenant Calley committed a crime. It is my place to represent my people and my country in these Halls to the very best of my ability and to give to them and to this country my very best thoughts and my most responsible and dutiful actions.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked President Nixon to pardon Lieutenant Calley immediately. But I also stand firm in my belief and determination that we must not allow the Calley affair to destroy our national will.

A BILL TO DEAL WITH ILLEGAL SEIZURE OF AMERICAN TUNA VESSELS**HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, American fishing vessels are continually being harassed, seized, and fined while fishing in international waters off the South American coast. Congress, in enacting the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967—22 United States Code 1971—specifically provided for a mechanism to assist our fishermen in obtaining reimbursement for fines which they have paid due to these illegal seizures. The Department of State has been lax in adequately implementing the provisions of that act, and Government reimbursement for fines under the Fishermen's Protective Act involves months and years of delay. During this time, many of our fishing vessel owners have been forced to cease fishing operations due to the lack of capital, which has been used to pay these illegal and exorbitant fines levied upon them by such countries as Ecuador and Peru.

I am introducing a bill today which would establish a revolving fund out of which a fishing vessel owner will be promptly reimbursed for his payment of such illegal fines. It also requires the Secretary of State to immediately notify the offending foreign country of the claim against it for reimbursement of the moneys paid by the U.S. Government to our fishing vessel owners. If this reimbursement is not collected within 120 days after the required notification to the foreign country, then the Secretary of State is required to deduct the amount of the claim from the funds programed to that foreign country under the Foreign Assistance Act and immediately transfer such funds to the revolving fund. The bill also authorizes \$3 million to be appropriated to provide initial capital for this fishermen's protective fund and such other sums as may be necessary to carry out the bill's provisions in the future.

This bill will insure that the State Department takes immediate and concerted action to obtain restitution from the foreign country to secure the prompt release of the fishing vessel and its crew. In addition, the reimbursement of fines paid by the fishing vessel owners will be quicker, so that no undue hardship is imposed on our fishermen and their families.

I am joined in the introduction of this bill by the very able Congressmen DINGELL, LENNON, KEITH, LEGGETT, BIAGGI, ANDERSON of California, FORSYTHE, TIERNAN, and BLACKBURN.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the

time is now upon us when Congress must take prompt and effective action to solve this disconcerting and continuing problem, and I am hopeful, as we move into this session of Congress, that more of my colleagues will join me and the other initial cosponsors of this measure in this effort.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL LOOKS AT RAILPAX**HON. FLOYD V. HICKS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1971

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written in the past few weeks about the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and the routes it has selected for continued American railway passenger service.

I happen to agree with some of the criticism, particularly that which reflects some disaffection with the Corporation's decisions on routes to and through the Pacific Northwest.

Nevertheless, to be fair, Railpax has a side, too. The Wall Street Journal, in an editorial published on March 31, points out some of the background of Railpax and some of the difficulties under which it labors, and we should give these considerations some attention, too. The editorial follows:

REALISM ON RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE

The National Railroad Passenger Corp. has announced its route system and, predictably enough, a number of people are dissatisfied. Most of them live in or near the cities that, starting May 1, will have no passenger service or much less than they have now.

The dissatisfaction is understandable. Many Americans are nostalgic about railroad trains, even though they no longer patronize them. More important, the nation's transportation needs can only grow in the years ahead, and trains are still the most economical means of moving people from place to place.

In taking over rail passenger service, however, Railpax officials are hardly in a position to give much weight to the wishes of rail buffs or to the nation's long-run transportation problems. The quasi-public corporation created by Congress is at the very best a holding operation that will keep skeletal passenger service until more durable programs can be formulated—and financed.

Finance is a key problem. The rail corporation for some time to come will be able to offer little more than existing equipment and service, where it provides any service at all. Its resources are extremely slim even for the limited system it has outlined. David W. Kendall, chairman of the corporation, says that "at best the losses anticipated in the first several years of operation may well exceed the financial resources of the company."

In the circumstances Railpax is wise to restrict its services to the routes that offer the best chances for eventual profitable operation. Officials have made it clear that they are willing to talk with state and local agencies about added services—provided the agencies are willing to underwrite a large part of any losses.

Railpax does have some advantages. Unlike the railroads it will be free to experiment with fares and routes. The heavy-handedness of federal regulation helps to explain why passenger trains became such a burden on the railroads, a burden the new corporation now will try to lift.

